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New Asian immigrants were tested on Levenson's internal control, control by powerful others and control by chance (IPC) scale. As predicted, there was no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the subtest on the internal factor when New Asian immigrants were compared with New European immigrants, Old Asian immigrants and Caucasian faculty and staff members. Significant differences were found in the mean scores on the subtests on the powerful others and chance factors. New Asian immigrants were also tested on an Attribution scale. A high positive correlation was found between the scores measuring the internal factor of both Levenson's IPC scale and the Attribution scale.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

In recent years, psychologists and counsellors have been interested in the locus of control construct (Joe, 1971; Lefcourt, 1976; Sue, 1981; Throop & MacDonald, 1971). Locus of control is a personality construct reflecting one's belief or perception about who controls behavior and life events. The range of beliefs extends from internal to external locus of control. The internal individual expects a certain outcome or event to occur based on personal effort or behavior and the individual takes responsibility for this consequence. The external person sees no correlation between one's actions and the consequences of such actions. Outcomes are not within the external person's control but are randomly controlled by such outside forces as chance, fate, luck and powerful others or the social systems.

A large body of research has indicated that individuals who are defined as internals view themselves as exerting significant influence over the course of their own lives (Lefcourt, 1974) while those defined as externals tend to believe events are unrelated to personal effort or influence (Rotter, 1966). Because of this belief, externals may be unmotivated to change.

Statement of the Problem

"The apparent lack of motivation in a student or client is a frequent concern for counsellors, teachers, and case
workers" (Connolly, 1980, p. 176). Connolly differentiated the "unmotivated" into two categories: Those who were not and probably would not be motivated, and those who were motivated but perceived themselves incapable of achievement. For the latter, the counsellor "might be more successful in attempting to change their external expectancies of control" (Connolly, 1980, p. 177). Connolly then went on to suggest some intervention strategies intended to change external expectancies in the direction of internality.

It would seem that the locus of control expectancy is considered an important variable in the choice of counselling approach, strategies and process. Therefore, it would be important that the counsellor understand the concept of externality and be very certain that the client is an external person or, as described by Connolly, a "motivated external".

Though the internal-external expectancy construct has been the subject of a great deal of study (Joe, 1971; Lefcourt, 1976; Throop & MacDonald, 1971), much controversy still exists with regard to the concept of externality (Hersch & Schiebe, 1967; Rotter, 1975). Rotter (1975) cautioned investigators against perceiving the I-E construct as a clearcut dichotomy and against predetermining that internals are always 'good guys' and externals are always 'bad guys'.

The construct of externality has not been fully explained and/or researched. Rotter himself (1975) wrote about different types of externals: "the defensive externals who are competitive, striving and ambitious when placed in competitive
achievement situations ..." (p. 64) and the "passive externals", - people who exhibit passive acceptance of the external statements in the I-E scale, probably because of attitudes acquired from their cultures, e.g., Moslem or other ethnic and oriental beliefs (Rotter, 1975). Hersch and Scheibe (1967) suggested that there may be "a diversity in the psychological meaning of externality" (p. 612). For example, one may be an external individual because one is in fact physically or intellectually weak in relation to others, including peers. This individual, perhaps, is the "passive external" mentioned by Rotter (1975). "On the other hand, a person may describe himself as an external because he is in a highly competitive social situation, where the actions of others may have great relevance for the success of his own efforts" (Hersch & Scheibe, 1967, p. 613). This individual is akin to the "motivated external" and "the defensive external" (Rotter, 1975).

A third explanation of the external person put forward by Hersch and Scheibe (1967) is the "person who believes in luck or fate and, if he believes that these external forces are on his side, he may accurately describe himself as an external" (p. 613). This is an optimistic orientation and the person may consider external forces as benevolent as opposed to malevolent.

In the extensive research on generalized expectancies of locus of control, many studies have shown that members of ethnic groups have scored significantly higher on the
external end of the control construct (Graves, 1967; Hsieh, Shybut & Lotsof, 1969; Mahler, 1974; Reitz & Groff, 1972; Wolfgang, 1973). People from underdeveloped or developing societies and from lower socio-economic communities (Lefcourt, 1966; Reitz & Groff, 1972) and women (Lao, 1977) are found to be more external. There is an inherent danger that if the I-E construct were used as a criterion of mental health, many minority, poor and female clients would be seen to possess less desirable attributes.

There is a possibility that the minority, poor or female client who is perceived to be external (Graves, 1967; Hsieh, Shybut & Lotsof, 1969; Lao, 1977; Rotter, 1966) is also perceived as unmotivated, strong on system blame, strong in the belief in luck and fate and, thus, generally unmotivated to bring about changes in personal life. But this conclusion may be too generalized and simplistic and could even be damaging. As Sue (1981) writes, "The problem with an unqualified application of the I-E dimension is that it fails to take into consideration the different cultural and social experiences of the individual. This failure may lead to highly inappropriate and destructive applications in counselling. ... it seems plausible that different cultural groups, women, and lower-class people have learned that control operated differently in their lives as opposed to how it operates for society at large. In the case of Third World groups, the concept of external control takes on a wider meaning" (p. 75).

Sue (1981) maintained that externality may be affected
by three factors: (a) chance-luck, (b) cultural beliefs which are viewed as benevolent, and (c) a political force (racism and discrimination) that represents malevolent but realistic obstacles" (p. 77).

This may perhaps explain an apparent paradox. Asians (Japanese, Chinese, Taiwanese, Thais) have been found to be more external than North Americans (Hsieh, Shybut & Lotsof, 1969; Lao, 1977; Mahler, 1977; Reitz & Groff, 1972), and yet Asians seem to possess the attributes described by Lefcourt (1976) as pertaining to internals. Internals are "more perceptive to and ready to learn about their surroundings. They are more inquisitive, curious and efficient processors of information than externals ... more cautious and calculating about their choices, involvements and personal entanglements" (p. 52).

In Li-Repac's study (1980) of perceptions concerning the typical attributes of Chinese people, there was a positive correlation between the ratings of Chinese clients and white clients. Both whites and Chinese saw the Chinese people as being "adaptable, alert, ambitious, cautious, dependable, intelligent, practical, rational, reliable and self-controlled" (p. 335). These characteristics seem to parallel those of the internal person described by Lefcourt (1976).

The question then arises: why this paradox? If Asians possess so many of the characteristics of the internal person, then why, in most research studies undertaken to date, do they often score more externally in comparison with whites in North America? Could it be that the measuring instrument used,
Rotter's I-E Scale, is not valid to the cultural situation of the subjects? Could cultural differences, beliefs, values and practices explain some of this paradox?

It could be that the cultures of Asians (Bodde, 1981; Fung, 1948) and perhaps, of Native Indians (Sue, 1981; Trimble, 1976) have influenced their subjects to accept the power of some external forces as benevolent forces. A respect and reverence for cosmic powers and unexplained happenings in the universe (especially in an environment that is not highly developed), a humble acceptance of the smallness and ineffectual power of man as compared to that of nature, and the overall sense of the need for humility and modesty so well imbued in the Asian may explain why Asians and Native Indians are rated external on the scale measuring perception of control.

It would seem, therefore, that there is a need to use another measuring instrument which would reflect more accurately the expectancies for control as perceived by the Asian. Could the Asian subject be external in certain dimensions and internal in others? Would a more precise measuring instrument be able to differentiate these dimensions of the internal-external construct?

The second focus of this study is to observe the individual's perceived expectancies for control in association with a specific reinforcement and the actualization of the reinforcement. The construct of locus of control is a
relationship between expectancies for control and reinforcements. "The perception of control is but a single expectancy construct. Other interacting variables of equal, if not greater, importance include the value of the reinforcements in question, as well as the expectancy that one will obtain that desired reinforcement whether by one's own or by external forces" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 153). Attribution of causality and locus of control of reinforcement are related subjects that have generated numerous studies (Lefcourt, 1976; Miller, 1976). Locus of control is a specific element in attributing causality to either external or internal forces. Rotter (1966) suggested that an internal orientation meant that one felt events could be controlled from within; that is, events were within the control of the individual, in contrast to an external orientation, where one sensed a helplessness or powerlessness to control one's destiny (control by powerful others or by chance). These causal beliefs not only precede performance but also partly account for subsequent action (Weiner & Sierad, 1975). It would thus be useful to construct a situation where an individual's perceived expectancies for control for a specific reinforcement could be measured and correlated with his attribution of causality.

**Purpose of Research**

The first objective is to investigate more accurately the expectancies for control as perceived by Asian immigrants. Three dimensions of externality will be examined: internal control, control by powerful others, and control by chance.
The major instrument used will be Levenson's IPC Scale (Levenson, 1972), which divides externality into three subscales: Internal-External Control, Control by Powerful Others and Control by Chance.

The research is designed to show that people are not totally internals or externals and that, as far as the Asian immigrant is concerned, internal and external control expectancies differ as a result of influences brought about by factors such as culture, value of the reinforcement and the socialization process. The study attempts to show that "it is possible for all three to coexist independently within individuals" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 135). It is hoped that the results of such a study would sensitize counsellors and therapists working with Asian clients to the different dimensions of externality and how these relate to the clients and the counselling process.

The second objective of the study is to investigate whether the Asian subjects' expectancy for control, as expressed in the variables of control by luck, personal ability and effort, and control by powerful others, such as teachers, is related to actual behavior (i.e., writing an English language test) and to the outcome of that behavior (i.e., success or failure at the test).
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

A Definition of Locus of Control

Reinforcement, reward or gratification plays an important role in the acquisition and performance of a person's skills and knowledge and in determining general behavior. However, no two persons will react to a reward or reinforcement in the same manner. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceives the reward as a direct outcome of a particular behavior, effort or attribute or, conversely, as an outcome controlled by outside forces which may occur independently of any specific actions (Rotter, 1954).

Reinforcement also acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behavior or event will be followed by continued reinforcement in the future. Once an expectancy for such a behavior reinforcement sequence is built up, it tends to generalize from a specific situation to a series of situations which are perceived as related or similar. This generalized expectancy or attitude or belief becomes a personality variable and might affect a variety of behavioral choices in a broad spectrum of life situations. Generalized expectancies in two different persons, for example, will result in characteristic differences in behavior in a particular situation (Rotter, 1954, 1962). Thus, when a person
has the generalized expectancy that an event or reinforcement is contingent upon personal behavior or relatively permanent individual characteristics, the result is a belief in internal control. In contrast, when a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some personal action but not being entirely contingent upon that action and occurring as a result of luck, chance, fate or as the result of the inter­mediation of powerful others, or where the result is unpredict­able because of the great complexity of external forces, then the subject has a belief in external control (Rotter, 1966).

**The Theory of Reinforcement in Social Learning**

Rotter (1966) affirmed that the internal-external variable "is of major significance in understanding the nature of learning processes in different kinds of learning situations and also that consistent individual differences exist among individuals in the degree to which they are likely to attribute personal control to reward in the same situation" (p. 1).

As Rotter's conclusion predicted, the internal-external construct has been linked closely to social learning and personality theories. In social learning experiments, it has been observed that differences in subject behavior are related to task differences along a dimension of skill and chance (Bennions, 1961; Blackman, 1962; Phares, 1957, 1962). Cohen (1960) has also noted the tendency for the "gambler's fallacy" to appear in games of chance, and to produce an
effect opposite to the usual effect of reinforcement.

Social scientists have long been interested in the significance of the belief in fate, chance or luck. Veblen (1899) felt that a belief in luck or chance, that is, an external belief, represented a barbarian approach to life and was generally characteristic of a society which is inefficient, less productive, ineffective and generally passive. Merton (1946) explained the belief in luck in terms of defensive behavior, as an attempt "to serve the psychological function of enabling people to preserve their self-esteem in the face of failure, or may also in some individuals act to curtail sustained endeavor" (p. 3). Rotter (1975) writes about the 'good guy-bad guy' dichotomy. He complains that, "In spite of fears, and even warning to the contrary, some psychologists quickly assume that it is good to be internal and bad to be external," and that, "It would help in such investigations if the researcher had not already predetermined that internals are always 'good guys' and externals are always 'bad guys'." (Rotter, 1975, p. 60).

The internal-external variable is also related to the concept of alienation. Seeman (1959) linked this concept of alienation as it refers to powerlessness to internal-external control as a psychological variable, and Heffler (1957) and Soole (1956) developed a crude individual measure of alienation with the internal-external variable as one determining factor.
Rotter (1966) hypothesized that internals would show more overt striving for achievement than externals. Other investigations (Atkinson, 1958; Crandall, 1963; McClelland, Atkinson et al, 1953) suggested that people who scored high on the need for achievement had some belief in their own ability and skill to determine the outcome of their efforts.

**Development of the Internal-External (I-E) Scale and Related Studies**

The first attempt to measure individual differences in the belief in external control as a psychological variable was begun by Phares (1957) in his study of chance and skill effects on expectancies for reinforcement. He developed a Likert-type scale with thirteen items stated as external attitudes and thirteen as internal attitudes. Phares found that individuals with internal attitudes would behave in a manner similar to all subjects when placed in a chance situation versus a skill situation. Individuals with external attitudes (externals) tended to make unusual and illogical or unrelated shifts in expectancies.

Phares' work was followed by James (1957) who used Phares' scale and a revision of Phares' test with a Likert format composed of 26 items plus filler items. The choice of the 26 items was based on those items which appeared to be most successful in the original Phares study. James found that external subjects had smaller increments and decrements following success and failure; they generalized less from one
task to another and recovered less following the period of extinction.

Rotter (1966), in association with Seeman and the late Liverant, undertook to broaden the test. They developed sub-scales for different areas, such as achievement, affection and general social and political attitudes, in constructing a new forced-choice questionnaire. The earliest version of Rotter's scale included 100 forced-choice items, each one comparing an external belief with an internal belief. The 100-item forced-choice scale was eventually trimmed down to a 29-item test which included six filler items intended to make the purpose of the test a little more ambiguous.

The items in the Rotter I-E scale deal exclusively with the subject's belief about the nature of the world as illustrated by the subject's expectations about how reinforcement is controlled. The I-E scale was tested on subjects selected from a variety of populations: college students chosen at random, different prisoner populations, Negro populations, Peace Corps volunteers, and high school students. These and other studies provided strong evidence of the validity of the I-E scale's construct, either from predicted differences in the behavior of internals and externals or from correlations between behavioral criteria and internality. One such study (Seeman, 1964) seemed to indicate that membership in a union versus non-membership, the degree of activity within the union, and general knowledge of political affairs were all significantly related to internality.
"Reliability measures reported for the Internal-External (I-E) Control Scale have been consistent" (Joe, 1971, p. 619). Rotter (1966) reported good discriminant validity for the I-E scale as indicated by low correlations with variables such as intelligence, social desirability and political affiliation; but some findings, for example, Tolor (1967) and Tolor and Jalawiec (1968) found nonsignificant correlations between the I-E scale and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

Interest in the I-E scale has generated the development of many other similar scales: Schneider (1968) constructed a forced-choice activity preference scale; Dies (1968) developed a projective measure for evaluating internal-external control from TAT stories; Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall (1965) designed an I-E scale for children; Nowicki and Strickland (1972, 1973) designed two scales, one for non-college as well as college adults and one for children; and, lastly, Levenson (1973) created the IPC (internal, powerful others and chance) scale by essentially categorizing and rewording the items on the Rotter scale.

The I-E Scale, Learning and Achievement

Studies seem to indicate that internals perform better than externals under conditions where skill controls the outcome, while externals perform better than internals under conditions determined by chance (Lefcourt, 1965; Lefcourt, Lewis & Silverman, 1968).
Seeman's study of prison inmates (1963) should be of great interest to educators for it indicates the importance of values as well as expectancies for making differential predictions of learning. Seeman found that inmates low in externality learned the parole-related material significantly better than inmates high in externality. Seeman's study also showed that inmates, who had earned merits demonstrating conformity to institution demands, were low in externality and learned more of the parole-related material. These studies seem to indicate that, with regard to the learning variable, the internal-external construct allows some prediction when the materials are relevant to the subject's goals.

Many studies have correlated the I-E construct with the need for achievement, particularly in the area of academic and intellectual activities and pursuits (Chance, 1965; Crandall, Katakovsky & Crandall, 1965). Internals spent more time in intellectual activities, exhibited more intense interest in academic pursuits, and ranked higher on intelligence tests and other academic tests than did externals.

In two studies (Gurin & Gurin, Lao & Beattie, 1969; Lao, 1970) students with a high sense of personal control had higher achievement test scores and grades, higher academic confidence, and higher educational expectations and aspirations than did students who held a belief in control ideology. These results suggest that it is the sense of personal control rather than control ideology that differentiates motivation and performance.
Personality and the I-E Scale

Hersch and Scheibe (1967) correlated the I-E scale with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Adjective Check List (ACL) and found that internally-oriented subjects scored higher than externally-oriented subjects on the Dominance, Tolerance, Good Impression, Sociability, Intellectual Efficiency, Achievement via Conformance and Well-Being scales, and tended to describe themselves as assertive, achieving, powerful, independent, effective and industrious (Joe, 1971). Feather (1967) noted a significant tendency for externally-scoring subjects of both sexes to report more debilitating anxiety and neurotic symptoms. Tolor and Reznikoff (1967) reported that external scores were significantly related to sensitization and overt death anxiety while internal scores were significantly related to repression and insight.

I-E Construct and Anxiety

Research in this area suggests that externals describe themselves as anxious, less able to show constructive responses in overcoming frustration and more concerned with fear of failure than with achievement per se (Ray & Katahn, 1968; Watson, 1967). Feather's study (1967a, 1967b) raises the question of whether the belief in external control produces anxiety or whether anxiety produces a belief in external control. Further study of this problem would help illuminate the I-E control dimension in subjects from underdeveloped and developing countries and from other ethnic cultures.
The I-E Dimension in a Cross-cultural Context

It could be that a belief in external control is a reaction against anxiety learned and reinforced by past experiences in stressful situations. If this is so, then the fact that subjects from low socio-economic levels and from underdeveloped and/or developing societies tend to score high on the externality scale seems fairly logical. In North America, Negroes, Asian Americans, new immigrants and people from other ethnic groups, such as Mexicans and people from lower socio-economic levels generally, have higher external scores than whites and middle-class individuals (Battle & Rotter, 1963; Lefcourt & Ludwig, 1965a, 1966). Scott and Phelan (1966) noted that unemployed whites were significantly more internally oriented than unemployed Negroes or Mexicans, and unemployed male adults were more externally oriented than white middle-class college students.

Hsieh, Shybut and Lotsof (1969), in a cross-cultural comparison study, reported that Anglo-Americans were significantly more internally oriented than American-born Chinese and Hong Kong-born Chinese. In addition, the American-born Chinese were significantly lower on the external scale than the Hong Kong-born Chinese.

Parsons and Schneider (1970) compared the I-E attitudes of university students in two western societies which differ in the degree of governmental control; namely, Denmark and the United States. Danish and U.S. students manifested the same
general level of internality. However, they differed in the pattern of scoring over the various items comprising the I-E scale. When asked to predict other students' responses, Danes ascribed greater internality to U.S. and West German students, while U.S. students ascribed greater externality to West German, Japanese and other U.S. students. This interesting study seems to indicate that the I-E scale is a fairly valuable scale for determining perceptions of cultural differences and national stereotypes.

Graves (1967) adapted the I-E scale for high school students and studied the ethnic differences in an isolated tri-ethnic community. He found whites to be least external, followed by Spanish Americans. Indians were the most external in attitudes. Graves felt that ethnicity was an important source of variance after other factors were controlled.

Reitz and Groff (1972) studied the I-E orientation of workers in the United States, a developed Western country, Japan, a developed Oriental country, Mexico, a developing Western country, and Thailand, a developing Oriental country. Subjects were all nonsupervisory workers in industrial plants. The authors adopted the four categories created by Schneider and Parsons (1970): luck and fate, politics, respect, leadership and success. They omitted the category on academic success. In the "leadership and success" category, workers from each of the two developed economies, the U.S. and Japan, were significantly more internal than workers from either of the two developing economies, Mexico and Thailand. On
"personal respect", as hypothesized, workers from each of the two Oriental countries were significantly more external than workers from either of the two Western countries. Contrary to the hypothesis, the Japanese workers were least external on politics; and workers from developed countries (U.S. and Japan) tended to be more external than workers from developing countries (Thailand and Mexico) on general luck and fate. This study has provided greater insight into differences among cultural groups than was formerly obtained by simply comparing total scores.

Levenson's Internal, Powerful Others and Chance (IPC) Scale

Just as Schneider and Parsons concluded that the I-E scale was not unidimensional, so have other investigators (Gurin et al, 1970; Lao, 1970; Levenson, 1973; Muriels, 1970). Levenson suggested that the definition of externals as those with expectancies that fate, chance, or powerful others control events was far too global. She created a new scale that actually comprises three scales, -- internal, powerful others, and chance (IPC), -- to measure belief in chance expectancies as separate from a powerful others orientation. She postulated that people who believe the world is unordered, or dependent on chance, would behave and think differently from people who believe the world is ordered, but that powerful others are in control. In the latter case a potential for control exists. Levenson suggested that by separating the elements of Rotter's unidimensional scale into the three dimensions of internal, powerful others and chance, the relationship between a
person's involvement and expectation for control, e.g., in testing Negroes' attitudes about participating in demonstrations, would be better understood. Each facet of the IPC scale consists of eight items in a Likert 6-point format. The IPC scale has another very important difference from Rotter's I-E scale. All the statements in the three scales are phrased so that each statement addresses the subject directly. Thus, the test measures the degree to which an individual feels in personal control over what happens as differentiated from perceived attitudes about people in general. Using the scales on 96 male and female adults, Levenson came to the following conclusions: (1) Mean differences indicated that the I scale (M = 35.48) was significantly different from both the P (M = 16.65) and C (M = 13.94) scales; (2) The P and C scales correlated moderately with each other but both were negatively related to the I scale; (3) A person with high expectations of control by powerful others (high P) or low expectations for control by self (external) will still be involved in social action (such as demonstrations), but a person who scores high on chance would not believe that there is hope for control and, therefore, would be less involved.

Because the IPC scale measures the dimension of control more specifically and accurately, it may be a more useful and valid instrument for testing people of other cultures. Mahler (1974) tested American and Japanese students with the IPC
scale and found that American students scored in a more internal direction than did Japanese students, but Japanese students feel that they are more controlled by chance and luck than do American students. Mahler had hypothesized that Japanese students would score higher on control by powerful others but the results showed otherwise. Lao (1977), using the scales on Chinese and Americans and comparing his results with Mahler's, concluded that (1) the forces of the control variable may be tapping some basic psychological dimension common to different cultures, (2) there was a high degree of similarity between the Chinese and the U.S. scores, (3) there was a significant pattern between the sexes for each culture, and (4) contrary to expectations as in Mahler's study, U.S. students scored highest on the P scale (control by powerful others), followed by the Chinese and then the Japanese, who had the lowest scores.

The IPC scale, as it is presented in three subscales, is an instrument of great potential in the study of the control dimension as it pertains to minority groups. On the Rotter I-E scale, ethnic group members and people from lower socio-economic levels score significantly higher on the external end of the continuum (Hsieh, Shybut & Lotsof, 1969; Lefcourt, 1966). But, because of the forced-choice format and the uni-dimensional concept, this global conclusion is not as pertinent and useful as the results obtainable from Levenson's IPC scale. Besides, as studies using the IPC scale have shown (Lao, 1977; Mahler, 1974), the differences in the scores of
various cultural groups on the internal-external scale were in most cases too small to be significant. On the other hand, cultural groups seem to vary significantly on the chance scale; for example, factory workers from developed countries scored higher on the chance scale than factory workers from less developed countries (Reitz & Groff, 1974). These differences have important implications for counselling.

Causal Attribution of Success and Failure

Attribution theory examines the individual's analysis of behavioral causation for the purpose of understanding how the analysis affects behavior. Attribution theory is "based on three broad assumptions: (I) The individual attempts to assign a cause for important instances of his behavior and that of others; when necessary, he seeks information that enables him to do so. (II) His assignment of causes is determined in a systematic manner. (III) The particular cause that he attributes ... [affects] his subsequent feelings and behavior" (Jones, 1972, p. 8).

The attribution processes have also been viewed as a way of providing the individual with "a means of encouraging and maintaining his effective exercise of control" (Jones, 1972, p. 12). The purpose of causal analysis is thus effective control. In consequence, the attribution process is directly related to the locus of control construct and it is maintained that the "attributional process can be well understood only in the context of a comprehensive analysis of the
exercise of control" (Jones, 1972, p. 12). Within this context, too, control of one's environment involves a balance between "Controlling the controllable and controlling the important" (Jones, 1972, p. 15).

Sue, S. (1977) writes that many minority groups, such as Asian Americans, have over the years become aware of the areas of control and noncontrol. In the controllable areas, such as the socio-economic aspects of life and in academic pursuits, the Asian Americans have exercised their control and succeeded; but in other areas, such as civil rights and political power, they have kept away, being influenced by a long history of negative relationships which were often manifested in unfair legislation and racial discrimination. Through this history of experience, Asian Americans have fallen prey to learned helplessness. Sue believes that there is a definite relationship between the concepts of locus of control and learned helplessness. It would seem that, as far as Asian Americans are concerned, the three concepts of attribution, locus of control and learned helplessness are interrelated.

Individuals do not employ the same causal explanations to account for their successes and failures. Individuals tend to take more personal responsibility for their successes than their failures and to view external factors, such as luck and task difficulty, as being more responsible for their failures (Jones & Wortman, 1973). Miller and Ross (1975) found that individuals are more likely to accept responsibility
for expected outcomes than unexpected outcomes and, in general, people expect success and not failure. In another study, Miller (1976) found that individuals engaged in more self-protective attributions under high- than low-involvement failure conditions. Similarly high-involvement success subjects engaged in more self-enhancing attributions. High-involvement failure subjects attributed more responsibility for their performance to luck. Miller had manipulated a social-perceptiveness scale (SPS), testing in such a way that subjects would either be highly- or casually-involved in the task.

Earlier studies had not differentiated the stability dimension of the attribution factors, such as ability, effort, evaluator accuracy, task difficulty and luck. Duerk (1975) postulated that the stability dimension is an important consideration. Lefcourt et al (1979) developed a goal specific multiattributional assessment (MMCS) in which differentiations are made between success and failure, internality-externality, stability-instability, and achievement-affiliation. They found that "goal specific measures of locus of control should be better predictors of behavior associated with their respective goals than generalized locus of control measures" (p.288). A disadvantage is that the former should allow for less generality than the latter.

A number of attribution of causality studies have been conducted in the cross-cultural context. Fry and Ghosh (1980) conducted a study using children from Canadian Caucasian and Asian Indian populations. Caucasian subjects took greater
personal credit for success and attributed failure to luck, but Asian subjects assumed more personal responsibility for failure and attributed success to luck. It was felt that the socialization process of the two cultures had an influence on the attribution process.

Chandler, Shama et al (1981) carried out a cross-national study of multiattributational causality using Lefcourt et al's MMCS. Subjects were selected from the five countries of India, Japan, South Africa, the United States and Yugoslavia. Across all countries, subjects attributed their achievement more to their own effort than to ability, luck or context. Among countries, the differences for attributions to ability, context and luck were significant.

Cultural Factors Affecting Locus of Control: The World of Nature in Chinese Culture

For the Chinese, the world of man and the world of nature constitute one great indivisible unity (Bodde, 1981). Man is but a part, though a vital part, of the universe as a whole. This concept may have originally sprung from the agrarian nature of Chinese civilization and its dependence upon the unpredictable forces of nature. This belief is further strengthened by the philosophy of Taoism whose basic principle is that Man must subordinate himself to Tao, that is, Nature. In the west happiness is to be found by harnessing the forces of nature to the will of man. In China, on the contrary, when one surrenders oneself to the universe as one finds it, one gains the true happiness of contentment in
simplicity (Bodde, 1981). "The universe is my mind, and my mind is the universe, so that if I can develop completely my mind, I thereby become identified with Heaven," said Lu Chin-Yuan (Bodde, 1981, p. 275). Heaven, or T'ien, is a total cosmic process, and whatever is in the universe must be good, simply because it is (Bodde, 1981). If something is amiss or if something is beyond the control of man, it is because man has failed to actualize the potential of his nature and has failed to understand adequately how the universe operates. Man should then accept the consequences of his behavior or any natural cosmic happenings with acquiescence. Quiescence (Ching) is an important concept in both Taoism and Buddhism. "Emptiness, quiescence, stillness and nonactivity: these are the levels of the universe and the perfection of Tao and Te (the Power)" (Bodde, 1981, p. 277). The schools of Taoism, Confucianism and Buddhism have thus contributed to the Chinese acceptance of the workings of T'ien or Heaven. In modern society, particularly in western society, T'ien is interpreted as Fate. One difference is that, according to Chinese philosophy, Fate is not necessarily malevolent because T'ien or the Universe is always in a state of flux (Bodde, 1981) and any one event need not be seen as evil.

Objectives of the Study

When subjects from cultures other than the white North American culture have been tested, the findings show them to be more externally-controlled (Graves, 1967; Hsieh, Shybut &
Lotsof, 1969; Reitz & Groff, 1972). But counsellors believe that an internal locus of control is an important requisite for the success of counselling therapy (Connolly, 1981; Lefcourt, 1966; Phares, 1976, Sue, 1981). Thus, minority clients may often be viewed as "inherently apathetic, procrastinating, lazy, depressed or anxious about trying" (Sue, 1981, p. 75). However, most research has not differentiated the multidimensions in the external factor of Rotter's I-E scale. Therefore, Levenson's IPC scale, which measures the locus of control construct in the three dimensions of internal-external control, control by powerful others and control by chance, will be used in this study to assess the control perception of the Asian immigrant.

The general objective of this study is to measure more accurately the construct of I-E locus of control by employing the Levenson IPC scale. In pursuit of this general objective, specific hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically \((\alpha = .05)\), when New Asian immigrants, Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants are compared.

Hypothesis 2: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically \((\alpha = .05)\), when faculty and staff members, New Asian immigrants and New European immigrants
are compared.

Hypothesis 3: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when Asian faculty and staff members are compared with Caucasian faculty and staff members.

Hypothesis 4: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when female immigrants are compared with male immigrants, whether their origin is Asian or European.

Hypothesis 5: There is no positive correlation between the subscores of the internal, powerful others and chance factors of the Levenson IPC scale and the Attribution scale.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

As was mentioned earlier, one purpose of this study is to measure more accurately the locus of control construct as it pertains to Asian subjects. Hersch and Scheibe (1976) have reported Rotter's externals as being a more psychologically heterogeneous group than Rotter's internals. In studies undertaken to date (Mahler, 1974; Reitz & Groff, 1974), Asians have proved to be more external than North American whites. It is hoped that this study will provide a clearer breakdown of the multidimensional construct of externality as it pertains to Asian subjects.
In all the ethnic studies of the locus of control scale, groups whose social position is one of minimal power, either by class or race, tend to score higher in the direction of external control. (The subjects under consideration here also share this social position.) The Asian immigrants' world view is influenced significantly by the strong perception that they belong to a group with minority status. Visible ethnic differences and economic factors separate them from the larger majority group. As immigrants (many with refugee status), their recent past experiences and present process of acculturation would influence their perception of control. A study of immigrants' perception of control, whether they be Asian or European, would, therefore, be useful.

Expectancies of control depend on a sequence of reinforcements or outcomes which are the consequences of certain behaviors. A cumulation of similar patterns of behavior and reinforcements would act to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behavior or event will be followed by that particular reinforcement in the future. Thus, a behavior-reinforcing sequence is built up, and a generalized expectancy for control is developed.

In the context of immigrants, it can perhaps be postulated that with the passage of time the immigrants would formulate expectancies for control according to the behavior-reinforcing experiences which occur in a new geographical and cultural environment. This would also mean that the expectancy for control could change and adapt over time.
If this rationale is logical, one should then be able to predict that the expectancies for control of the immigrants would change over time according to the length of their residence in Canada. Though a longitudinal study would be ideal to ascertain this, in this study it is hoped that there would be differences between the expectancies for control of new immigrants (with residency below three years) and that of old immigrants (with residency above four years) which would indicate that a movement or change in the control construct would be possible over a period of time.

Many previous studies (Lao, 1977; Mahler, 1974; McGinnies, 1974) have shown that males, in general, felt that they had more control over their lives than females, and that they were less susceptible to the influence of powerful others. In the Lao (1977) study of American and Chinese male and female subjects, the differences between male and female subjects were greater for the Chinese.

The hardships, which immigrant women endure during the adjustment process in the first few years in a new country are well-documented (Immigrant Women Conference Report, 1981). Yet most of them seem to shoulder this burden well. They seem to be in control. It would be valuable to study their perception of control and to compare it with their male counterparts.

If Asian immigrants have different perceptions of control because of cultural differences and historical treatment by majority groups, what would be the nature of the
perception of control of the European immigrants? Though visible differences appear fewer, would other cultural and past political experiences influence their expectancy for control? Research has shown the Europeans to be more internal than the Asians (McGinnies, 1974; Schneider & Parsons, 1970).

It could be assumed that as members of the faculty and staff are in more secure and stable socio-economic positions, were either born in Canada or have lived longer in Canada, they would be in a better position of control. Since they occupy positions of authority and respect, their perception of control would be stronger than those of their students, who many even view them as "powerful others". It is postulated that this group of subjects will score higher on internal control while others will score higher on control by powerful others and by chance.

What areas do Asian immigrants feel that they have control over? Do they believe they have the methods or means to control important life events? Academic achievement has always ranked high in the Asian immigrants' hierarchy of social values (Sue, S., 1977). Would they feel a strong sense of control in the matter of success in academic achievement? Similarly, would the subject consider that failure in academic pursuits was due to external factors, such as luck or control by powerful others? It is hypothesized that the Asian immigrants who attribute success to internal control will perceive themselves in control, for this is an area of personal control
which reflects a person's belief about his/her own sense of personal competence (Sue, D., 1981). Academic achievement and an upward socio-economic mobility have been two areas of control historically open to the Asian immigrant (Sue, S., 1977).

Assumptions

This thesis makes the following assumptions. One is that Asians and Asian immigrants do possess the personal characteristics that have been described to define internal control. This supposition has not been widely researched and, for the purposes of this study, it is based in part on personal experience. In defense of the assumption, this study will discuss the relevant research and point to the fact that, historically, many Asian immigrants all over the world, -- in Southeast Asia, North America, South Africa, Europe and Australia, -- have enjoyed economic success for centuries.

The thesis also makes the assumption that most Asians, whether they be Chinese (from Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Malaysia, Laos or South America) or Vietnamese or Japanese or Korean, share some basic cultural similarities (Pedersen, Draguns, Lonner & Trimble, 1981). This assumption is predicated on a few factors. The majority of Asians in this sample are ethnic Chinese. Chinese sovereignty and culture have had a great influence on other Asian countries, such as Vietnam, Korea and Japan over the centuries (Morton, 1980). The fact that all these subjects are immigrants also means that they share many experiences unique to the immigrant adjustment process.
CHAPTER III
Design of the Study

Sample

Of the total sample for this study, 190 subjects were taken from a community college which has a large department devoted to the teaching of English as a second language. This English Language Training (ELT) Department has a sizable student population of adult immigrants from all over the world. The subjects of this study were drawn both from students learning the English language and faculty and staff of the ELT department.

The remaining 20 subjects comprised community workers from social agencies which provide services for immigrants. These subjects were classified as staff members because of their continuous interaction with the immigrant students. In addition, some of these subjects also qualified under the category of 'old' Asian immigrants.

The student immigrant subjects were chosen from language classes where it was expected that the level of English competency was high enough for the subjects to comprehend the measuring instruments with ease.

New Asian Immigrants. Included in this sample were immigrants from Mainland China, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, the Philippines, India and other Asian countries. These subjects were designated as 'new' if they had not
resided in Canada for more than three years. They were enrolled as adult immigrant students in the English language classes held at the community college.

**Old Asian Immigrants.** These subjects were similar to the 'new' Asian immigrants except for their length of stay in Canada. They had been in Canada for more than four years. As members of the staff and faculty of the college or social workers for community agencies, 'Old' Asian immigrants also form a subgroup of that category below.

**New European Immigrants.** These subjects were immigrants from Russia, Poland, Czeckoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Italy, Greece and other countries of Europe. The immigrants had not been in Canada for more than three years. As adult students, they also attended English language classes at the same community college.

**Faculty and Staff Members.** Subjects under this category were members of the faculty and administration of the college's English language department. As mentioned earlier, workers from community agencies whose clients are the immigrant students in the study were included in the faculty and staff category. This category was further divided into two groups: Asian members and Caucasian members. Old Asian immigrants make up the Asian subdivision. Members of both categories were language instructors, language workers, paraprofessionals, counselling personnel, program assistants, librarians, health service personnel or clerical support staff.
Description of the Instruments

Levenson's IPC Scale. The chief instrument used was Levenson's IPC Scale (see Appendix A). This scale was constructed by Levenson to provide a more accurate measure "to examine the validity of separating the unidimensional I-E scale of Rotter into three dimensions (I, P, & C) in order to understand better the relationship between involvement and expectations for control" (Levenson, 1972, p. 261).

The IPC Scale has three scales (Internal, Powerful Others and Chance) which are factorially independent of one another. It has a Likert-type 6-point scale. "On the I, P and C scales a personal-ideological distinction has been made as all statements are phrased so as to pertain only to the subject himself. They measure the degree to which an individual feels he has control over what happens to him, not what he feels is the case for 'people in general'" (Levenson, 1972, p. 261). The I, P and C scales also have a high degree of parallelism in content.

Item analyses were carried out with several pre-test groups and the results indicated that all of the items distinguished significantly between high and low scorers for each of the three scales. Correlations between the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1964) and each of the items were very near .00, the highest being only +.19.

The IPC scale presented in Appendix B shows the correlation of each item of the 24-item scale to the total scale.
score. It can be seen that these are fairly high and consistent. The letter preceding the item indicates the scale to which it belongs.

Internal consistency estimates are only moderately high, but this is to be expected since the items sample from a variety of situations. These correlations compare favorably with those obtained by Rotter (1966) for the I-E scale. Kuder-Richardson reliabilities (coefficient alpha) yielded $r = .64$ for the I scale, $.77$ for the P scale and $.78$ for the C scale. Split-half reliabilities (Spearman-Brown) were: $r = .62$ (I scale), $.66$ (P scale) and $.64$ (C scale). Test-retest reliabilities for a one-week period were: $rs = .64$ (I scale), $.74$ (P scale) and $.78$ (C scale). Means for the second administration of the scales were not significantly different from those of the first administration. Levenson (1972) maintains that the three predicted factors of I, P and C emerged in factor analysis (varimax rotation method), and the scores were differentially associated with such variables as involvement and information. Furthermore, items referring to system control and to modifiability have been omitted on the new IPC scale, thereby eliminating some confounding variables found in other studies.

The IPC scale consists of 24 items on a 6-point Likert format with 8 items for each of the I, P and C factors (see Appendix B). A subject receives a score on each of the three scales. The I (internal-external control) is scored in the
internal direction, whereas the P and C factors are scored in the external direction. The higher score on I means higher internality, and a higher score on either P or C means higher externality. Items for each scale are arranged to make a random blend of I, P and C items (Appendix A).

The Attribution Scale (Appendix C). A short questionnaire of six statements on the same 6-point Likert scale as the Levenson scale was designed to observe the relationship between the subject's perception of control and his causal attribution for the reinforcement of a specific behavior, which, in the case of the present study, took the form of the results (success or failure) of an English language midterm test. Three of the statements asked for the subject's causal attribution for success or failure in test-taking in general, and three statements referred specifically to the results of the English language midterm test that was taken. The content of the six statements attempted to cover the three factors of I, P and C; two statements related to the subject's perception of internal control (ability and effort), two statements to powerful others (subjectivity of evaluator), and two statements to chance (luck).

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between the mean scores on the three factors (I, P and C) of the Levenson scale and the Attribution scale.

A test-retest of the Attribution scale was taken at another test-taking performance. Students (n = 15) were
given the Attribution scale after an in-class essay test. A week later, the Attribution scale was administered again.

Collecting Data from New Asian and European Immigrants

Language instructors were consulted to determine the level of language competency of the subjects. The instrument, Levenson's IPC scale (Appendix A), introduced by a letter of instruction (Appendix F) was then administered in the classroom. Questions for clarification were permitted. Less than half an hour of class time was allotted for answering the questionnaire. Two hundred and ten questionnaires were collected in several sessions over a period of four months.

Collecting Data from Faculty and Staff Members

Many staff members who helped to administer the questionnaire and other members of the faculty volunteered to answer the questionnaire. Additional data was collected for the sample by written request (Appendix D). Thirty-five faculty members and 20 staff members answered the questionnaire.

Collecting Data for Comparison of Sex Differences in I-E Control Expectancies

All data collected from the 210 immigrant student subjects, whether Asian or European, were separated into female and male categories.

Collecting Data for the Correlation between Expectancies for Control and Attribution of Outcome

Subjects were first given a three-hour English language midterm test by their instructors. A week later, the midterm
test results were released. Students were then asked to complete the two questionnaires, the Levenson scale and the Attribution scale, and to indicate whether they had succeeded or failed in the English language midterm test. Thirty subjects were administered the two scales.

Throughout the study no one was coerced to provide any data. All questionnaires were answered anonymously, and in each case subjects were asked to provide the additional personal information which is added at the end of the Levenson IPC scale; namely, country of origin, length of stay in Canada, and sex.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis 1: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically $(\alpha = .05)$, when New Asian immigrants, Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants are compared.

The first hypothesis was tested by means of a one-way ANOVA design, using New Asian immigrants, Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants as the three levels, and the three subscores of the Levenson scale, $I$ - internal control, $P$ - control by powerful others, and $C$ - control by chance, as independent, dependent variables.

Hypothesis 2: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically $(\alpha = .05)$, when faculty and staff members, New
Asian immigrants and New European immigrants are compared.

The second hypothesis employed the same experimental design with these three levels: faculty and staff members, New Asian immigrants and New European immigrants.

Tukey pairwise comparisons were performed on both the first and second hypotheses following significant ANOVA effects to assess the significance of the differences among individual means.

Hypothesis 3: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when Asian faculty and staff members are compared with Caucasian faculty and staff members.

Hypothesis 4: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when female immigrants are compared with male immigrants, whether their origin is Asian or European.

The third and fourth hypotheses were each subjected to t-test analyses. The independent variable levels were: Asian faculty versus Caucasian faculty, and male immigrants versus female immigrants. The I, P and C subscores of the Levenson scale were again the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 5: There is no positive correlation between the subscores of the internal, powerful others and
chance factors of the Levenson IPC scale and the Attribution scale.

For the fifth hypothesis, the Pearson r coefficient correlation test was employed to examine whether there were any significant relationships between the I, P and C scores on both the Levenson scale and the Attribution scale for subjects involved.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Sample Description

A total of 210 subjects were tested. Of the questionnaires returned by the subjects, 40 were discarded as spoilt. Some completed questionnaires were rejected because it was felt that the subjects' level of English language competency was not high enough for them to comprehend the questionnaire with ease. Since the questionnaires were not properly filled out, it was felt their content was not fully understood. Some questionnaires were rejected because the responses were incomplete. As shown in Table 2, the total breakdown of the subjects were: 84 New Asian Immigrants, 40 New European Immigrants, and 46 Faculty and Staff Members. This was a mixed sample of both male and female subjects. From the total male and female immigrant sample (both Asian and European), only a subsample of 60 female and 40 male immigrants was taken, as many completed questionnaires failed to note gender status. The faculty and staff subjects were not included in this section of the study.

On the average the age of the new immigrant subjects fell in the range of 25 to 30 years, though there were subjects as young as 19 and as old as 50. The age of the staff members would be in the range of 30 to 35 years. This data was collected from class registrations and observation.
### TABLE 1: Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Asian Immigrants</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New European Immigrants</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Asian Immigrants</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Asian Faculty and Staff)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected questionnaires</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usable sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male subjects</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female subjects</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total subsample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Asian Immigrants (NA)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New European Immigrants (NE)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Immigrants (F)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Immigrants (M)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff Members (Faculty)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Faculty and Old Asian Immigrants (OA)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian Faculty (CA)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The female sample exceeds the male sample in number in all categories.

Table 2 reports the mean scores and standard deviations for the identified groups on the three dependent variables of internal control, control by powerful others and control by chance. While differences in the mean scores on internal control among all the identified groups were small, the differences in the standard deviation were much larger.

New Asian immigrants and male immigrants scored highest on both the subscales of control by powerful others and control by chance.

The differences between male and female subjects on all three subscales were very small.

Caucasian faculty and staff members seemed to score most internally on the powerful others and chance subscales when compared to the other subject groups.

**Test-Retest Reliability of the Attribution Scale**

A week apart, a test-retest of 15 subjects was taken on the Attribution Scale. The coefficient correlation was $\rho = .849$, $\alpha = .05$, $n = 15$.

**Testing Hypothesis 1:** Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when New Asian immigrants, Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants are compared.

As indicated in Table 3, there is no significant
TABLE 3: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Internal Control; Comparing New Asian, New European and Old Asian Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>89.103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.551</td>
<td>2.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2701.837</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>18.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2990.940</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Control by Powerful Others; Comparing New Asian, New European and Old Asian Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>355.085</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>177.543</td>
<td>5.250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4970.904</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5326.000</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

TABLE 5: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Control by Chance; Comparing New Asian, New European and Old Asian Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>594.393</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>297.196</td>
<td>5.549*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7871.881</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>53.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8466.273</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
difference \((\alpha = .05)\) in the mean scores on the Internal factor for the three independent groups (New Asian, New European and Old Asian immigrants).

However, there was a statistically significant difference on the P (control by Powerful Others) mean subscores (Table 4). The Tukey pairwise comparison's test revealed that New Asian immigrants scored more externally on control by powerful others than Old Asian immigrants, while there was no significant difference between the New Asian and New European immigrants or Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants.

The effect for the control by Chance subtest was also statistically significant (Table 5). Using the Tukey pairwise comparison's test, it was found that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of New Asian and Old Asian immigrants. Old Asians were more internally oriented on the C (chance) factor.

There was no significant difference either between the New Asian immigrants and the New European immigrants or between Old Asian immigrants and New European immigrants.

Testing Hypothesis 2: Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically \((\alpha = .05)\), when faculty and staff members, New Asian immigrants and New European immigrants are compared.

As predicted, there was no significant difference in the perception of Internal control by all groups (Table 6).
TABLE 6: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Internal Control; Comparing Faculty, New Asian and New European Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>102.630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.315</td>
<td>2.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3234.670</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>19.369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3337.300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Control by Powerful Others; Comparing Faculty, New Asian and New European Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>688.347</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>344.173</td>
<td>9.743*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5899.065</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>35.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6587.412</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

TABLE 8: ANOVA for Dependent Variable: Control by Chance; Comparing Faculty, New Asian and New European Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1520.792</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>760.396</td>
<td>14.531*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8738.860</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>52.329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10259.623</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
However, there was a statistically significant difference in the perception of control by Powerful Others (Table 7).

Tukey's pairwise comparison's test reveals that New Asian immigrants were much more external on the P subscale than were faculty members, while there was no significant difference between the New Asian and New European immigrants or between New European immigrants and Faculty.

The main effect for the control by Chance factor was statistically significant (Table 8). Faculty members proved most internal with New Europeans coming next, while New Asians were most external.

**Testing Hypothesis 3:** Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when Asian faculty and staff members are compared with Caucasian faculty and staff members.

The main effect for the I (internal control) factor and the P (control by powerful others) factor were not significant when Asian faculty members were compared to Caucasian faculty members. However, Asian faculty members proved more external than Caucasian faculty members on the Chance factor, $t$ test $= -2.269, \alpha = .05$.

**Testing Hypothesis 4:** Mean scores on the three subtests (Levenson's IPC scale) will be no different, statistically ($\alpha = .05$), when female immigrants are compared with male immigrants.

As predicted, there was no statistical significance
between the mean scores of male and female subjects for all three subscores. The mean differences were not statistically significant. \( t = -1.492, \alpha = .05 \).

**Testing Hypothesis 5:** There is no positive correlation between the subscores of the internal, powerful others and chance factors of the Levenson IPC scale and the Attribution scale.

A significant relationship was found between the I (internal control) factor score on the Levenson scale and the I factor score on the Attribution scale, \( r = .62 (\alpha = .05, n = 26) \). The P (control by powerful others) factor scores on both scales were not related, \( r = .03 (\alpha = .05, n = 26) \), while there was an \( r = .42 (\alpha = .05, n = 26) \) between the C (control by chance) scores.
CHAPTER V

An Analysis of the Results

Internal Control

The most interesting finding of this study was that there is no statistically significant difference across all cultural groups on the Internal Control factor. Whether 'old' Canadians or 'new' Canadians, Asians or Caucasians, males or females, all subjects seemed to perceive a similar degree of personal control. And, if we compare the mean scores of the subjects of this study to those of other similar studies, as shown in Table 9, the subjects of this study scored in the same internal range as subjects of the other studies. The fact that Asian immigrants scored as internally as non-Asian Canadians is a departure from the norm. Most cross-cultural studies (Hsieh et al, 1969; Lao et al, 1977; McGinnies et al, 1974; Reitz & Groff, 1974) have shown the Caucasian to be more internal.

Several conclusions may be drawn from this finding. The Levenson scale is perhaps a more refined instrument than Rotter's I-E scale or Parsons and Schneider's subdivision of Rotter's scale. By dividing the Externality dimension into three dimensions of personal control, control by powerful others and control by chance, the subject's perception of personal control (which is really what I-E means to most people) comes into clearer focus. To most subjects, it may
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Internal $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Powerful Others $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Chance $\bar{x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee (1982)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>New Immigrants</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>36.630</td>
<td>24.930</td>
<td>27.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>New Immigrants</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37.200</td>
<td>25.480</td>
<td>27.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>New Immigrants</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35.950</td>
<td>24.333</td>
<td>27.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>New Asians</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>36.690</td>
<td>25.860</td>
<td>27.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>New Europeans</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>36.500</td>
<td>23.730</td>
<td>25.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Asian Canadians</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>38.650</td>
<td>21.880</td>
<td>25.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>38.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>18.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levenson (1977)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>M&amp;F</td>
<td>35.500</td>
<td>16.700</td>
<td>13.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao (1977)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36.390</td>
<td>22.140</td>
<td>23.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33.980</td>
<td>21.050</td>
<td>24.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36.610</td>
<td>25.111</td>
<td>24.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36.210</td>
<td>23.350</td>
<td>24.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.410</td>
<td>19.010</td>
<td>25.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33.420</td>
<td>16.470</td>
<td>18.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32.980</td>
<td>16.720</td>
<td>17.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also provide the essential distinction between what they feel they can control -- the "controllable" -- and what they feel they cannot control. Perhaps too, for Asians, who accept the fact that there are situations beyond their control because of the workings of a universal cosmic power, the distinction between the I and C subscale is made clearer.

Another factor could be that immigrants belong to a subset of the Asian or European population. As alluded to earlier in this study, immigrants may possess a higher expectancy for control when compared to the general population of their country of origin. It may be this internal strength which enabled them to break from old established systems to start afresh in a new system.

The internal control factor does not seem to be affected by either socio-economic or sex differences in this study. The Canadian and Asian faculty subjects were definitely of a higher socio-economic status than the immigrant students, and yet there was no significant difference in their internal subscores. Some students might have enjoyed better socio-economic conditions before emigrating, but most subjects had experienced either communistic or socialistic conditions previously. As well, many subjects came from underdeveloped or developing countries, such as Vietnam, Mainland China and the Phillippines. Although the Reitz and Groff (1974) study had found that people from developing or underdeveloped countries were more external than people from developed
countries, this study does not substantiate their conclusion.

The finding that there are no statistically significant differences in the mean scores for all three factors (IPC) between the male and female groups again runs counter to the usual conclusions of similar studies. In studying a fairly large sample, Lao et al (1977) had found statistical differences between the male and female groups in the mean scores for all three factors (Table 9). In this study the perceived differences were not significant. One could again postulate that immigrant women, as part of the immigrant population, possess a greater degree of personal control. Members of this group may not then be representative of average women in any given population. One other qualifying aspect is the fact that the female subjects were attending Advanced English classes, which require a much higher level of competency than the level at which so-called 'survival' English classes for most immigrants are conducted. Many immigrant women have not reached this level, a fact which again may suggest that the female subjects in this study belong to a more select sample.

Most of the female subjects (98%) were wage earners and home makers during the day and English students at night or vice-versa. This fact would indicate that these female subjects possess a fair degree of ability, determination, competency and a good sense of deferred gratification, qualities indicating a greater degree of personal control which are often attributed to internal people.
Lefcourt (1976) mentioned that the I-E construct should not be considered a personality trait and that changes depending on expectancies, behavioral change and the value of specific reinforcements may cause a shift in the I-E perception of an individual. "The perception of control is a process, the exercise of an expectancy regarding causation" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 153). It was thus predicted in this study that the Old Asian Canadians (who have been in Canada for more than four years) would be more internal than the new arrivals. The results show that both groups were equally internal.

In this regard, it would be valuable to design a longitudinal study for the present new immigrant subjects so as to observe this process.

Control by Powerful Others

Statistical differences were found between the mean scores of the P factor in two groups: the comparison of Old and New Asians and the comparison of Faculty (both Asian and Caucasian) with New Asians.

Since Old Asians and the Asian faculty members are really members of the same group, it means that there is a significant difference between the New Asians and the Asian faculty, as well as between the New Asians and the Caucasian faculty. There was no statistical difference between the two immigrant groups or between the New European immigrants and the Caucasian faculty.

Unfamiliarity with the public system, public structure and procedures may cause the New Asians to feel
powerless and helpless. Hiroto (1974) and Sue (1977) had linked the concept of learned helplessness with the I-E construct. Sue (1977) had suggested that Asian Americans feel powerless because they lacked institutionalized techniques to deal with civil and public matters. Asian immigrants, coming from different civil systems and lacking the English language competency to understand and function comfortably in the new system, could be expected to feel powerless.

If this argument is accepted, it is logical to infer that both Asian and Caucasian faculty members with a longer residency in Canada, with a mastery of the English language, and with experience working as members of the public and community systems, would, therefore, be more internal with regard to control by powerful others.

Control by Chance

Differences in the perception of control by chance were greatest in this study both across cultures and within cultures. Only the sex differences were not significant.

In this study, as in others, the concept of Chance has been linked loosely and collectively with probability, luck, risk and fate. Just as the Internal factor has stable and unstable dimensions, as indicated in MMCS results (Lefcourt, 1979), so too it is conceivable that the Chance factor can be refined in a similar manner. Chance (probability) and luck may be considered unstable or accidental and Fate may be considered more stable since it may refer to a philosophical concept. (See Chapter II.)
The different statements on the Chance subscale of the Levenson scale seem to refer to these different dimensions of Chance. It is the author's contention that different cultures may interpret these statements according to their specific world views. Consider Statement 10: "I have often found that what is going to happen will happen." This statement would refer most closely to the overall concept of Fate, to the traditional Chinese belief in "T'ien" or Heaven, a cosmic power which is linked to human existence through the philosophies of Confucianism and Taoism (Bodde, 1981). The Oriental explanation of this statement could be that "if I have done my best in working towards a particular objective and/or if I have failed or others have failed, then T'ien will take its course and I cannot shape what T'ien has designed." In a subsequent analysis the average score on this statement (4.5) is higher than for any other statement pertaining to Chance, and the average score of the Asians in this study is higher than the average Caucasian score. This may suggest that, to most of the Asian subjects, Statement 10 is an accepted universal truth.

Statement 12: "Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck" would be interpreted as Chance (as in a game of chance). Statement 24: "It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends" caused some puzzlement for the Asian subjects since they did not relate their conceptualization of Fate to
social relationships. The author would like to suggest, in this regard, that the greater degree of differences in the perception of control by the Chance factor may be the result of different interpretations of the statements in this instrument. Earlier socialization and differences in cultural conceptualization may account for the greater statistical differences.

Hersch and Scheibe (1967) had suggested that luck might be considered as benevolent rather than malevolent by certain people. It could be postulated that the immigrant subjects in this study would perceive luck as benevolent because of their recent experiences as refugees. Because of great competition and restrictive immigration policies, being successful as an independent immigrant, sponsored immigrant or refugee immigrant could be considered a highly unpredictable event (chance), and many immigrants have verbalized that they felt they were 'lucky' to be in Canada. This may account for the fact that, when comparing the mean scores for the P and C factors, the C factors showed the most external average scores.

Relationship between the I Factors of the Levenson and Attribution Scales

Subjects' perceived control of the I factors correlated positively ($r = .62$) with subjects' attributed causal factors for the outcome of their test taking. Subjects scoring high on internal control believed that the results of their achievement tests were due to their ability, effort and determination. This conclusion is similar to those of Fry and Ghosh
(1980) and Miller and Ross (1975). Ross (1976) also concluded that attributing one's perceived control, ability and effort to success at a task is related to ego-involvement, and the subject's expectancy for success is higher than that for failure.

The high degree of successful subjects and the fairly high correlation between the I factors on both scales are predictable in a sample composed mostly of Asian Canadians. Sue, S. (1977) maintained that academic achievement is one of the areas perceived by Asian Americans as most "controllable". They perceive a high degree of personal control and have achieved success which in turn has enhanced their socio-economic standing.

The author had not expected a correlation between the P factors of the Levenson and Attribution scales ($\gamma = 0.03$). Asian cultures, particularly those influenced by the teachings of Confucius, hold the position of an instructor/teacher in great honor, esteem and respect. Even if a subject should feel that the instructor or evaluator was biased against him, early socialization would make it difficult to attribute blame to the instructor. It would be against the conditioning of Asian culture.

The correlation ($\gamma = 0.42$) between the Chance scores on both the Levenson and Attribution scales can be expected when it is remembered that the mean scores on Chance for all subjects were higher. As explained earlier, a higher expectancy for control by Chance is influenced by cultural ideology.
Cultural socialization would also cause an Asian subject to attribute a successful event or outcome to luck. In the true Asian tradition, a person has been conditioned as a child to attribute the success of his actions, whether in academic, social or political achievements, first to parents, teachers and others, then to Fate which has been kind and, last, to claim personal credit. The individual would act very modestly and take a humble stance. In both the Fry and Ghosh (1980) and Chandler et al. (1981) studies, East Indian subjects and Japanese subjects attributed their successes more often to luck than did subjects from other cultural groups.

Limitations

This study focuses on an immigrant population sample. Many of its findings, therefore, have limited application to the Asian or European populations at large. Also, as Asians in this sample represent many different Asian ethnic groups (though non-Chinese constitute a very small number), the study is further limited in the cross-cultural context. Yet, because to a large extent Canada is a country of multicultural immigrants, this study perhaps has a relevant place in research literature.

The findings of the second objective have limitations too. Academic performance or achievement performance tasks like test-taking may be perceived to be more "controllable" than other behaviors such as securing a job. However, mastery of the English language has always been considered a difficult task for Asians and fewer Asians are employed in aesthetic,
liberal arts and professional fields, such as law and education, because of the difficulty of mastering the language (Sue, S., 1977). So, though the task may be "controllable", it is also viewed as difficult and the subject's perception of control over the event would be worthy of study.

Summary

As hypothesized, there was no statistical difference on the internal control factor across all subject groups. Comparisons made with other studies (Table 9) indicate (though the results were not statistically significant) that subjects in this study are at par on the internal control mean scores. However, immigrant subjects seem to score much more externally on the powerful others (P) and particularly on the chance (C) scales. The conclusion is that the Asian subject is internal on personal control but more external than non-Asian subjects in his perception of control by powerful others and by chance. This conclusion and the suggestions which have been made in this report about differences in cultural ideology make the historical evidence of the "success image" (Sue, D., 1974) of North American Asians (U.S. and Canada) much more acceptable.

Studies have shown that most Asian Americans are external. However, internal people have the greater probability for success either in socio-economic or self-actualization terms (Connolly, 1981; Sue, D., 1977). Thus, there is a paradox. This study has shown that in a small sample the Asian Canadians are as internal as non-Asian Canadians and
that, limited to this investigation, the paradox does not seem
to exist.

It was also suggested that the chance factor was the
confounding influence in the unidimensional concept of exter­
nality with regard to Asians. The great number and the high
degree of statistical differences among the mean scores of the
various cultural subject groups on this scale, when chance was
treated independently of the other external dimensions, have
substantiated the prediction.

Policy Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

More cross-national studies have been conducted on the
I-E construct using Rotter's I-E scale than Levenson's IPC
scale. It would certainly be encouraging to see more investi­
gations conducted with the Levenson scale on both a cross-
national as well as a cross-cultural basis within North
America. If the I-E construct is considered an important
influence in the counselling process, it would seem important
that more accurate studies are made, particularly with regard
to various cultural groups.

If the perception of control or the expectancies for
control of reinforcements are considered as a process (Lefcourt,
1976) in light of changes over time, it would be profitable to
conduct some longitudinal studies of the process. Immigrants
(according to the Immigrant Settlement Policy) are provided
with settlement services for a period of three years. A
longitudinal study over a span of at least three years would
be invaluable, particularly to the Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program of the Ministry of Immigration and Employment, Canada.

To measure more accurately the concept of chance, particularly as it relates to Asian groups, it would be advantageous to take a close look at the chance subscale in an effort to refine it. Just as Lefcourt et al. (1977) developed the multidimensional-multiattribitional causality scale (MMCS), a similar scale could be developed for the chance dimension, taking into account the conceptual differences of probability, luck and fate and the accidental aspect of luck and chance in contrast with the all-encompassing ideological concept of fate. Perhaps a similar refinement could be made for the powerful others scale.

For an Asian population, consideration could be given to areas perceived to be "controllable", such as academic achievement and economic enterprise, as well as areas which are perceived to be beyond the individual's control, for example, civil and political involvement.

Extended studies of the nature mentioned above would substantially add to the present limited cross-cultural studies in this social-learning construct which has been accepted by social scientists as important since it is so closely linked with attributional causality and human behavior. In the context of Canadian multiculturalism, these studies would be most relevant and valuable.
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APPENDIX A

IPC Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
3. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
4. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
5. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I am lucky. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3
8. Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.  

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

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

11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

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

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

14. 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 luck.

15. Getting what I want required pleasing those people above me.

16. 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.

17. If important people were to decide that they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.

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

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

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

21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.
22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.

23. My life is determined by my own actions.

24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.

Country of Origin: ____________________________
Number of Years in Canada: _______________________
Sex: _________________________________________
## APPENDIX B

Factor Analysis of I, P and C Scales:

Hanna Levenson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Item Scale No.</th>
<th>Factor I: Powerful Others Control</th>
<th>Factor II: Internal Control</th>
<th>Factor III: Chance Control</th>
<th>Varimax Rotation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  .61 3.</td>
<td>I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  .59 13.</td>
<td>People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  .70 11.</td>
<td>My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  .77 15.</td>
<td>Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  .53 19.</td>
<td>I am usually able to protect my personal interests.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  .52 23.</td>
<td>My life is determined by my own actions.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  .67 18.</td>
<td>I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  .64 5.</td>
<td>When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  .43 21.</td>
<td>When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  .60 2.</td>
<td>To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  .51 6.</td>
<td>Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interest from bad luck happenings.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  .70 7.</td>
<td>When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Item Scale</td>
<td>Total Item Scale No.</td>
<td>Factor I: Powerful Others Control</td>
<td>Varimax Rotation Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor II: Internal Control</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor III: Chance Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>14. 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.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>16. 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.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>12. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>8. Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>20. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Attribution Scale

1. What marks (good or bad) I get for any test in any course depends on my own belief in my ability and on how much effort I have put into the test. 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Whether I do well or badly in any test depends on luck. 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Whether I do well or badly in any test depends on how the instructors like me. 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. The mark I received for this test was due to my own determination, ability and effort. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. The mark I received for this test was affected by the fact that the instructors like me. 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. The mark I received for this test was largely due to luck. 1 2 3 4 5 6
APPENDIX D

Letter of Request to Faculty and Staff Members

Elizabeth Lee,

18th January, 1982

Dear Friend/Colleague,

I shall be greatly obliged if you could fill in this questionnaire for me.

I am writing my M.A. (Counselling Psychology) thesis, and my topic is "Locus of Control as Perceived by the Immigrant Student". The research tries to show how the average immigrant student perceives her/his life as being controlled -- by herself/himself; by powerful others, such as teachers government agents or administrators; and by Chance, such as luck and fate.

One of the hypotheses of the thesis is to compare the Locus of Control scores of the students with those of the faculty and "older immigrants". Another hypothesis is to compare the Control scores of Asian subjects with those of Caucasian subjects.

I have finished testing and gathering data from student subjects and some faculty and staff members. I need more male subject volunteers both from the faculty and staff as well as from community agency staff members. I shall be most grateful if you would kindly complete the questionnaire and either leave it in my mail box or mail it to me. Needless to say, all data is treated as confidential and names are not requested.

Thanks you.

Yours sincerely,
APPENDIX E

Instructions for Answering Attribution Scale

This is a short questionnaire of six questions. The questionnaire is planned to help the counsellor to try to find out why some students do well in their studies and some students do not.

This is the code by which you answer the questionnaire:

1  strongly disagree
2  disagree somewhat
3  slightly disagree
4  slightly agree
5  agree somewhat
6  strongly agree

Please circle the number which corresponds most closely to what you believe to be true for you. For example:

Whether I do well or badly in any
test depends on luck.  1  2  3  4  5  6

PLEASE NOTE:

The answering of this questionnaire is completely voluntary. If you do not feel like participating, do not feel obliged. You do not have to give your name. The number on the questionnaire is for the purpose of recording. The results of this questionnaire are strictly confidential.
APPENDIX F

IPC Locus of Control Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire that will help the counsellor. She is doing research about how immigrant students are getting on in the college.

Please circle the number which represents most closely what you believe to be true for you. For example:

When I get what I want, it's
usually because I am lucky.  

-3  -2  -1  +1  +2  +3

Please answer all questions.

At the bottom of page 4, please provide the information by giving the following. For example:

Country of origin:  Malaysia.
No of Yrs in Canada:  5 years.
Sex:  Female.

Please note: The answering of this questionnaire is completely voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, please do not feel obliged. You do not have to give your name. The number on the questionnaire is for the purpose of recording. The results of this questionnaire are strictly confidential.

Thank you.