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ABSTRACT

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Leon Simon Anisfeld

The relationships and interactions of political participation and personal control are the focus of this study. Factor analyses indicate that both concepts are multi-dimensional in nature, political participation being defined by general and specific types of conventional participation and by general and specific types of radical participation, and the personal control dimension being defined by measures of individual vs. system blame, efficacy, and internal vs. external locus of control. A number of demographic factors are included so as to refine and broaden the results.

The major findings are as follows:

Internals attribute political outcomes to systemic factors, externals to individual effort: general conventional political activity is related to specific forms of conventional political activity and to general radical activity, but not to specific radical activity of boycott; intra-party activity is related to voting and extra-party activity but voting is not related to extra-party activity; lower economic status
and external locus of control are related to participation in boycott; males are likely to engage in general radical activity, females in the specific radical boycott action; marrieds and those with more social work experience engaged in extra-party activity; locus of control and economic status are not related; where attribution of outcome is to system and efficacy is high, the score on general radical activity is low; where attribution is to individual effort, score on general radical activity is high when efficacy is high and locus is internal; boycott is engaged in most where economic status is high and locus is external, indicating that incongruity between economic status and locus may motivate participation in radical action. Participation in the boycott was also evident among those of lower economic status, especially where locus was external.

Externality and incongruity between economic status and sense of control thus seem to be motivating factors for engaging in radical political activity.

Internality seems to motive participation in conventional political action, especially where economic status was higher.

The study indicates quite clearly that locus of control must be defined in terms of the context within which the measure is taken, that the very definition of control depends upon the individual's belief that the attributes of a particular context either provide (internal locus of control) or do not provide (external locus of control) the opportunity
for effecting outcomes within it. In this study, the contention is put forth that a need for control is a general motivating force for all individuals and that the individual will participate (politically, in this study) within those contexts that afford him the opportunity to believe in his or her sense of control. Where the individual believes that the extant political context offers an opportunity to exercise a belief in personal control, that individual may be said to be internal in locus of control. Where alternate political contexts have to be created or alternate (radical) political activities engaged in so that a sense of personal control is established, the individual engaging in those alternate activities may be said to be external in locus of control.

The various sub-specialties in social work will utilize the results of this study differently. It may be that political activity is affected by locus of control and/or vice versa, thereby making the results differentially useful to the policy planner and organizer and the casework practitioner. For each, as well as for the political and social scientist, the results of this study extend the concept of reward beyond the usual socio-economic one to include the personal control concept.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST OF TABLES</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  THE RESEARCH PROBLEM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL REFERENTS AND DEFUNCION OF CONCEPTS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV METHODOLOGY.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Questionnaire.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic and Statistics</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V  RESULTS.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor and Item Analyses: Introduction</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor and Item Analyses: Political Participation Variables.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Factorial Scale.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renshon Scale</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nio Verba Scales</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwarce-Roper Scale</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal-External Locus of Control</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual vs. System Blame</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty Scale</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Correlation of Personal Control Variables.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercorrelation of Political Participation Variables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Demographic Measures Economic Status, Political Activity, and Demography and Political Participation and Personal Control</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy and Participation Individual Vs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Blame and Participation</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control and Participation</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Variables</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Control Variables with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of General Radical Activity</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Renshon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Economic Status and Locus</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Control for the Boycott Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Theoretical Implications of the Results</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1  The Demensions and Modes of Political Activity .......................... 21
2  Frequency Distribution of Demographic Data. ............................ 55
3  Intercorrelation of Demographic Data. .................................... 57
4  Rotated Factors for the Factors Derived From The Renshon and Nie-Verba Items. ........................................ 70
5  Locus of Control. ................................................................. 82
6  Inter-Item Correlations of Efficacy Scale .................................. 86
7  Inter-Item Correlations of Civic Duty Scale ............................... 88
8  Frequency Distribution of Scales. .......................................... 90
9  Intercorrelation of Control Variables ........................................ 100
10 Intercorrelation of Political Participation Variables ..................... 103
11 Intercorrelations of Control and Political Participation Scales with Demographic Variables ........................................... 106
12 Relations of Personal Control and Political Participation Measures ........ 111
13 Interaction of Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Individual Vs. System Blame for Renshon Scale. ................................................. 116
14 Interaction of Economic Status and Locus of Control as Independent Variables and Boycott as Dependent Variable. .................. 119

FIGURE

1  Matrix of Participation Variables in Six Countries .......................... 23
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following faculty members for their cooperation in distributing the questionnaire used in this dissertation to members of their classes at the Columbia University School of Social Work: Professors Charles Grosser, Martin Whiteman and Abraham Alcabes, and Ms. Lynn Schneider.

Thanks are also due to Ms. Essie Bailey for the careful work she did in typing the preliminary and final drafts of this study.

Professor Martin Whiteman has been most helpful and patient from the beginning to the end of this project. His intellectual and emotional support as advisor on this dissertation made possible its ultimate completion.
CHAPTER I
THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The social worker specializing in community organization, policy formulation and planning has, especially since the 1960s, become increasingly involved in the complex process of political participation. With demands by constituents for greater participation in political decision-making, many policy planners and organizers have attempted to assess the nature of participation on a wide variety of social and political issues and within an extended range of political settings. The problems raised by these circumstances are numerous, clustering around the question of why people participate in the political process in specific ways. What are the motivating factors, the rewards that can be obtained? Is the reward, as is so often assumed, of a higher economic and social status or must the concept of reward be extended to include the possible psychological benefits of participation qua participation? Can we, for example, take the individual's need for personal control over the events occurring in his or her life as a factor that motivates political participation? It is the latter proposition that forms the major research question addressed herein. More
specifically, are particular forms of participation related to the individual's belief that he or she either has or does not have control over the events in their lives?

Political participation as a process will be viewed both behaviorally and attitudinally. It is examined in terms of specific activities grouped along dimensions of radicalism versus conventionality, the radical dimension being subdivided between general and more specific forms, the conventional dimension being subdivided among three types of participatory activity: voting, intra-political party, and extra-political party types of participation.

The personal control measure is also viewed multi-dimensionally. In this case, we have taken three measures that have appeared extensively in the psychological literature as general and more specific measures of personal control. The general measure of personal control is Rotter's internal-external locus of control, which concerns the individual's belief in whether he or she controls events occurring in their lives or whether this control is exercised by forces external to them. The two more specific measures of personal control are related to the dependent variable, political participation. These latter measures of the personal control variable concern the individual's belief in his or her effectiveness in producing political outcomes (efficacy), and the belief as to whether individual effort or systemic factors are most important in determining
political outcomes (individual vs. system blame).

The major assumption underlying the study concerns the fact that a need to control events in one's life does exist. The basis for this assumption is outlined in Chapter III, where the literature on personal control is reviewed. Building upon this assumption, we hope to demonstrate how participation in various specific political activities (as outlined above) may be explained by that activity providing a context within which the individual can believe in his or her ability to control political outcomes.

Thus, the research problem to be explored concerns the relations between and the interactions of the various dimensions of political participation (dependent variable) and personal control (independent variable). So as to present the findings within a meaningful context, some demographic characteristics of the population are included in considering the relations and interactions between the major variables.
CHAPTER II

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL REFERENTS AND DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

A. Attitudinal Referents

Nie and Verba,1 in their review of political participation for The Handbook of Political Science have divided the process into three phases: the process of politicization, participation input, and the consequences of participation in terms of government response. The major argument of these authors "is that there are a variety of ways of participation that are likely to have different consequences." Thus, Nie and Verba focus in their study on the participation input, i.e., on "the ways in which citizens can participate" and on the various ways in which this participation takes place. Nie and Verba's modes and dimensions of political participation will serve as a major portion of the dependent variable in this study. We note at this point that neither Nie and Verba nor the present author limit political participation to the electoral process, a limitation that is often imposed on

participation studies by political scientists because of the ease with which survey data has been able to be collected since the introduction into the social sciences of computerized operations. We will be interested in this dissertation in a variety of modes of political participation, believing that the process is multi-dimensional in nature, that there exist many modes of participation, each of which attracts to it individuals with a variety of motivations and each of which has distinct effects and elicits distinct responses from the decision-maker. More specifically, we will concentrate on several motivational factors that may help explain why a particular individual participates in a particular way.

The literature reveals three explanations that have been offered for the degree of political participation engaged in (the types of participation have not, to my knowledge, been broken down in terms of various motivations). The explanations include political utility, civic obligation, and political efficacy.¹

The concept of political utility is derived from the well-known economic utility theory which is based on the assumption that "an individual gains utility (or satisfaction) from the consumption of goods and services (or rewards). . . . Total utility is the total amounts of satisfaction obtained

from obtaining various quantities of rewards. ...the more
of a reward obtained per unit of time, the greater the
utility (or satisfaction) any individual will receive up to
a certain point.\(^1\)

This exchange theory is also used by Homans\(^2\) in his
work on the exchange process in social life, where the
concept of psychological "reinforcement" is put in the
place of "reward" in the economic theory. In the political
sphere this reward or reinforcer may include anything an
individual needs, wants, or values.

Several problems with the utility model are pointed
out by Renshon.\(^3\) First, individuals in both the economic
and political arenas may be "satisficers" rather than
"maximizers", i.e., they may be content with incremental
rather than total satisfaction of their needs and desires.
This suggests that there may be no fixed level of reward
for different individuals or even for the same individual
over time and in regard to different needs or desires. Also,
the nature of the rewards sought in the political sphere
(which presumably motivate participation) may not be

\(^1\)R. L. Curry and L. L. Wade, \textit{A Theory of Political}
\underline{Exchange} (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 5-6.

\(^2\)George Homans, \textit{Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms}

\(^3\)Stanley Renshon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21ff.
compatible, e.g., one person may want to increase his political power or prestige, another may want to have more money allocated to conservation programs, and a third person may want to begin a third major political party. As Renshon says,

In short, people appear to participate in politics for a variety of reasons, each of which might be subsumed under the concept of reward. Yet, assembling these varied motives under the reward rubric does not extend our understanding of political participation. The level of generality that would place these motives together obscures, in our view, important differences relevant to the understanding of the motivation to participate and the selection of participation modes.1

Yet, the concept of utility is important for it is clear that political participation is engaged in so that some reward may be obtained. This reward, while varying in intrinsic material composition may be seen in psychological terms as something non-material but eagerly sought by the human being for the sake of increasing his self-esteem. Utility in this sense may be viewed in terms of the means used to obtain a particular end, whether this end be a material or non-material thing. The writer proposes that this assumption is in keeping with the subject of this study, i.e., political participation, which is itself a means of obtaining a desire or need. Utility will in our thinking be defined in terms of a sense of control

1Ibid., p. 23.
over the political process and the major responsibility of that process, i.e., the authoritative allocation of values. This "feeling of control" will be defined in Chapter III under the heading "internal-external locus of control." We will in that chapter also provide the rationale for using the concept of "a need for control" as our measure of utility in the political participation process and as a motivational variable in itself.

While a need for personal control may exist in all individuals, how can we connect this to the participatory process in the political sphere? We must first of all consider the question of whether a person believes that the political system is "controllable." Does the individual believe that control over decision making is potentially within the realm of any citizen's power or does he believe that whatever the ordinary citizen wants will be subject to a pre-existing set of forces, institutions and actors? In fact, this question is actually a refinement in the concept of personal control ("internal-external locus of control"), a refinement which will be discussed in Chapter III under the heading "individual versus system blame." At this point, we wish only to introduce this as a dimension of the larger question of whether an individual's participation in the political process can act to satisfy his need for personal control.
Another aspect of this question concerns the importance of the political system to the individual. Does the individual believe that the political system has an effect on matters of importance to him? If not, then it is a moot question as to whether he can fulfill his need for personal control via political participation. It would be an empty victory to gain control over an issue or area that one does not consider relevant to one's life circumstances. This question of "political salience" will therefore be assessed as a conditional variable in this study. The questions that will be asked regarding political salience will attempt to distinguish the salience of the federal and local governments to the subject. The questions appear as Appendix A.

Returning now to the traditional explanations of political participation, we note the ubiquity of the concept of political efficacy. The concept has been defined by Easton and Dennis as "a disposition towards politics, a feeling of effectiveness and capacity in the political sphere."¹ Campbell, Gurin and Miller,² whose political efficacy scale will be used in this study to measure the dimension (Appendix B) in question, define it as "the feeling that individual political action does have or can


have an impact upon the political process--that is, that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties." It is suggested that political efficacy as an attitude may make participation more likely. Renshon goes further, believing it to be a motivation for political participation.¹

The literature supports the connection between political efficacy and participation, as a facilitating if not a motivating force. In studies of voting, Barber has noted that "there is good evidence that a sense of political efficacy...encourages voting participation in the United States,"² while Campbell, et al state that "the rate of voting turnout was found to increase uniformly with the strength of an individual's sense of political efficacy."³ Berelson,⁴ Almond and Verba,⁵ and Dahl,⁶ have confirmed this linkage of political efficacy and participation in separate studies. The political efficacy scale developed

¹S. Renshon, op. cit.

²James Barber, Citizen Politics (Chicago: Markham, 1969), p. 139.


by Campbell and his associates has been utilized extensively in measuring this variable. It is undoubtedly an important attitudinal measure of a person's feeling of confidence in his ability to participate with some degree of effectiveness in the political process. The major drawback of the measure, however, relates to its almost exclusive focus on the voting process and because of this, other, perhaps more unconventional modes of participation, may not be as highly correlated to this measure. It is in part for this reason that we will supplement the use of the political efficacy scale with the political saliency questions (Appendix A) and with a scale of individual versus system blame (see above and Chapter III).

The third conventional explanation of political participation concerns the attitude toward or belief in one's civic duty--i.e., people participate because they feel they should. However, studies by Levenson¹ have found that civic obligation in and of itself was only slightly related to political activity. It may be that this study, dealing as it does with high school seniors and their parents, focuses on a group which has not as yet had the opportunity to vote and thus may not as yet have internalized the normative code of conduct in question. Yet, the

internalization of normative civic duty may itself be dependent on personality factors that have little to do with one's actual history of political involvement. One's relation to authority and thus to "rules being imposed from above" may just as well explain the seeming insignificance of the civic duty profile to political participation in e.g., Levinson's study.

Since in this study we will be questioning social workers with a wide variety of political, socio-economic, and psychological backgrounds on the question of political participation and since we will be dividing the participation variable into a number of dimensions, it might be interesting to observe the role of a normative attitude like civic duty in assessing the results. It may be that individuals with different ethnic backgrounds, for example, adhere to the norm of civic duty differently and that some of these individuals may tend to channel their participatory efforts differently on that basis. For these reasons, the civic duty scale will be administered to subjects as a part of the test battery (see Appendix C).

Thus, we have put forth some of our reasons for utilizing three attitudinal scales (Political Saliency, Political Efficacy, and Civic Duty) that will be assessed in terms of political participation.

A fourth attitude measure concerns the individual's belief in the citizen's ability to influence the decision-
making process, a measure which has been discussed briefly above as "individual versus system blame." We will expound on this attitude as a dimension of the personal control variable in Chapter III.

At this time, it is necessary to put before the reader the concept of political participation that will be used in this study as our dependent variable. Since we consider the process of political participation to be multi-dimensional in nature, three scales will be used to assess the behavioral qualities of the participation process. Each scale will tap different, or at least distinguishable aspects of the variable and will serve as the behavioral complement to our attitude measures.

B. Behavioral Referents

The first scale is one developed by Woodward and Roper.1 It taps the general dimension of political participation and has been used extensively in studies of the process since it was first introduced in 1950. The Woodward-Roper "Political Participation Index" includes five dimensions: voting; membership in pressure groups; personal communication with legislators; political party activity; and "engaging in habitual dissemination of

---

political opinions through word-of-mouth communications to other citizens." The Index was originally used in a national study of 8,000. It "has been shown to be discriminating and because it does not tap personality sensitive areas, it is assumed that this measure of reported behavior is a close approximation of scores that would be gained should the individuals be observed directly."¹ The version of the Index to be used in the present study is taken from Knutson's work on participation and personality, cited in the last footnote. It appears as Appendix D.

The Woodward-Roper Index has two major pitfalls which we shall attempt to remedy with the use of two additional behaviorally-oriented indices of political participation.

The first pitfall of the Index is the exclusion of extra-legitimate means and techniques of political participation. With the wide spread involvement in demonstrations, sit-downs and violent confrontations that this nation witnessed in the 1960s and with the attention that these methods drew from the mass media and thus, from the public at large, it seems essential to include these unconventional participatory modes in our survey. The rationale for this is made even stronger by the fact that our study will concern itself with social work graduate students who, as part of the

larger university polity, are exposed to and serve as leaders for the introduction and utilization of these unconventional participatory modes. So as to include the latter in the survey of political participation, we shall include Renshon's political participation Index which appears as Appendix E.

The second problem with the Woodward-Roper Index, and this applies also to the Renshon Index, is its focus on only general dimensions of the participation variable (these dimensions are listed in the text, above). While the use of the Renshon Index adds politically radical participatory modes to the Woodward-Roper Dimensions, both indices fail to be specific enough within the dimensions surveyed. Thus, both indices inform us on the question of whether subjects engaged in party activity but do not specify the nature of that activity. This lack of specificity could eliminate potentially useful and discriminatory sub-categories of political participation by including them under a general rubric. It will also prevent us from being able to correlate our personality variable (internal-external locus of control) with a specific participatory mode. The ability to do this would lend a greater precision to our understanding of why particular individuals engage in specific political activities at a particular time and within a specific socio-political context.

In order to attempt to include more specific dimensions in the measure of political participation, we shall adapt

1Stanley Renshon, op. cit., Appendix D, p. 275.
for our purposes a scale of political participation developed by Nie and Verba.\(^1\) (See Appendix F). What follows is a description of this scale and the minor changes that will be made in it so that it can be used with our specific survey population. It may be useful to go about this description by pointing out the dimensions, modes and orientations which apply to the scale.

First, the specific acts that individuals engage in under the general heading of participation may be listed under the following categories or dimensions:

1. **The type of influence exerted** - this dimension includes the communication of information to political leaders and the application of pressure on political leaders to conform to specific citizen preferences.

2. **The scope of the desired outcome** - this dimension takes up the issue of whether the desired outcome of political participation will effect the citizenry collectivity, e.g., the outcome of an election or tax reform bill, and/or whether the outcome will have a narrower scope, e.g., granting a license to an individual or exempting an individual from military service.

3. **The conflict dimension** - this dimension considers the extent to which participatory activity involves conflict with others. Is, for example, the desired outcome beneficial to the interests of one group and detrimental to

\(^1\)Nie and Verba, op. cit., pp. 6-22.
the interests of another? Without implying that all participatory acts are "zero-sum" conflicts we may see that this dimension is related to the dimension of the scope of the potential outcome. As Nie and Verba put it: "the wider the impact of the outcome, the more likely it is that there will be opposing groups active in relation to it."¹ Also, some participatory acts involve no opposing group since the desired outcome may be mobilization of apathetic citizens, mobilization of resources, attempts to move inert institutions to action on some issue within their sphere of responsibility, etc.

4. Initiative required - this dimension involves the difficulty of the act of participation, i.e., "the amount of time and effort needed by the individual in choosing when to act and how to act."²

These four dimensions distinguish among a variety of modes or ways of participating politically. Again, we follow Nie and Verba's model.

1. Voting is a mode of political participation that conveys little if any specific information about citizen preferences. It's effect or scope is broad and the degree of pressure put on political leaders is high. Voting involves the citizen in conflict, though not direct confrontation, and the degree of initiative required is relatively low.

¹Ibid., p. 9.
²Ibid., p. 9.
2. **Campaign activity** is a second mode of political participation. The citizen can increase the amount of pressure put on a political leader over the amount exerted through voting. More information about preferences may also be related to the leader "because campaign activists are a more clearly identifiable group with whom candidates may be in close contact."¹ Like voting, campaign activities produce collective outcomes and involve the citizen in conflictual situations. Also, they require more initiative than voting.

3. **Citizen-initiated contacts** is the first of the modes of participation that moves beyond the electoral process. In this mode of activity, the citizen acts alone and determines the timing, substance, and target of the act of participation. In terms of the scope of the desired outcome, only citizen-initiated contacts "can reasonably be expected to result in a particularized benefit."² This mode of activity communicates extensive information about preferences "but it probably exerts little pressure, coming as it does from a single citizen...On the conflict dimension, we assume that such contacts do not usually involve direct conflict with other citizens."³ Finally, the degree of

¹Ibid., p. 10.
²Ibid., p. 10.
³Ibid., p. 10.
initiative required is high since the citizen chooses when to participate, the subject matter of his communication and the particular political actor that will be approached.

4. **Cooperative activity** involves group or organizational activity to deal with social and political issues. Cooperative activity is significant because it can combine information about citizen preferences (since citizens come together to work on a particular issue) with pressure (since leaders are more likely to respond to a number of citizens than to a lone contractor).\(^1\) Cooperative activity is likely to be relevant to outcome of a somewhat collective nature, though the interests of a particular group rather than the entire citizenry will probably be involved. The degree of conflict involved probably falls between the high level of conflict involved in elections and campaign activity and the low degree of conflict involved in citizen-initiated contacts. The degree of initiative required in cooperative activity will vary with the individual's specific role in the activity, e.g., is he a relatively inactive member or a leader and organizer for the group.

The several modes of participation explicated above differ significantly in how they allow citizens to influence the government (what kind of influence is exerted and over what scope of outcome), in the extent to which they involve the citizen in conflict, and in the amount of initiative

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 11.
they require."¹ Table 1, which is replicated from the Nie and Verba study we have been citing, summarizes the modes and dimensions outlined above. In the table, citizen-initiated contacts are broken down into those aimed at influencing a broad social issue and those aimed at obtaining some particularized benefit. "We do this because these two types of citizen contacting differ significantly in scope of outcome and...empirically as well."²

Summarizing, Nie and Verba say the following about the validity of their categorization:

Data about participation indicate that the modes form identifiable clusters of political acts, different kinds of citizen take part in these different modes, the process by which one comes to be active differs from one type of participation to another, and different modes of activity have different consequences.³ (may emphasis)

In order to validate the distinctiveness of the four modes of participation, Nie and Verba have examined the empirical relationships among political acts falling within each of the various modes.

¹Ibid., p. 12.
²Ibid., p. 2.
³Ibid., p. 12.
### Table 1

**The Dimensions and Modes of Political Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Activity</th>
<th>Type of Influence</th>
<th>Scope of Outcome</th>
<th>Presence of Conflict</th>
<th>Initiative Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign activity</td>
<td>High pressure, low to high information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Conflictual</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopera-tive activity</td>
<td>Low to high pressure, high information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Maybe yes, usually no</td>
<td>Some or a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>High pressure low information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Conflictual</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting officials on social issues</td>
<td>Low pressure high information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Usually non-conflictual</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting officials on personal matters</td>
<td>Low pressure, high information</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>Nonconflictual</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dimensions and modes of political activity are outlined in Table I, taken from the Nie and Verba study. This table points to the multi-dimensional nature of participation, differentiating the modes of political activity in terms of how a particular mode allows citizens to influence the government (what kind of influence is exerted and over what scope of outcome), the extent to which the mode involves the citizen, and the amount of initiative required to operate within the specific mode. Nie and Verba indicate that their data demonstrate that the modes form identifiable clusters of political acts, that different kinds of citizens take part in these different modes, that the process by which one comes to be active differs from one type of participation to another and that different modes of activity have different consequences.

In a six-nation study utilizing these modes of participation, Nie and Verba were able to identify a group of specific political activities that were assumed to represent examples of activity within the various modes. A factor analysis of these specific political acts produced a structure strikingly similar in six different nations. (Figure 1).¹

¹Ibid., pp. 13-17.
FIGURE I

MATRIX OF PARTICIPATION VARIABLES IN SIX COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Campaign Activity</th>
<th>Voting</th>
<th>Communal Activity</th>
<th>Particularized Contacting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Persuade others how to vote</td>
<td>a u ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actively work for a party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attend political meetings</td>
<td>A i J U Ne*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contribute money to a party</td>
<td>A i U Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Membership in political clubs</td>
<td>A I J U Ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vote regularly in national elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Voted in 1976 presidential election*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Voted in 1972 presidential election*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Frequency of local vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work with others on local problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Form a group to work on local problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Active membership in community problem-solving organization</td>
<td>a i J u ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Contact local official with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contract extralocal official with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Contact local official on social matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Contact extralocal official on social matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularized Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Contact local official on particularized problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Contact extralocal official on a social matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The letters refer to the six nations for which data are reported: Austria, India, Japan, Nigeria, the United States, and the Netherlands. Capital letter means loading of .65 or greater on expected factor. Small letter means loading of .40-.65 on expected factor.

*In the Netherlands the activity involves displaying or distributing campaign leaflets or posters.
**In Nigeria these two items formed a separate factor, there having been no campaign activity measures.
Thus, having distinguished four modes of participation and their distinctiveness from one another, we will utilize Nie and Verba's list of political activities under each mode as a major component of our dependent variable. We will also utilize Renshon's Index of Political Participation so as to include in our dependent variable -- Political Participation -- a measure which relates to non-conventional modes of political participation. Woodward and Roper's Political Participation scale will also be used. The latter scale will serve as a check on Nie and Verba's listing of specific acts under particular modes of participation. Thus, if a respondent does not indicate that he has engaged in any of Nie and Verba's specific acts of, e.g., campaign activity, but does indicate that he has engaged in general campaign activity (on the Woodward and Roper Scale) we will have evidence for the need to expand Nie and Verba's list of specific political acts. (Nie and Verba's Figure 1, presented above, will constitute Appendix F of this study.)

In this section we have outlined the behavioral scales or indices that will be used in this study to operationalize our dependent variable-political participation. Also outlined were several attitudinal measures that have in other studies proved to be highly correlated with the level of political participation--political efficacy and civic duty.¹

¹Jeanne Knutson, op. cit.
In order to place these measures in a context that would ensure their relevance to the respondent we have also included a measure of political salience.

In the next chapter we will introduce the independent variable -- internal vs. external locus of control. It should be noted here that we will be interested in the correlation of our independent and dependent variables under varying conditions (of political efficacy, etc.). This effort at correlation will not establish the flow or direction of causality. Yet, the fact that relation may exist between the variables (as established by their inter-correlation) may provide the worker with a clue as to what types of intervention strategies would be most effective in achieving a particular objective. The intervention could, according to this formulation, begin with the independent variable (locus of control) in an attempt to achieve some change in the dependent variable (type of political participation), or visa versa. The fact that a correlation between the variables exists gives the worker some idea as to what factors, among the many otherwise possible, might be most useful to manipulate in order to achieve some goal.
CHAPTER III

INTERNAL VERSUS EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL

A. THE DIMENSION OF PERSONAL CONTROL IN PSYCHOLOGY

Before reviewing the literature in the area of internal vs. external (I-E) locus of control, it is necessary to state explicitly that a need for personal "control over the forces and experiences that impact upon and shape our lives"\(^1\) exists and, furthermore, that it represents a motivational variable of interest to us. Whatever the degree of need for personal control (and this will vary among individuals), it is suggested here that "certain observable psychological and behavioral consequences would follow from its frustration."\(^2\)

Renshon, in his review of the psychological literature, has gone far in pointing out the existence of a need for personal control in a variety of psychological works. The following paragraphs are a summary of his review.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Stanley Renshon, op. cit., p. 43.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 43.
In terms of animal studies: rats and monkeys have demonstrated a tendency to explore novel environments even after their hunger and thirst motives for doing so have been satisfied. Indeed, the opportunity to effect a stimulus change in the environment has served as a reinforcing agent, as Zimbardo and Miller have made clear. Similarly, Harlow's experiments with rhesus monkeys demonstrate that the monkeys exhibit a "manipulatory drive," where the monkey's attempts to solve puzzles served in and of itself as a source of intrinsic motivation. These studies, among others, seem to support the hypothesis that animals display a drive similar to the need for personal control in the human animal.

Turning next to psychoanalytic theory, Renshon discusses briefly the work of Freud. He gives Freud's famous example of the child who seeks to control or master through play the anxiety provoked by temporary absence of the mother, the aim of which is to reduce the anxiety-tension that is provoked by object loss. More recent explanations offered by ego psychologists might supplement the drive-reduction explanation by an explanation based on the ego's need for "efficacy," its need to be able to exercise its various functions competently in relation to

---

the environment. In either case, we note the existence of a need for control, whether that need is viewed as a compensatory device, a vicissitude of the drive, or as a primary drive. The need for personal control may be seen also in Horney's concept of basic anxiety, where the need is expressed in terms of overcoming feelings of isolation and helplessness provoked by a potentially hostile world of overdominating parents, erratic parental behavior or too little responsibility having been assumed by the child's caretakers.¹

In the area of developmental psychology, Renshon cites Piaget's remarkable contribution concerning the infant's motility as highly suggestive about a need for personal control: "Piaget has noted that as early as the fourth month, the play of his children centered on a result produced in the external environment...rediscovering the movement which by chance exercised an advantageous action upon things...by the end of nine months, Piaget noted that the presentation of a new stimuli elicits four types of responses: (1) visual exploration, (2) tactile exploration, (3) slow movement of the object in space, and (4) use of the child's repertory of action upon the object, each in turn (being observed by the child) with a sort of prudence, as though studying the

¹The psychoanalytic citations appear in S. Renshon, _op. cit._, pp. 48-53.
effect produced. The child thus appears to be systematically testing his impact on the world and experiencing some intrinsic reward for being the locus of causality.

Finally, Renshon turns to the work of the humanistic-existential school, whose major representatives include Maslow, Rogers, Goldstein and Angyal. In the work of these theorists, the desire for self-fulfillment or self-actualization is seen as a major motivational force and this "third force" is closely aligned with our need for control variable. As Angyal puts it:

The human being "has a characteristic tendency towards self-determination, that is, a tendency to resist external influences and to subordinate the heteronomous forces of the physical and social environment to its own sphere of influence."

Without going any further, we may note the importance of the concept of a need for personal control in various psychological schools. "The evidence appears strong that there is within each of us a need to exert some amount of control over relevant aspects of our life-space." As pointed out in the last chapter, a measure of political salience will be used to assess the relevance of the

---

1Ibid., pp. 54-55.


3S. Renshon, op. cit., p. 58.
political sphere to our particular subject population. The exercise of one's personal control in terms of the political arena will thus be assessed, although we will not by this procedure be able to assess the comparative importance of politics as against some other area of concern to the individual. We will not, for this reason, assume that because politics is relevant to a person that he will therefore choose to exercise his personal control there rather than in other areas of his life.

B. INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL

Having established that the need for personal control is a motivational variable that is utilized by many different and otherwise divergent psychological theorists, we now require some measure of the need for personal control. Such a measure is available in the work of Julian Rotter on internal versus external locus of control.

The large number of studies utilizing this psychological dimension began in 1966 with the pioneering work of Rotter.\(^1\) The latter's work concerns itself with the nature of learning processes in different situations and focuses, within the context of social learning theory, on the individual's perception of reinforcement, reward, or gratification. Quoting Rotter, "An event regarded by some persons

as a reward or reinforcement may be differently perceived and reacted to by others. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behavior or attributes versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself and may occur independently of his own actions... when a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control.¹

Rotter postulates that the generalized belief or expectancy regarding the relationship between one's own behavior and its consequences may affect a great variety of behavioral choices. For example, he relates his internal-external (I-E) dimension to concepts of "alienation"

¹Ibid., p. 1.
(Robert Merton), and "autonomy" and "competence" (Robert White), as these concepts are described in sociological and psychological theory.

The I-E dimension is linked also to McClelland and Atkinson's need for achievement variable, the latter being a motivational attribute that is positively correlated with performance in various learning situations. Though the relationship between need for achievement and the I-E dimension is probably not linear, it seems probable "that people who are high on the need for achievement...have some belief in their own ability or skill to determine the outcome of their efforts."¹ The I-E locus of control also seems related to Witkin's concept of "field dependent" and "field independent," this concept referring to whether a person derives his cues for judging various situations from external or internal sources. From a sociological perspective, Riesman's work on inner- and outer-directedness may be related to the I-E dimension in several respects, but it should be differentiated from it by stating that Riesman's concept is based on the degree to which an individual is controlled by internal versus external forces, whereas the locus of control dimension deals "only with the

¹Ibid., p. 3; John Atkinson and Joel Raynor, Motivation and Achievement (Halstead Press, 1974); Feather, N.T. "Valence of Outcome and Expectation of Success in Relation to Task Difficulty and Perceived Locus of Control," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (1967), 7:372-386.
question of whether or not an individual believes that his own behavior, skills or internal dispositions determine what he receives."\(^1\) (my emphasis)

Rotter goes on to say that different kinds of learning paradigms will produce different kinds of learning functions and that learning under skill versus chance conditions should produce different levels of learning, e.g., greater or lesser degrees of resistance of extinction; greater or lesser degrees of expectancy that similar behavior will be rewarded similarly in the future; degree of generalization of expectancies of reinforcement from one task to another;\(^2\) etc. Several studies will now be reviewed that have been done with the I-E dimension in order to clarify that concept further.

Several demographic variables are correlated with an internal or external locus of control.\(^3\) In several studies quoted by Rotter,\(^4\) students in high school seeking to go to college were more internal than an unselected

---

\(^1\)J. Rotter, Ibid., p. 4.


\(^4\)J. Rotter, op. cit., p. 16.
group of high school students. In the Franklin study there is a significant relationship between higher socio-economic class and internality. Battle and Rotter found that among Black and white sixth-grade and eighth-grade children there was a significant social class effect on the I-E variable, with lower-class Blacks considerably more external than groups of middle-class Blacks or upper- or lower-class whites. Similar studies utilizing more homogeneous populations, e.g., various ethnic groups attending the same undergraduate college, did not find such clear differences in the I-E variable, thus demonstrating the importance of considering the social context within which the measure is taken. Several studies that attempt to relate I-E scale scores (which will be discussed in detail later) to political party affiliation have produced no significant findings.

Perhaps more relevant to our specific concern is a study by Seeman and Evans on the sense of powerlessness.


3Rotter, op. cit., p. 18.

and alienation experienced by tuberculosis patients in a hospital setting. In this study, 43 matched pairs of white male patients showed that those patients who scored as internals "knew more about their own condition, questioned doctors and nurses more...and expressed less satisfaction at the amount of feedback or the information they were getting about their condition from hospital personnel" than those patients who scored as externals.¹

Gore and Rotter,² in a study of Black college students, found that those students willing to participate in a march on the state capital or to join a freedom riders' group were clearly and significantly more internal than those willing only to attend a rally or not to make any commitment at all. A similar study of Strickland³ investigating activists in a Negro civil rights movement found that the activists were significantly more internal on the I-E scale measures.

¹J. Rotter, op. cit., p. 20


Phares, in an interesting study of the ability of college students to successfully change attitudes of other students regarding maintenance of fraternities and sororities on campus, found that the internals were significantly more effective in changing the attitudes of others than were the externals. This finding hints at the role of the locus of control in political participation by its focus on one important element of the participatory process, namely, the ability to persuade others that one's political position is of benefit to them.

The measure has also been applied in societies outside of the United States. In a study of workers in Sweden, Seeman found that membership in unions versus non-membership, activity within the union, and general knowledge of political affairs were all related to internality (as measured by a translated version of the I-E scale).

While the results obtained from these studies may point out refinements that need to be made in our definition of "internal" and "external" expectancies (e.g., the need to define a particular individual's externality as either

---


an actual external orientation or as a defensive need to remove responsibility from himself), the results of the quoted studies lend strong and relatively consistent support to the hypothesis that a generalized expectancy -- that one can affect the environment through one's own behavior -- is present in at least two different cultures, can be reliably measured, and is predictive of logical behavioral construct referents.\(^1\)

In reviewing four studies indirectly concerning persuasion, propaganda, and conformity, Rotter presents some conclusions which are of interest to the present study:

The individual who perceives that he does have control over what happens to him may conform or may go along with suggestions when he chooses to and when he is given a conscious alternative. However, if such suggestion or attempts at manipulation are not to his benefit or if he perceives them as subtle attempts to influence him without his awareness, he (the internal) reacts resistively.\(^2\)

Finally, let us return to the Battle and Rotter study cited earlier.\(^3\) In that study, it was found that the lower SES Negro group, which was more external than either middle-class Negroes or upper and lower class whites, this lower SES Negro group demonstrated a significant relationship

\(^1\)Rotter, op. cit.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 24.
\(^3\)E.S. Battle and J.B. Rotter, op. cit.
between higher intelligence and externality, a finding which contradicts most other I-E locus of control studies (where lower intelligence is correlated with an external locus of control). Though based on a small N, the Battle and Rotter study may suggest that the perception of limited material opportunities and of powerful external forces is one variable making for an external attitude.\(^1\) This implication is worth considerable study, since it points to the important role of opportunity and social structure in determining beliefs, motivation, self attribution and consequently, individual behavior.\(^2\)

At this point a review of a portion of the literature on political participation and an attempt to interpret the results of these latter studies in terms of the I-E locus of control variable will be presented. Though such an interpretation will be limited and necessarily omits many important, perhaps crucial variables and their interactions, it may provide some partial insights into the role of an individual's personality in his participatory behavior. These insights may then be used to generate hypotheses and to formulate intervention strategies in the area of individual personality change and in the political arena.

In assessing the issue of political participation, it is necessary first to specify the context. Participation, in terms of its qualitative and quantitative aspects, differs

\(^1\)Rotter, op. cit.

\(^2\)Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960).
depending on such factors as the types of issues confronted, the existence of various kinds of political structures and institutions, the relation of issues to the needs of participants and, among many other variables, the capability (skill + motivation) of various individuals to act effectively in providing input and authority in the policy formulation process. This last factor will be of major concern in this study and requires that we place the political actors in a context where their needs and capacities are either supported or opposed by various other actors who have a stake in the outcome of the political process. (Note here the importance of the conflict dimension in political participation posited by Nye and Verba and summarized in Chapter II of this study.)

While the political system itself has been defined as the legitimate allocator of authoritative values\(^1\) in a society, the system has obtained this function by maintaining other, complementary functions. Sanders\(^2\) outlines several of these complementary functions. He lists, for example, the provision of services to constituents, commual decision making procedures, the exercise of social control, conflict management, and the allocation of power.\(^3\)

\(^1\) David Easton, *A Framework For Political Analysis*, op. cit.


manner in which government exercises these functions, e.g., provision of services to constituents, will often directly influence the degree to which constituents will feel justified in different types of political participation. For example, will the welfare client who depends on government allocation of money feel as free to voice political views as the middle- or upper-income constituent? This will depend on the level of motivation and skills of the specific population, on the manifest and latent guidelines determining eligibility for welfare assistance that exist in a particular political system, and on the quality and quantity of other types of demands being made on the political system in question. These issues are relevant to the community organizer, the policy-maker and planner, the politician, and the administrator, for they will determine the values and the goals of policy, the issues that are considered,\(^1\) the types of populations that will be effected and the actual acceptance and consequent ability to implement a particular policy objective within a specific political and social context. These contexts include voluntary associations, primary group units, social movements, politically oriented groups, and client organizations.\(^2\) Within each, we may distinguish between various


types of political participation, including expressive
and instrumental behavior, public and private auspices
and remunerative and nonremunerative motives. In each
case we may view participation as the result of inter-
actions between an individual's personality and socio-
political structures. A holistic approach is required
for an accurate and realistic appraisal of the participatory
process, and it is essential to such a realistic appraisal
that the process be portrayed as a dynamic rather than
static affair. For example, participation in a voluntary
association has been found to vary with an individual's
occupation and within occupational groups, with an indi-
vidual's ethnic class. Participation rates have also
been found to vary with age, opportunity, motivation,

1Ibid.; C.W. Gordon and N. Babchuk, "A Typology of
Voluntary Associations," American Sociological Review, 24,
No. 2 (February 1959), 22-29.

2W. Faunce and D. McClelland, "Professionalization
and Stratification Patterns in an Industrial Community,"
American Journal of Sociology, 27, No. 4 (January 1967),
341-50; R. Hagedorn and S. Rabovitz, "An Analysis of Com-
munity and Professional Participation Among Occupations,
Social Forces, 45, No. 4 (June 1967), 483-91.

3Charles Bonjean, "Mass, Class, and the Industrial
Community: A Comparative Analysis of Managers, Businessmen,
and Workers," American Journal of Sociology, 72, No. 2
(September 1966), 149-62; A. Seals and J. Kolaja, "A Study
of Negro Voluntary Organizations in Lexington, Kentucky,"

4M. Babchuk and A. Booth, "Voluntary Association
Membership: A Longitudinal Analysis," American Sociological
and capacity, the latter factors being themselves associated. Levels and types of participation have also been found to be associated with parental philosophy of political liberalism, and with family structure.

Etiologically, socialization of attitudes affecting participation has been shown to be acquired early in life. For example, children of eight years of age have displayed differences in their sense of political efficacy, a factor which seems to effect political participation.

Let us now focus on some more specific findings in the political participation literature and speculate on the possible effects of our independent variable, I-E locus of control, on these findings.

The study to be reviewed concerns the area of voting behavior, which has been an important and ubiquitous subject for investigation in the political science literature.

---


In an analysis of voting patterns of Italians in New Haven, Wolfinger\(^1\) found that ethnic voting increased among Catholics as they acquired middle-class status. This finding contradicted the traditional "assimilation theory" which "hypothesizes that ethnic voting is strongest during the earliest period of residence of the group and declines as the group members leave the working class..."\(^2\) Wolfinger formulated a "mobilization theory" of ethnic voting to explain the actual results of his study, hypothesizing that "middle-class status is a virtual prerequisite for candidacy for major office; an ethnic group's development of sufficient political skill and influence to secure such a nomination also requires the development of middle class attributes such as education and political sophistication. Therefore, ethnic voting will increase when the ethnic group has procuced a middle class."\(^3\) Wolfinger's "mobilization theory" provides the framework for an explanation of his results. It does not, in my opinion, go far enough. For example, the attempts of various ethnic groups, including Jews, Blacks, and Puerto Ricans to see themselves as "Americans," to assimilate, and then at another time in


\(^2\)Rothman, op. cit., p. 312.

\(^3\)R. Wolfinger, op. cit., p. 905.
their history, to uphold as sacrosanct their allegiances to their own ethnic group contradicts the mobilization hypotheses by providing an example of ethnic politics not motivated by change in economic status.

Voting patterns as well as activities ranging from attendance at religious gatherings to the foods one eats are surely affected by historical shifts that seem to be more related to patterns of identification with one's ethnic "family" than to the narrower focus of the economic and social status of the ethnic group within a society. Socio-economic status may serve to precipitate identification, to serve as a framework encouraging mobilization of one's political and social leanings, but the factor of identification, however it is mobilized, seems to be the prerequisite for, among other things, voting along ethnic lines. We need only note the political allegiance of Blacks to the Black movement in the 1960s and 1970s to illustrate this hypothesis. The fact that in Wolfinger's study, ethnic voting is accounted for by listing as its prerequisites political skill and influence, etc., speaks in favor of the identification hypothesis which the author has put forward. In this context, the political skill, influence, and incumbancy of a particular ethnic group representative serves as an example to other members of that ethnic group that "someone like me" can achieve a particular station in life and can control the variety of forces necessary to achieve that station in life. This
identification is therefore based on an increasing sense of what has been defined earlier as an internal locus of control. The statement "he is like me and he has succeeded, therefore, so can I" represents the motivating factor for identification and consequent voting behavior that is based on that identification. This formulation is applicable also to decreases in ethnic voting which occur with suburbanization. In the latter case, Wolfinger's mobilization hypothesis may not succeed in explaining the decrease in ethnic voting patterns. The identification hypothesis presented above would explain such a decrease in ethnic voting by positing a shift in patterns of identification, where the basis for attribution of internal locus of control has shifted onto a variable other than ethnicity or social class.

Returning to the example of Black support for the Black movement in the 1960s and 1970s which was used above, we may speculate that the very participation of Blacks in that movement served to increase their internal locus of control. This speculation reverses the order of causality put forth above. Whereas we attempted to explain ethnic voting (a form of participation) by positing an increase in internal locus of control, here we utilize as the independent variable, social-political participation and, as the dependent variable, internal locus of control. In
a study by Levens\(^1\) which refers to a concept similar to internal locus of control—i.e., the absence of feelings of powerlessness or alienation—the hypothesized causal relationship seems to be upheld. In her study, Levens found that participation in social movements was inversely related to powerlessness and that participation seemed to reduce feelings of powerlessness.

This two-way causality has important implications for intervention strategies and tactics. What we must be clear about in formulating our intervention strategies is what result we have in mind and some of the characteristic attributes of that result. The means we choose to use in achieving the result can then be tailored to the specific context within which we operate, to the feasibility of achieving the result desired on the basis of a rational consideration of the existing conditions. The "existing conditions" should include the positive, neutral and constraining forces to change, including organizational, community, and personality factors which are relevant to our objective.\(^2\) It is with this general approach in mind that the present dissertation is concerned when we attempt to correlate individual personality


attributes with political participation. In the chapter presenting the results of the present study, the discussion of Wolfinger's study presented above, will form the basis for an explanation of some of the data.

C. **INDIVIDUAL VS. SYSTEM BLAME**

In reviewing the literature on the internal-external control dimension there were several studies which contested the validity of the measure. In a 1970 study by Thomas\(^1\) for example, the author holds that internality on the Rotter scale is a function of ideological bias, that internality is based in the Rotter scale on a conservative political stance.

In a second study by Sanger and Alker\(^2\) the question of whether the control dimension can be conceived of unidimensionally is answered in the negative. Basing their work on an earlier study by Gurin and her co-workers,\(^3\) Sanger and Alker differentiate a person's belief in personal control from belief about whether political and cultural institutions are able to be changed. The latter belief system corresponds to the reality of the insti-

---


tutional structure's amenability to change by particular population groups. The assessment of whether institutions or individuals are responsible for particular social, economic and political conditions is one dimension of an internal or external orientation and the assessment will be reflected in the Rotter scale scores. Thus, Gurin, et al., find that with Blacks it is the external rather than internal orientation that is associated with the more effective, innovative behavior, this finding being explicable on the basis that for Blacks an external orientation is in keeping with their real life circumstances. The same was found to be true for certain groups of women in the Sanger and Alker study cited above. Renshon's study,¹ referred to above, also hints at the importance of the individual versus system blame dimension when in his study of college students the results demonstrated a significant correlation between externality and degree of political participation.

Thus, in the present study, we shall utilize a measure of individual versus system blame (Appendix H) to refine the I-E scale and to permit us to differentiate among various ethnic and SES groups involved in different types of political activity the degree of their internal versus external locus of control (within the context of a specific population group's relation to the society's institutional culture).

¹S. Renshon, op. cit.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Eight scales (Appendices A-H) were administered to 98 graduate students of the Columbia University School of Social Work.

In order to gauge more precisely the nature of our population several background items are suggested in an eight-item questionnaire that is included as Appendix I. The items request that subjects supply the following information: (1) economic status, (2) ethnic class, (3) age, (4) gender, (5) degree sought at Columbia, (6) area of social work specialization, (7) years of social work related experience (paid and voluntary) and (8) political ideology: liberal, conservative, radical, other.

On the basis of this questionnaire, we correlated the various background items pertaining to subjects with their scores on the internal-external control dimension (Scale G) and the various scales of political participation (Appendices D,E,F). The interrelation of these various items provide us with more specific results concerning who participates politically, how, and why and also serves as a refinement of the external-internal control variable by specifying some of the personal characteristics and
issues of concern to individuals scoring as externals or internals.

Thus, while the major concern is with the correlation between personal control and various specific modes of political participation, the questionnaire items and the scores on political salience (Appendix A), political efficacy (Appendix B), and Civic Duty (Appendix C), are used to refine the final interpretations of the major correlations. In addition, the individual vs. system blame scale (Appendix H) is used to refine the measurement of internal-external control. The individual vs. system blame scale is also used in conjunction with the results obtained from the questionnaire (Appendix I) as a retest of Gurin's suggestion that the I-E Scale of Rotter is too broad and non-specific in terms of social circumstances of subjects to be used as an accurate measure of these subjects' motivation to induce change and obtain rewards through their own actions.

Administration of the Questionnaire

All of the appendices comprising the test battery were described in detail in the opening chapters of this study. It is our present task to describe the administration of the questionnaire to our specific subject population.

It was the researcher's good fortune to have obtained the help of four instructors at the Columbia University
School of Social Work in administering the questionnaire. I was not present during the administration and collected from the instructors the completed questionnaires. My aim in choosing these instructors was to achieve as wide a representation of the study body at the School as possible. One class was composed of doctoral students who were taking a course in research methods required of all doctoral students, representing each of the various specializations in the D.S.W. program. The questionnaires were also distributed to two research classes at the Masters level. The fourth and fifth classes to whom the test battery was administered were at the Masters level and specializing for the most part in social policy, planning, administration, while the sixth class was composed of Masters level students specializing for the most part in practice or casework - group work and who were part-time students in the M.S. program.

Each portion of the questionnaire (Appendices A-1), which represented the various items to be assembled later into scales, was to be answered, even where some of the items appeared repetitious. This instruction was included in the covering sheet that preceded the questionnaire items; the appendices or various scales were separated for subjects by means of assigning to each a letter. No other distinguishing properties (e.g., the name of the scale to be responded to) were identified.
Each of the items was answered by each subject except for the final question. Only one of the classes responded to that question, which concerned whether or not the student had actively boycotted classes in order to demonstrate support for office personnel at the School of Social Work who were involved in a wage dispute and subsequent strike action at the School. The strike had commenced after most of the questionnaires had already been completed and the boycott question was added as an addendum. The N=23 for this particular item, while somewhat low in terms of obtaining statistically significant correlations, offered some data of particular interest to this study. It may also be said that with so small a sample on the boycott question, any significant result would indicate a particularly strong effect.

The six classes in which the questionnaire was administered had completed it in a period of about 15 to 25 minutes. All items were coded and then, utilizing the DATATEX program of the Columbia University Computer Center the results were obtained concerning the relevant data. Ninety-eight questionnaires were able to be used, about 15 more being unuseable because of the incompleteness of responses.

Sample

The first computer run involved obtaining the frequency distribution (Table 2) for each item on the questionnaire.
In this section we shall concern ourselves with the demographic data relating to the sample and also with the inter-item correlations of the demographic variables. This should give a clearer idea of who the results obtained pertain to and to whom they might later be generalized. Regarding this question, it must first be made clear that our sample consists solely of social work graduate students and that this group can be expected to differ substantially from the general population in their orientation to and values concerning political change and participation. Because of the specificity of this social work group, our findings may therefore not be generalizable beyond the sample and this is not our purpose. What we hope to do, and perhaps this is all that can be done with the results obtained from any sample, is to generate hopefully meaningful hypotheses that can later be used to study other samples in the population. The heterogeneity of our group of social workers does indicate that we may expect differences in our major variables, participation and sense of control and that our samples' interest in the process of change would lead to an expectation that the major variables are of interest to them.
The majority of subjects (88 percent) are between 20 and 39 years of age. Fifty-two percent are 20 to 29 years old and 36 percent are 30 to 39 years old. Eleven percent are 40 to 49 and only 1 percent or one subject was 50 years of age or older. Taking a look at the correlation coefficients we note that age is correlated with ethnicity (p = .05), i.e., that the older the student the more likely will that student be nonwhite. Although we may find this correlation of little explanatory value in and of itself, we may note that the structure of the student population and its possible political activity might be related to this correlation.

Age is also positively correlated with marital status (p = .01), economic status (p = .001), years of social work experience (p = .001), and enrollment in the doctoral rather than the masters degree program.

In terms of ethnic status, whites comprise 80 percent of our sample and nonwhites only 20 percent. Besides age, which has just been discussed, ethnic class correlates at a significant level with only one of our other demographic variables, specialization within the DSW program (p = .05). We note here that doctoral students who are non-white tend
TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lives away from or with parent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>Away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 or less</td>
<td>$5,000-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of social work experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N =</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>D.S.W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization: DSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>SPPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization: M.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Liberal Radical Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 4 59 11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total = 4 64 12 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycott Class During Strike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 10 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

INTER-CORRELATION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Ethnic Class</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Gender</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Marital Status</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Live with or away from parents</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Economic Status</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Years of social work experience</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Degree Program Specialization: MS</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Political Ideology</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Boycott class</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 level of significance; ** .01 Level of significance; *** .001 level of significance
to specialize in the social policy, planning, and organization sequence, while white doctoral students tend to specialize in the direct practice (casework-group work) sequence. Putting these correlations alongside those pertaining to age, we note that older, non-whites in the doctoral program specialize in a methods area that can be assumed to be more politically engaging (social policy-planning-organization) than younger whites, the latter specializing in a more individually - (practice) than socially or politically oriented methods area.

While we shall discuss a most interesting correlation between gender and degree of politically radical activity in the next chapter, we note now that our population is composed of 62 percent female and 38 percent male students. There are no significant correlations between gender and our other demographic variables.

We discussed above the correlation of marital status with age, economic status, years of social work experience, and degree program. We should note that 60 percent and 40 percent of our population is single or married, respectively. We will discuss later the correlation between marital status and type of political participation. The latter correlation indicates that married students are more likely than single students to engage in extra-political party rather than voting or intra-party types of political activity.
Our next variable, whether the student lives with or away from parents, proved not to be a variable at all, since 98 percent of subjects lived away from parents. There were no correlations of any significance between this variable and any of the others, so that we will not consider it further.

Our next variable, economic status, sheds some light on the nature of participatory activity in the political sphere. We note first that the population is distributed rather uniformly among the various income classes. Thirty-one percent of students claimed to be earning $5,000 per year or less, while 36 percent fall within the $10-25,00 per annum category. Eighteen and fifteen percent earn $5,000 to $10,000 or $25,000 and more, respectively. Looking now at the correlation coefficients for economic status, we see that correlations significant at the .001 level exist between economic status and marital status, i.e., the higher the income level, the older the student and the more likely will the student be married rather than single. Also, at the p = .05 level of significance, economic status correlates positively with years of social work experience.

A word must be said about the economic status variable. Since we are dealing with a group of graduate students who justifiably expect to secure jobs after the complete their graduate training, we cannot expect that an income level of
$5,000 or less per year will mean the same to them as it does to a member of the general population earning that amount. In addition, many of these students are being supported by spouses and/or parents, which puts them in quite a different state of mind than a member of the general population who indicates that they are earning the same amount the students say he or she is earning. Still, we have used the economic status of the student as an indicator for several reasons, the first being the pragmatic one that we could intrude on the student's privacy to a limited extent. We also contend that the correlations and other findings to be reported are not invalidated by the qualifications discussed above since in an important sense the student, even if only at present and temporarily, is a member of the economic status group he lists himself as belonging to and may form identifications and alliances with other members of that economic status group, perhaps long after he himself has attained a higher economic status.

Although 22 percent of our subjected responded that they had six to ten years of social work experience (including both paid and volunteer positions), the great majority of students (63 percent) had between zero and
five years of experience in the field. Only one subject had more than twenty years of experience, while 11 percent and 2 percent had 11-15 or 16-20 years of experience, respectively. Our highest correlation with the variable, years of social work experience, was with age \( (r=.643, p=.001) \). Also significant at the .001 level was the correlation with degree program. Thus, those with the greatest amount of experience are older and more likely to be in the DSW than the MS degree program.

Insofar as the degree program in which the subject is enrolled, we note that 19 percent of our subjects are in the DSW degree program, while 81 percent are enrolled in the MS degree program. Age, marital status, and years of social work experience, as noted above, are positively correlated with degree program, the older, married, and more experienced subject being more likely to be a DSW student.

In terms of specialization within each of the degree programs, we note only one correlation, that between ethnicity and specialization within the DSW program. As noted earlier, nonwhites were more likely to be specializing in social policy-planning-organization, while whites were more likely to be specializing in the practice sequence. We will examine our data later to see whether the student's area of specialization is related to the type of political participation engaged in. We should note here that 60
percent and 40 percent of doctoral students specialized in practice or social policy-planning-organization sequences, respectively; 70 percent, 18 percent, and 11 percent of masters degree students specialized in practice, policy, or administration, respectively. For each degree program, then, the majority of students specialize in direct service—practice methods, the minority specializing in the more socio-politically oriented policy-organization methods.

Interesting for the lack of any significant correlations with our other demographic variables is the variable of political ideology. We note that 64 percent of subjects identified themselves as liberal in political orientation, while 12 percent identified themselves as radical. Only 4 percent identified themselves as conservatives, and 20 percent chose to identify themselves as adhering to a political orientation "other" than the three so far named.

The final demographic variable, boycott of classes in support of striking office workers at the School of Social Work was discussed above and is correlated with one other demographic variable, economic status. The reader will recall that the lower the economic status of the subject, the more likely was he or she to boycott classes. The distribution of the sample shows that 57 percent of students did boycott classes while 43 percent
did not. We will discuss the correlation between economic status and boycott in the next chapter.

Having described the population demographically, the next step is to describe the logic and statistical tools used to test our hypotheses.

Logic and Statistics

The first objective of the analysis is to explore the reliability of the adapted Nie and Verba Index of political participation for the social work student population that comprises the sample. Specifically, we are interested in whether the modes of political participation developed and tested by Nie and Verba hold for this sample. We explore empirically whether the 17 items in Appendix F form clusters (modes) that are similar to those obtained by Nie and Verba. As we will see, modes of political participation that differ from the Nie and Verba modes had to be constructed.

Reliability estimates (Cronbach's Alpha) are computed for each of the scales used. The Renshon Index of Political Participation (Appendix E) is a second qualitative measure of our dependent variable, political participation. We will thus have a measure of participation that takes into account various specific objectives or modes (the Nie and Verba Index) of political activity and a measure that takes into account the conventional versus more uncon-
ventional means (Renshon Index) of implementing those modes of political participation.

1. Our first empirical question concerns the relationship between the various facets of our dependent variable, political participation: i.e., the relationship between the type of political activity engaged in and the radicalism of political activity. The statistical method of measuring this relationship is the coefficient of correlation (r). In assessing the correlation between type of activity and conventionality of participation we will have a measure of how individuals engaging in different types of political activity assess the means necessary to implement those types of activity within the political sphere.

2. Next, we are interested in the relationship of our major independent variable, I-E locus of control, to the two measures of political participation, type of activity and conventionality of participation. Thus, we determine the coefficient of correlation between, (a) I-E locus of control and the type of activity and (b) I-E locus of control and the conventionality of participation (Renshon Scale).

3. The next step is to look at the role of political attitude (e.g., efficacy) as it affects the type of political activity engaged in and as it affects the individual's sense of control over political outcomes.
Thus, the correlation between political attitude and type of political participation and between political attitude and locus of control is assessed. We are also interested in the possible interactions of political attitude with the locus of control to assess their mutual affect on type and conventionality of political participation. In order to assess the latter question, an analysis of variance will be used.

4. The next step is to chart the relationship (r.) between locus of control and political participation, controlling for the individual's view of whether the individual or the system is seen as dominant in determining political outcome. We will thus use our individual versus system blame index as a possible intervening variable in the correlation between the independent and dependent variables. Also, it is of interest to assess whether the individual versus system blame variable interacts with locus of control to effect the type and conventionality of political participation. Again, an analysis of variance will be computed.

5. The relation (r) of the demographic variables, especially economic status, to conventionality and type of participation is assessed and, finally, an analysis of variance is computed to assess the interaction of economic status and locus of control in determining the various types and degree of participation.
Factor and Item Analyses: Introduction

The main independent and dependent variables are degree of personal control and political participation, respectively, and our major hypothesis was framed in terms of a relationship between these variables. The factor analyses, inter-scale correlations, and analyses of variance indicate that both the independent and dependent variables are multi-dimensional in nature, i.e., that there exists for both the independent and dependent variables a number of discrete dimensions which define them and their specific relationships to one another.

For the independent variable, degree of personal control, the item analysis produces three discrete measures of the global personal control variables: locus of control, efficacy, and individual versus system blame. The derivation of each of these measures is outlined below. For the dependent variable, political participation, six differentiated scales are discernable: the Renshon scale of general radical political activity, which includes various general unconventional forms of
political participation engaged in in the past, the boycott question, which asks the subject to respond to whether he or she took part in the specific radical act of boycott of classes in support of a recent strike action of office personnel in the School of Social Work. This question aims to chart the subject's direct participation in a specific radical political activity within the environment applicable to his or her locus of control. Referring to the boycott action as a radical act may be problematic for a number of reasons, primary among them being that a number of faculty members also supported the boycott, thus possibly making the students' support an act of conformity. It may have been better, if it was possible, to delineate the reasons for the students' support of the boycott action. Since this was not possible in terms of timing of the administration of the questionnaire, we have decided to refer to support of the boycott as a specific radical act on the basis of its representing an alternative to the conventional political activities engaged in by students within the context of the School of Social Work. The Woodward-Roper scale of general, conventional political activity; and three Nie-Verba factorial scales, each of which represents a discreet measure of the more general
Woodward-Roper scale of conventional political activity. The three Nie-Verba factorial scales include a scale of intra-political party participation (Factor I), a scale of voting activity (Factor II), and a scale of extra-political party participation (Factor III).

The item analyses for each of the three measures of the independent variable and each of the six measures of the dependent variable are outlined below.

**Factor and Item Analyses: Political Participation Variables**

The factor analysis of the data as well as the correlation matrix for each item on the questionnaire demonstrate quite clearly that the original indices used in the questionnaire were composed of items that did not cluster together for our population.
It may be said that the scales in their original forms might be reliable for use with only particular populations, e.g., undergraduate students. When the scales were applied to a population of social work students, on the graduate level and working toward achieving a particular professional degree and subsequent occupation, the scales had to be reconstructed so that an acceptable level of reliability (utilizing Cronbach's Alpha as the statistical measure of reliability) was obtained.

Another speculation besides the one just offered, i.e., that the specific nature of the social work student population required reconstruction of scales, is that the sample size was too small to promote reliability on the original scales. While this hypothesis may prove to be correct, the fact is that our sample size exceeded that of many of the original studies upon which the scales were first tested. This is especially the case with Rotter's internal-external locus of control scale, where the original study, cited and discussed earlier, as well as many subsequent studies using this scale, had N's far less than the N=98 of the present study. The item analysis used by Rotter in preparing this scale may have been constructed with the benefit of a population that was small, but qualitatively distributed along very specific demographic lines. If these demographic characteristics differ substantially from those of our population, and if
TABLE 4
ROTATED FACTORS FOR THE FACTORS DERIVED FROM
THE RENSHON AND NIE-VERBA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renshon Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a mass demonstration</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broke law to oppose policy</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took part in sit-in</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical confrontation</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuaded others on how to vote</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie-Verba Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked for political party</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended political meetings</td>
<td>-.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed money to party</td>
<td>-.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a political club</td>
<td>-.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote regularly in national election</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in 1976 presidential election</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in 1972 presidential election</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in last local election</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with others on local problem</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formed group on local problem</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a problem-solving organization</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The procedure for selecting the number of factors is based on selecting a set of factors which have the maximum amount of variation between the factors and the least amount of variation in the correlations between items within factors. This procedure is analogous to finding the most uniform correlations in an analysis of variance. The higher the level of correlation between items, the less random the variation between the items. The aim is homogeneity of the items included in a factor and internal consistency between items within a factor.
Table 4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nie-Verba Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted local official with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted extra-local official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted local official on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted extra-local official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on social issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted local official on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particularized issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these characteristics are correlated to various items of the scales in specific ways, the same items will not mean the same thing to the two different population samples.

The aim of the pages that follow is to describe the factor analysis for each scale and to discuss what the scale may mean in light of the factors that compose it. Next we will discuss and describe the inter-item correlations and reliability measures for each scale. Next will follow a description and discussion of the inter-scale and scale-demographic data correlations.

Table 4 (Rotated Factors) shows the loading of factors for the Renshon and Nie-Verba items. The reader will note that the Nie-Verba items emerge as three separate factors based on the loadings after four rotations. We will describe each factor below. The Renshon includes five items, the final item ("attempted to persuade others on how to vote") having been a part of the Nie-Verba Scale of the original authors (Nie and Verba). The factor analysis shows that this item clusters more favorably with the items of the Renshon than with the items of the Nie-Verba Factorial Scales for our specific population.

Construction of Factorial Scales

The method of constructing the factorial indices proceeded from a listing of the items originally included on the Renshon and the Nie-Verba Scales. This produced
four separate and discrete factors as outline in Table 4. The third factor represents 8 items that clustered together and had in common the attribute of political participation of an extra-political party nature. We shall refer to this as Factorial Scale 3, extra-political party types of participation. The second factor contains 4 items having to do with voting and will be referred to as the voting scale of political participation or Factorial Scale 2. The first factor shows 4 items that clustered together and that relate to intra-political party types of participation. This latter factor will be referred to as Factorial Scale 1. Finally, the 4th rotation of items on Table 4 contains 5 items that clustered together to form the Renshon Scale of general, radical political activity.

We note that Factors 1, 2, and 3 (Table 4) were originally part of a single scale, the Nie-Verba Political Participation Scale. Yet, the manner in which the items of that scale clustered together into 3 separate factorial indices for our population indicates the multi-dimensionality inherent in this list of specific political activities. We will see in our later discussion of the correlation of these scales with the Woodward-Roper Scale of general, conventional political activity and with the specific radical activity of boycott of classes that statistically significant correlations appear between all of the scales
Renshon Scale

The Renshon Scale was to be used to measure one aspect of the dependent variable, political participation. Specifically, the Renshon Scale purports to assess the degree of radical activity engaged in by subjects. The 4th rotation of the factor loadings (Table 4) enables us to include in the Renshon Scale the following five items: attending a mass demonstration; breaking a law to oppose a public policy; taking part in a sit-in; engaging in a physical confrontation in order to demonstrate support for a particular political aim; and persuading others on voting. The last item, as mentioned above, had originally been included in the Nie-Verba political participation scale. In examining the rotated factors, however, this item clustered with the others on the Renshon Scale. Subjects must have viewed the attempt to persuade others on how to vote as a more radical activity than had originally been anticipated. We may explain this by viewing the attempt to persuade as a more active, more self-involving activity than voting per se, the latter putting the participant less on the line than the attempt to openly persuade others on how to vote.

The degree of radical political activity engaged in is calculated by the number of items that the subject
responded to having participated in. The item-item total correlations of this scale are as follows:

1. Attending mass demonstrations = .36
2. Breaking law to oppose policy = .62
3. Taken part in sit-in = .53
4. Engaged in physical confrontation - .43
5. Persuading others on voting = .30

The reliability of the Renshon Scale, as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .642.

Nie-Verba Factorial Scales

The seventeen items that appeared on the questionnaire as Appendix F fall into three separate categories, each of which forms a scale. One of the factors, "persuading others on how to vote," as mentioned above, clustered with the items of the Renshon Scale. Therefore, there are sixteen items to be included in the three Nie-Verba Scales.

The first scale, which shall be referred to as Factorial Scale III, includes the following items that clustered together in the 3rd rotation of the factor loadings (Table 4): worked with others on local problems; formed group on local problems; was a member of a problem-solving organization; contacted local officials with others; contacted extra-local officials; contacted local official on a general social issue; contacted extra-local official on a general social issue; and contacted local
official about a particularized matter.

What these items have in common is the ad hoc nature of the political activity engaged in and the fact that the activity was engaged in outside of political party channels. We shall, therefore, refer to this scale, in addition to its designation as Factorial Scale III, as the "Scale of Extra-Political Party Types of Participation." The original factor analysis by Nie and Verba includes two items which are subsumed within our "Scale of Extra-Political Party Types of Participation." They are: "communal activity" and "particularized contacting."

The item - item total correlations are as follows:

1. Worked with others on local problem = .63
2. Formed group on local problems = .70
3. Was a member of a problem-solving organization = .74
4. Contacted local official with others = .74
5. Contacted extra-local official = .68
6. Contacted local official on a general social issue = .65
7. Contacted extra-local official on a general social issue = .60
8. Contacted local official about a particularized matter = .50

The reliability of Factorial Scale III as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .882.

Taking a look at the second rotation of the factor loadings (Table 4), we arrive at what will be referred to
as Factorial Scale II, which is composed solely of items concerning the subjects' political participation in the form of voting in national and local elections. The items that comprise this scale include: voting regularly in national elections; having voted in the 1976 presidential election; having voted in the 1972 presidential election; and having voted in the most recent local election. The item - item total correlations are:

1. Voting regularly in national elections = .58
2. Having voted in the 1976 presidential election = .66
3. Having voted in the 1972 presidential election = .35
4. Having voted in the most recent local election = .46

The "voting" factor in the present study is the same as the "voting" factor in the original Nie-Verba factor analysis.

We note here that the item correlation matrix shows that many of the subjects who voted in the 1976 presidential election did not vote in the 1972 presidential election (r=.39) and that many who claimed to vote regularly in national elections did not vote in the 1972 presidential election (r=.22), while they did vote in the 1976 presidential election (r=.68). I believe these statistics derive from the fact that many of our subjects were not of voting age in 1972 while they were of voting age in 1976.
The reliability of Factorial Scale II, which shall also be referred to as the "Voting Type of Political Participation Scale;" as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .712.

The final scale, Factorial Scale I, falls into place on the 1st rotation of the factors (Table 4). The items that are included in this scale and their respective item-total item correlations are as follows: worked for political party (.63); attended political meetings (.54); contributed money to political party (.46); and, was member of a political club (.46).

Each of the factors included in Factorial Scale I involve the subject in political activities within the boundaries of the political party system and so this scale will also be referred to as the "Scale of Intra-Political Party Types of Participation." The reliability of this scale, again measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .727. The items included in this Factorial Scale I include items referred to by Nie and Verba as pertaining to "campaign activity" and "communal activity."

We now have four scales that comprise the dependent variable, political participation. The Renshon Scale is a measure of general radical activity. Factorial Scale I is a measure of intra-political party types of political participation, while Factorial Scale III measures extra-political party types of political participation. Finally,
Factorial Scale II measures political participation in terms of voting in national and local elections.

The next scale, the Woodward-Roper Scale of Political Participation, combines into one scale factors included in Factorial Scales I and II. We turn now to the item analysis of Woodward Roper.

**Woodward-Roper Scale of Political Participation**

Of the seven items included in Woodward and Roper's original national sample scale, one item - voting during the past four years - clustered not with the Woodward-Roper criterion but with the civic duty scale, which we will discuss shortly.

The items that loaded on the Woodward-Roper Scale, with the scores for the item-item total correlations, are as follows:

- frequently discussing public issues ($r = .45$);
- belonging to a public issue organization ($r = .34$);
- having written or talked to a public official ($r = .40$);
- worked for the election of a candidate ($r = .41$);
- contributed money to a candidate or party ($r = .24$);
- and attending a political speech in the last four years ($r = .33$).

While these items, included in the Woodward-Roper Scale, duplicate several of those on the three (Nie-Verba) factorial scales, we will examine which of the
Nie-Verba scales correlates most highly with the more general Woodward-Roper items. We will thus have some idea of how inclusive or general Woodward-Roper is for the political participation of those whose political activity falls within the different specialized categories of the various (Nie-Verba) Factorial Scales.

The reliability of the Woodward-Roper Scales for our population as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .632.

Now to the item analysis for our independent variable internal versus external locus of control. As implied in several studies quoted in a previous chapter, in order to achieve an acceptable level of reliability for the scale, we had to eliminate a number of the items originally used by Rotter in developing the I-E locus of control scale. We will now explore these factors and their relation to our specific population.

Factor and Item Analyses: Personal Control Variables

Internal-External Locus of Control

Of the 23 items included in Rotter's original locus of control scale, only ten appeared to cluster together for our sample.

Perhaps because of the relatively small N and the rather homogeneous nature of the population in terms of their status as students and because the measure was administered in the classroom by the students' instructors,
the nature of the items which clustered together to define an internal or external locus of control may have been determined by the student status of the population and the conditions under which the measure was administered.

Table 5 lists the items that clustered together to form the locus of control scale for our population, along with the item statistics for each item. When examining the means of the various items included in this scale, the reader should note that a mean of one indicates a purely internal and a mean of two a purely external response to the item in question.

Three of the ten items included on this locus of control scale deal with the students' classroom performance and they are the only items from Rotter's original listing that concern this subject. Since they do not cluster together for our sample, there may be some indication that the locus of control is itself viewed by respondents within the relevant, specific context that the measure is taken rather than as an indicator of locus of control in any general or overall way.

The ten items that cluster together to form the scale are: you get what you deserve; grades depend on the teacher as opposed to the student's actual performance; exams are fair vs. arbitrary; success is a matter of luck vs. effort; achievement is a matter of luck vs. effort; the exercise or possession of a certain degree of authority
## TABLE 5
### LOCUS OF CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Item-Item Total Correlations</th>
<th>Item Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Scores</td>
<td>Standard Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. You get what you deserve</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grade depends on teacher</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Examinations are fair vs. arbitrary</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Success: luck vs effort</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Achievement is luck vs effort</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Authority is luck vs skill</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is luck vs no such thing as luck</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Grades: effort vs arbitrary</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal information vs luck</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Internal vs external forces</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha
0.806 0.805

### Item Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is based on luck vs. skill; there is vs there is no such thing as luck; grades depend upon the student's effort vs. grades are arbitrary; things are obtained as a result of personal influence vs. luck; what happens is determined by internal vs. external forces.

The reliability of the locus of control scale as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .806. The frequency distribution for this scale, i.e., the distribution of internal and external responses will appear in the next section, along with the frequency distributions for the other scales.

**Individual vs. System Blame Scale**

The individual vs. system blame scale was included on the questionnaire as a check on the internal-external locus of control scale. Studies cited in the review of the literature on locus of control indicated that an individual's locus of control was determined not solely by the items for which responses were elicited on that scale but also by items on the individual vs. system blame scale, the latter giving an indication as to whether a particular subject believes that the individual or the system determined decisions in the political sphere. The latter factor was found to be correlated with various demographic characteristics of the subject, e.g., whether the subject was male or female and the subject's ethnic or economic status.
These studies demonstrated that certain individuals because of, e.g., their gender were, by the very nature of that demographic quality; (e.g., being female) more likely to respond as externals since the societal context within which they function determines such a response. Females, the argument contends, are less likely than males to have had the opportunity to achieve various political outcomes as a result of self-initiated action. Thus, they are less likely to attribute political outcomes to an internally initiated activity. For now, it is important to note that our particular population of social work students has a majority of female respondents and that this contextual fact may influence, inter alia, the nature of their internal or external attributions.

The three items included in this individual vs. system blame scale are:

the deterioration of life is attributable to individual vs. systemic factors; that to improve things the individual vs. the system must be changed; and that skills and status are determined by individual activity or efforts vs. systemic structures.

The reliability of this scale, as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .383. The relatively low reliability of this scale is probably attributable to the fact that only three items are included.
The two scales that will be described next are attitudinal scales, measures of the person's sense of efficacy in the political arena and of the sense of civic duty in relation to political participation of a particular sort - voting in national and/or local elections. After describing these scales, we will turn to the frequency distributions for all of the scales used in this study.

**Efficacy Scale**

Of the five items originally included in the efficacy scale and on the questionnaire, three did not cluster together as part of the scale. Two of these three items involved voting and the other item related to whether politics was understandable to the respondents. Evidently, one's sense of efficacy, at least for our population, was not related to such process variables, but rather to variables that indicated to the subject in a direct way what the response to his participatory activity was.

The two items that did cluster together to form this scale (Table 6) are: Whether the subject felt that officials cared about what he or she thought about political matters and whether the subject thought he or she had much say in the political decision-making process. The means of the scores obtained may be interpreted as follows:
1 = low sense of efficacy
2 = high sense of efficacy

The reliability of this scale, as measured by Cronbach's Alpha = .653.

TABLE 6
INTER-ITEM CORRELATIONS OF EFFICACY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Civic Duty Scale)</th>
<th>Item-Criterion Correlations</th>
<th>Item Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Officials Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I think</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I don't have much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say in what is decided</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civic Duty Scale

The Civic Duty Scale is an attitudinal measure of the subject's commitment to conventional forms of political participation, specifically voting as a political act.

The original four items of the questionnaire all cluster together to form this scale. In addition, a fifth item taken from the original Woodward-Roper Scale
("having voted in the last four years") was included in the Civic Duty Scale because of its better fit with the latter scale in the clustering of items (Table 7).

The five items included in the Civic Duty Scale, along with the scores for the item-criterion correlations, are: whether the subject felt that he or she would or would not vote if he or she felt that their candidate would not win the election (r=.33); whether the subject believed that local elections were or were not important (r=.56); whether the subject believed that because so many vote, he or she needn't (r=.47); whether, because the subject didn't care about the outcome of an election, he or she wouldn't vote (r=.33); and whether the subject voted in the last four years (4=.39).

The means of the scores for this scale may be interpreted as follows:

1 = low sense of civic duty
2 = high sense of civic duty

The final item on this scale, whether the subject voted in the last four years, is a behavioral item included on this attitudinal scale. It confirms the congruence of our behavioral and attitudinal measures, at least in the area of voting activity.

The reliability of the Civic Duty Scale, as measured by Cronhach's Alpha = .635.
TABLE 7
- INTER-ITEM CORRELATIONS OF CIVIC DUTY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-Criterion Correlations</th>
<th>Item Statistics</th>
<th>Item Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No win, no vote</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local elections, not important</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So many vote, I needn't</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I don't care about outcome, I don't vote</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in last 4 years</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now to describe the frequency distributions for each of the scales. Following this step, we will be prepared to describe and discuss the correlations of the scales with each other and with the demographic variables.

**Frequency Distributions of Scales**

Table 8 includes the means for each of the scales, as well as a listing within each scale of the percentage of subjects who fall within each of the sub-categories (values) for each variable; these sub-categories will be described below. Let us look first at the dependent variables.

The overall responses of the Woodward-Roper Scale fell almost precisely at the midpoint between high and low levels of political participation, the mean = 1.510 and the median = 1.500, with 1 = low and 2 = high levels of political participation. The seven sub-categories appearing on Table 8 indicate that the greatest percentage of subjects responded to the questionnaire items by indicating that their level of politically conventional activity, which the Woodward-Roper Scale measures, fell right around the mid-point level with a slightly higher percentage at the higher level of political participation.

The Renshon Scale, the scale of general radical activity, shows that here too subjects scored around the mid-point level, with a mean and median = 1.400. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty Scale</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Roper Scale</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renshon Scale</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial Scale I</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial Scale II</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factorial Scale III</th>
<th>Mean = 1.29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.00 1.13 1.25 1.38 1.50 1.63 1.75 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>36 12 15 9 4 5 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37% 12% 15% 9% 4% 5% 8% 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control Scale</th>
<th>Mean = 1.52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.00 1.10 1.11 1.13 1.17 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>8 4 1 1 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8% 4% 1% 1% 2% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.22 1.25 1.30 1.33 1.38 1.40 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>2 1 7 1 1 9 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>2% 1% 7% 1% 1% 9% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.50 1.56 1.57 1.60 1.67 1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>9 3 1 5 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>9% 3% 1% 5% 1% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.75 1.78 1.80 1.86 1.90 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1 1 8 2 7 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1% 1% 8% 2% 7% 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual vs. System Blame Scale</th>
<th>Mean = 1.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1.00 1.33 1.50 1.67 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>55 22 2 12 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>59% 24% 2% 13% 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reason for obtaining as high a score (1 = low level of politically radical activity; 2 = high level of politically radical activity) as we did is that many of the subjects did attend a mass demonstration and did attempt to persuade others on how to vote, while a much smaller percentage engaged in the other radical activities included on the Renshon Scale.

While over 32 percent of subjects scored within the 1.400 sub-category, about 39 percent scored at the 1.000 and 1.200 level, while about 29 percent scored at the 1.600, 1,800 and 2.000 levels. This indicates that our population as a whole is relatively conventional in its participation in the so-called radical activities included in the Renshon Scale.

The next measure of the dependent variable is Factorial Scale I, * which concerns itself with intra-party political activity. The mean of responses for this scale = 1.347 and the median = 1.250, with a score of 1 = low level of intra-party political participation and 2 = high level of intra-party political participation. Over 36 percent of the population indicated that they did not engage in any of the political activities included on this scale, while only 10.20 percent engaged in all of the

*Henceforth, we shall refer to Factorial Scale I as interchangeable with the intra-political party scale of political activity.
activities. Looking at the individual items, attendance at political meetings accounted for the largest number of participants with 1.561 being the mean for participation in this activity. The activities that were engaged in most frequently following the latter were working for a political party and contributing money to a political party, each with a mean of about 1.3. The least engaged in was being a member of a political club, the mean for this subcategory being equal to 1.153. Thus, we may note that participation within the political party system engaged our particular population in activities that required commitments of a less formal, more ad hoc nature than would have been the case with becoming a member of an ongoing political club.

Our next scale, Factorial Scale II,* concerns itself with voting behavior in national and local elections. The high mean (=1.712) and median (1.750) scores indicate that this form of political participation was most engaged in by our population. A full 43.88 percent of subjects engaged in each of the voting activities included in the scale, while only 7.14 percent engaged in none of these activities. Observing the means for each item we may note that a mean of 1.827 of our sample voted regularly in national elections, while a lower percentage, with a mean of 1.592 voted in the last local election. These figures indicate that voting, and

*Factorial Scale II shall also be referred to as the voting scale of Political Participation.
especially voting in national elections, was a major activity defining this population's political participation. Factorial Scale III* concerns itself with political activity outside political party channels and undertaken for specific social and political goals on an ad hoc basis. Of the three Factorial Scales, this scale includes items least engaged in by our specific population. With a score of 1 = low level of participation and 2 = high level of participation, we note that the mean for the population equals 1.293 and the median equals 1.250. Looking at the sub-categories for this scale, almost 37 percent of subjects engaged in none of the activities included on this scale, while only 8.16 percent engaged in all of them.

The individual item analysis indicates that working with others on a local problem and contacting local officials on a particularized matter (with means = 1.439 and 1.459, respectively) were the activities engaged in most by our subjects. Being a member of a problem-solving organization (mean = 1.306) and contacting a local official with others (mean = 1.357) were the next most engaged in activities. Forming a group on local problems (mean = 1.214) and contacting a local official on a social matter (mean = 1.286) were next, and the least engaged in activities on this scale were

*Factorial Scale III shall henceforth also be referred to as the Extra-Political Party Type of Political Participation Scale.
contacting an extra-local official.

and contacting an extra-local official on a social matter, both with means = 1.143. The latter items may have received such low means because of a confusion on the part of subjects as to what an extra-local official was. Interpreting the data as they appear we may say that subjects were more likely to become involved in group activities on local problems within groups that were already established rather than in group activity that required the formation of new groups and that participation was greater in activities that concerned a particular, circumscribed cause or individual than in activities that were less defined and more general in scope of outcome.

The independent variable, internal-external locus of control, may be interpreted as follows: a mean of 1 = internal and a mean of 2 = external locus of control. For the population as a whole, the mean = 1.524 and the median = 1.500. This shows that our population was about equally divided among externals and internals. Actually, taking a closer look at the individual sub-categories, over 12 percent of the population scored as pure externals, while only 1.02 percent or one individual scored as a pure internal.

The items on which subjects scored most highly as externals included: you get what you deserve; one's grade depends upon the teacher; success is luck rather than effort; there is luck vs. there is no such thing as luck; and,
personal influence is less important than luck in obtaining the rewards one desires. The items on which subjects scored the most internal include: achievement involves effort rather than luck; authority is achieved by skill rather than luck; grades are determined by effort rather than arbitrarily; and, internal rather than external forces determine the course of events in one's life.

We will later see whether these internal-external attributions coincide with the subjects' preferred forms of political activity, especially with their participation on the three Factorial Scales.

While it was just noted that external attribution of rewards characterizes our population, we note in looking at the individual versus system blame scale that the great majority of our population believes that individual rather than systemic factors are most important in producing political change. This is indicated by the mean of 1.197 and median score of 1.000, with over 59 percent of subjects scoring within the 1.000 sub-category, indicating a belief that individual rather than systemic factors are most important in determining political change. Only 2.15 percent of the subjects held the opposite view, i.e., that systemic factors were most important in determining political change. This analysis holds true for each of the items included on this scale: that deterioration of life, improving things, and skills and status are all determined primarily by individual
rather than systemic factors. We shall attempt to explain this seemingly contradictory result in the final chapter of this study.

Finally, let us look at the political attitude scales.

The efficacy scale indicates that about half of the population believed themselves highly efficacious and half not efficacious in the political sphere (mean = 1.474; median = 1.500). Almost 40 percent of subjects believed themselves to be low in political efficacy, while almost 35 percent believed themselves to be high in political efficacy, with 25.51 percent falling at the midpoint of the efficacy scale. Each of the two items comprising this scale had a mean of about 1.4. Those items include: "officials don't care what I think" and "I don't have much to say in the public policy-making process." We will note later whether either of these items correlates with the individual vs. system blame scale and the internal-external locus of control scale.

The scores on the Civic Duty Scale seem to conform to the high level of political participation reported earlier on Factorial Scale II or voting scale of political participation. While 1 = low level of civic duty and 2 = high level of civic duty, we note an overall mean of 1.810 and a median score = 1.800 for our population. Almost 45 percent of the sample scored at the highest level, while only 5.10 percent scored at the 1.2 sub-category level. The great majority of
subjects believed that they should vote even if their candidate was not expected to win (mean = 1.949), that they should vote even though so many others voted (mean = 1.929), and, in fact, the mean of 1.897 for having voted in the last four years indicates that the behavioral and attitudinal measures are congruent. A slightly lower, but still high mean of 1.765 indicates that local elections are considered important by subjects. The lowest mean score (=1.510) was for the item that asked subjects whether they would vote even if they didn't care about the outcome of an election. This seems to be a more pragmatic than normative measure of civic duty, the latter having been included in the item that questioned subjects if they would vote even though so many others did (see above).

We have now described the population demographically, defined the scales in terms of composition of items and the reliability of each scale. We have also indicated the distribution of the population demographically and in terms of its overall distribution on each of our scales.

It is now time to move on to a description of the (cor) relations among the variables and the subsequent analysis of variance.

Inter-Correlation of the Personal Control Variables

Table 9 indicates only one statistically significant correlation among the independent variables, i.e., between
the locus of control and the individual vs. system blame measures. The correlation is unexpected since it shows a relation between internal locus and attribution of outcome to systemic factors rather than to individual effort. One would have expected an internal subject, who believes that rewards in his or her life are determined through efforts that they control, to also believe that outcomes are the result of individual effort. This is not the case. One possible explanation of this result is that subjects with an internal locus of control have achieved a belief in their own control over events through a confrontation with systemic forces, i.e., that the internal locus of control subject has been interacting with his surrounding reality more than the external subject, the latter having confronted the system less and believing that outcomes are the result of an individual's effort, if only that individual believes strongly enough in their capacity to change things. In other words, this explanation proposes that the internal individual is more involved in the reality of the world outside himself and is thus more aware of the power of systemic forces than the external individual who, because he believes that external forces determine rewards, does not venture out into the world but maintains the belief that only by individual effort can things be changed. The latter belief would certainly lead the external to feel frustrated in obtaining rewards since if, in fact, individual
TABLE 9
INTERCORRELATION OF CONTROL VARIABLES
(LOCUS OF CONTROL; INDIVIDUAL VS. SYSTEM BLAME, POLITICAL EFFICACY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.208*</td>
<td>-.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual vs. System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.208*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Efficacy</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05

effort determines outcome, his external locus of control would rule out the possibility that he could effectuate such individually-determined outcomes. While this explanation of the correlation between locus of control and individual vs. system blame is admittedly quite speculative, it does provide a foundation for the finding to be reported later that externals rather than internals engaged in the radical boycott action because of the frustration the externals feel in regard to obtaining rewards within
Another possible explanation of this result is that internals seek relevant information to a greater extent than externals. This finding was noted in our review of the literature on internal-external locus of control in the study of Seeman and Evans of tuberculosis patients in a hospital setting. If internals seek information relevant to their life situation to a greater extent than externals, their sense of the difficulties inherent in effectuating political change by individual effort and their sense that political outcomes are determined in large part by systemic forces and structures may be the result of their (the internals') greater familiarity with the actual maze of interacting forces that exist and that must be confronted in attempting to secure some change in the political system, an hypothesis that parallels the one presented immediately above.

A third and more convincing explanation of the relation between external locus of control and attribution of political outcome to individual effort is the hypothesis that only by exerting individual effort within an accepting environment can the external achieve some sense of control over events. The internal subject would, according to this explanation attribute political outcomes to systemic forces because the present structure of these political forces has already provided for the internal a sense of control over events.
and so a maintenance of belief in the power of the extant political structures promises to maintain that sense of control.

The lack of any other significant correlations among the independent variables (Table 9) seems to indicate that we have discrete measures of the global need for control variable. The intercorrelation of the political participation variables also presents some interesting results. (Table 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercorrelation of Political Participation Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First, we note that the Woodward-Roper Scale of general conventional political activity is correlated with each of the 3 more specific Factorial scales of conventional activity as well as with the Renshon Scale of general radical activity, but not with the specific radical activity of boycott of classes. (Table 10) The Woodward-Roger scale correlations may indicate that an individual whose participation is conventional in nature might be likely to engage in different types of political activity unless that activity occurs in a setting that in some way threatens their conventional aspirations or goals, as might be the case with the boycott action. The same explanation could be offered for the lack of relation between the Renshon Scale and the boycott issue. We note that in the case of the Renshon, as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

INTERCORRELATION OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Radical</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Radical</th>
<th>Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factorial</td>
<td>2 Factorial</td>
<td>3 Factorial</td>
<td>4 Factorial</td>
<td>5 Renshon</td>
<td>6 W-R</td>
<td>7 Boycott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale I</td>
<td>Scale II</td>
<td>Scale III</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Party</td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Extra-</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.00  .327**  .427***  .292**  .668***  .213

.327**  1.00  .194  .223*  .409***  -.062

.427***  .194  1.00  .281**  .584***  -.076

.292**  .223*  .281**  1.00  .296**  -.094

.668***  .409***  .584***  .296**  1.00  .285

.213  -.062  -.076  -.094  .285  1.00

* p = .05
** p = .01
*** p = .001
with the Woodward-Roper, the Renshon scale is related to each of the other measures of political activity except the boycott measure.

Another interesting result in Table 10 is the correlation among the 3 Factorial Scales. We note that subjects engaging in intra-party activity also engage in voting activity and extra-party activity and vice versa. Yet those engaging in extra-party activity do not necessarily vote. We may speculate that individuals engaged in the more active, individually-focused activities of extra-party activity have a need to see that their activity is directly recognized by those they politically support, and that voting would not provide that recognition. Also, the items that comprise the extra-party scale include activities that may involve the participants in anti-candidate stances which would predispose these individuals to direct their participation to extra-voting activity.

The result is indeed a puzzling one. Still, another possible explanation may be that those engaging in extra-party activity are "single-issue" participants. If this is the case, voting, which involves the participant in general political issues, may not be of great concern to the extra-party, single-issue activist.

Viewing the lack of correlation from the other side, those who voted may not have engaged in extra-party activity because they conduct their activism solely within the
conventional party system or because their degree of activity in politics does not go beyond voting and into the more activist engagement in politics required by extra-party activity.

That the boycott measure is not related to any of the other measures of participation may indicate that it is a discrete measure of political activity. The lack of relation to the other participatory activities may be related to the boycotts' specific relation to its physical context, the School of Social Work. An individual's motivation to participate in either a conventional or a radical activity may thus be determined by the specific versus the general nature of the activity rather than by its radical or conventional orientation. Perhaps the specificity of a political action permits the subject to more obviously monitor the control or lack of control he or she feels in relation to it.

Relation Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Demographic Measures

Table 12 lists the correlations among the control and political participation variables and the demographic items requested of subjects on the questionnaire. We note first that the older the subjects the more likely will they be to engage in voting as a form of political activity. This makes sense, since the older the subject, the more likely
## Table 11

Intercorrelations of Control and Political Participation Scales with Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnic Class</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Live with or away from parent</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Years of Social Work</th>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>DSW Specialization</th>
<th>M.S. Specialization</th>
<th>Political Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual System</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Party</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>.240*</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.259*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Party</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>.240*</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.355*</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renshon</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.253*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward-Roper</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.271*</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Duty</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.356*</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.540**</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05

**p = .01
will it be that he or she has been exposed for a long period of time to propaganda that legitimizes voting as a political activity.

Next, we note that males were more likely to engage in general radical political activity (Renshon Scale) than females. We may explain this result by saying that males may have sensed some test of their masculinity in these radical acts. Still, that test of sexual identity was not important enough to motivate males to participate more than females in the university boycott action. On the contrary, we note that in the latter action, it was the females who participated more, to an extent that approached statistical significance in differentiating their participation from that of the male population. The low N for the boycott question was probably the factor that prevented the scores from achieving statistical significance. We could say that females engaged to a greater extent than males in the boycott because of their greater number in the social work student population, thus lending the support of numbers within the relevant context of protest to the more radical activity. We may also speculate that the males' traditionally greater career-orientation inhibited engagement in a radical activity that occurred within a context directly relevant to their career goals. It may be noted in each of these explanations how important the context of possible alliances and identifications is in defining participation in the
specific radical boycott action.

The next correlation is between marital status and the extra-party (Factorial III) scale, indicating that married subjects were more likely to engage in extra-political party types of participation, a result that could be explained by the marrieds choosing to spend more time on these time-consuming and independently initiated activities than single subjects.

Individuals with a greater number of years of social work-related experience were also more likely to engage in extra-political party activity. The explanation for this result may be presumed to lie in the fact that the political activity in question required a greater degree of independent activity and a greater knowledge of organizing within the political sphere than the other forms of activity which subjects were questioned about in the two other Nie-Verba Scales (voting and intra-party activity). Both of these requisites of extra-party activity are probably better developed in those with more politically related experience, which was very likely gained in a social work context.

Next, we note that students in the Master's degree program who are specializing in social policy and organization are more likely than those specializing in direct practice to engage in the general conventional political activities included in the Woodward-Roper scale. Evidently, students with a social policy-organization interest are more
likely than students engaged in clinical treatment to be involved in general, conventional political activity.

An interesting and logical finding is indicated by the relation between participation in voting and more conservative or liberal rather than radical political ideology; those identifying themselves as more radical in their ideological orientation were more likely to engage in the general radical activities included in the Renshon Scale.

Next is the finding that those of lower economic status were more likely to engage in the boycott action than those of higher economic status. We see in this result the first relationship of any of our items with the intra-university boycott action and we may explain this relationship by returning to the hypotheses presented earlier in this study.

The first explanation of why students of lower economic status boycotted classes was introduced in the review of the political participation literature. That explanation concerned the possible identification of lower economic status students with the wage demands of the striking office personnel. This explanation gains added credence in the context of the School of Social Work, where identification with the strikers on the basis of a common lower economic status is bolstered by the social workers' empathy for the poor.
In that boycott is also related to an external locus of control, we might speculate that it was not the common economic status of students and strikers but rather their common alienation from the system, due to an external locus, that led the students to boycott. This explanation gains support when we look at the analysis of variance to be reported later. In that analysis we find that externals of higher economic status also boycotted classes. This may indicate that externality rather than lower economic status is the focus around which identifications cluster. In order to effectively demonstrate this hypothesis, we would have to have evidence for a relation between locus and economic status, and we do not have this evidence in our data. Perhaps what is necessary is a locus of control scale that focuses on economic issues, an economic locus of control scale. This idea may be testable in future research if such a scale could be devised and tested in the light of various political activities.

We also note in Table 12 that economic status is related to each of the three factorial scales, of intra-party, voting, and extra-party activity. In this table, it is shown that higher economic status is related to conventional political activity indicating, perhaps, that those of higher economic status, having received one of the tangible rewards (money) offered by the conventional political system, support that conventional order and not the striking workers.
TABLE 12

RELATIONS OF PERSONAL CONTROL AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Efficacy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Individual vs.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Locus of Control</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Woodward-Roper</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Intra-Party</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Voting</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Extra-Party</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Renshon</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Boycott</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05
** p = .01
*** p = .001
who are rebelling against it.

**Political Participation and Personal Control**

Having summarized in a previous section of this chapter the relations between the control variables and in another section the relation between the participation variables, we are now ready to summarize the relation between these two multidimensional variables.

**Efficacy and Participation**

Table 14 indicates that those high in efficacy engage in general conventional political activity (Woodward-Roper) and in extra-party activity. In a previous section, we noted that these two forms of activity are themselves related. There are no significant correlations between efficacy and either voting or intra-party activity. Thus, we may say that where efficacy is higher, the subject will choose to engage in the more activist type of conventional activity, extra-party participation. Evidently those higher in efficacy are committed to the conventional political system but relate to it with a more activist orientation, an orientation that may satisfy the feeling of being efficacious.

**Individual vs. System Blame and Participation**

The subject who attributes to individual effort the major power to determine political outcomes tends to be, as
noted earlier, external in locus of control, while the subject attributing to the system the major power in determining outcomes tends to be internal in locus of control. Table 14 indicates that the subject who attributes to individual effort the major power in determining outcome is likely to engage in the boycott action and not to vote in national or local elections. Perhaps this individual does not believe that voting within the conventional and established system is effective and that engaging in the more radical and specific boycott action is effective. Effective in what sense?

**Locus of Control and Participation**

Perhaps the desire to be effective is not defined by effectiveness in achieving a particular political outcome but rather by effectiveness in increasing the belief in internal control. The data support such a hypothesis. We note that those with an external locus of control engage in only one of the political activities surveyed, i.e., the specific radical boycott action. Those internal in locus do not, it seems, engage in any of the political activities surveyed. At least the general response of internality is not in and of itself sufficient to account for political activity. What is notable is the fact that internality is related to a refusal to engage in the specific radical activity of boycott. In the next section, which outlines
the interactions among the variables, the results of this section are explained in the more specific context of the demographic variables that characterize the sample. It seems that, since both the personal control and political participation measures are multi-dimensional in nature, any explanation of the relationship between them requires a more specific delimitation of the interactions involved. This fact is crucial in assessing and refining the relevance of, for example, Rotter's locus of control concept.

We may note at this point that lower economic status as well as externality is correlated with participation in the boycott action. Utilizing economic status and external locus of control as the independent variables and boycott as the dependent variable we obtain a multiple correlation of .71. This indicates a high level of predictability of boycott from those individuals who are external and lower in economic status, a finding that will be discussed in the "Conclusions."

Interaction of the Variables

In order to refine the general findings reported thus far, the following analyses of variance have been computed.

1. As independent variables, we will use: - locus of control, political efficacy, and individual versus system blame and conduct analyses of variance using each of the following as the dependent variable: Woodward-Roper; Renshon;
Factorial Scales I, II, and III; and boycott.

II. As independent variables in our second set of analyses we shall use: economic status and locus of control. We will use the same measures of the dependent variable as were used in the first group of analyses (I, above).

Interaction of Control Variables with Scale of General Radical Activity (Renshon)

Of the twelve analyses of variance, only two indicated significant interaction effects.

The first of these analyses concerns the interaction of locus of control, individual vs. system blame, and political efficacy as the independent variables and the Renshon scale of general radical activity as the dependent variable. The significance level for the interaction is equal to .05.

Table 15 is divided into two sub-tables, A and B, each of which includes the statistics for the interaction of efficacy and locus of control on the Renshon Scale. In sub-table A, this interaction is considered for subjects who believe that the individual rather than the system is responsible for political outcomes, while sub-table B considers the same interaction for subjects who believe that systemic factors rather than individual effort is responsible for political outcomes.
TABLE 13
INTERACTION OF EFFICACY, LOCUS OF CONTROL, AND INDIVIDUAL VS. SYSTEM BLAME FOR RENSHON SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>17.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1.437</th>
<th>1.414</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>17.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1.533</th>
<th>1.300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, we note that among those who attribute to the system the major impetus for political change, those with a high sense of efficacy, whether they are internal or external in locus of control, score low on the Renshon Scale of general radical activity. We may explain this finding by speculating that an individual who feels competent to effect political change within the established political order will have no need to engage in political activities outside the conventional political structure, especially since that individual attributes to the extant political structure the major impetus for producing political outcomes.

Among those who attribute to individual effort the major impetus for effecting political outcomes, there appears a high score on the Renshon scale for those who are high in efficacy and internal in locus of control. Evidently, the attribution of political outcomes to individual effort tends to motivate the individual to more radical activity, especially where the sense of efficacy and internal control are higher. It may be that the individual's feeling of efficacy and internal control are themselves elevated when the individual attributes to his own actions the power to effect change and when this power is exercised within a context that stresses individual rather than systemic forces, as is probably the case within the context of radical activity, where individual effort and innovation will probably be more likely to appear than in an already
established system of rules and institutional arrangements.

Thus, the scores on the Renshon scale of general radical activity are usually low when the sense of efficacy is high, except with those individuals who attribute to individual effort the major impetus for political outcomes and who are internal in locus of control. Speculating, we may say that where the sense of competence in the political sphere is high and where the individual believes the extant political structure to be the major mover of political outcomes, he or she will be in some sense attached to the established political order, since it is within that order that his or her sense of efficacy is established. On the other hand, for those who believe that individual effort is the prime mover of political outcomes, the way to establish or maintain a high sense of efficacy and internal control will be to engage in radical activity, where the belief in the importance of individual effort can be realized to a greater extent than in an already established political framework.

Interaction of Economic Status and Locus of Control for the Boycott Question

The second analysis of variance that demonstrates a significant interaction between the variables (p=.01) involves economic status and locus of control as the independent variables and the question of whether or not the individual boycotted classes in support of striking office personnel as the dependent variable (Table 16).
TABLE 14
INTERACTION OF ECONOMIC STATUS AND LOCUS OF CONTROL AS INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND BOYCOTT AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction of the variables indicates a finding that is of major importance for this study. For those of low economic status, engaging in the boycott takes place at a rather high level of predictability, whether they are internal or external in locus, though those with an external locus do seem to engage in boycott to a slightly higher degree than internals. This finding supports the previously stated contention that identification with strikers on the basis of a common lower economic status may account for participation in the boycott action. However, when those of higher economic status are observed, we note that externals
are in fact the group that tends to engage in the boycott to an extent greater than any of the other groups, while those of higher economic status who are internal in locus do not engage in the boycott at all. While the N for each cell is quite small, and prevents any final conclusions, we may speculate that externality, perhaps especially when it is combined with higher economic status, is the major factor upon which identification and subsequent participation in the boycott rests. We might say that the incongruence of having secured one of the established political system's major rewards (higher economic status) and still feeling a sense of externality within that system may explain the higher economic status externals' support of the boycott as a rebellion against a feeling of powerlessness in the system. For the higher economic status individual who is internal in locus of control there exists no such incongruence. Engaging in the boycott for this latter group would be tantamount to supporting an obstacle to their continued sense of power and achievement within the extant political order.

A similar sense of incongruence to that hypothesized for the higher economic status, external may exist for the internal of high efficacy who attributes to the individual the major responsibility for political outcomes. As was demonstrated in the first analysis of variance this latter individual tends to be more involved in radical activity
than the majority of internals of high efficacy, the latter attributing to systemic factors the major responsibility for political outcomes. It may be that where the sense of incongruence is high between one's inner feelings about what one should or should not have and what is actually possible in the outside world, a desire arises to create or participate within a context that will lessen the sense of incongruence by increasing the sense of personal control.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

Summary of Results

1) Finding

Internal locus of control is correlated to an attribution of political outcomes to systemic factors rather than individual effort, while external locus is correlated to attribution of outcome to individual effort.

Interpretation

The internal is a greater seeker of information in certain situations that require decisions to be made. The internal may therefore attribute political outcomes to systemic factor on the basis of his greater knowledge of the existing political reality, a knowledge gained by his efforts to obtain information.

2) Finding

General radical activity (as measured by the Renshon Scale) is related to conventional forms of political participation (particularly extra party activity when the sense of efficacy is high) but not to participation in the boycott action.

Interpretation

This finding supports the contention that political participation is a multi-dimensional concept. Specifically, it is hypothesized that general radical activity is not
correlated with boycott since the former is a measure of general and the latter a measure of specific radical activity and that in the present case boycott may have represented a specific situation that attracted to it individuals with some common motive for engaging in the boycott of classes. That common motive may have been the opportunity provided to the external of gaining an internal locus of control which, the argument runs, may have been provided by the strike context’s more directly and obviously demonstrating to the participant his or her sense of control over events.

3) Finding

Conventional political activity was itself found to be a multi-dimensional concept. Intra-party activists engaged in extra-party activity and voting, voters engaged in intra-party activity, but extra-party activity was not correlated to voting.

Interpretation

An explanation was offered in terms of the extra-party activists’ focus on single-issue campaigns, while elections are multi-issue in nature. Another explanation views the lack of correlation from the other side, i.e., that voters do not engage in extra-party activity since the latter requires a greater degree of activism in politics than the person who merely votes is either capable or desirous of engaging in. A third explanation of the lack of correlation between voting and extra-party activity combines the preceding two interpretations. Perhaps the individual who doesn’t vote becomes involved only in those political activities
of salience to him. This would explain his lack of desire to vote, which generally involves a broad range of issues, many of which are not of immediate relevance. Activism may for these individuals be focused on the immediate and specific.

4) Finding

Females were more likely than males to engage in boycott of classes. Those of lower economic status engaged in boycott, as did those with an external locus of control.

5) Finding

Internals who attribute to systemic forces the major impetus for political outcomes (see #1, above) score low on the Renshon scale of general radical activity, while those internals who are high in efficacy and attribute political outcomes to individual effort score high on the Renshon scale.

Interpretation

This is an interesting finding since we also found that internals as a group attributed to the system the major impetus for political outcomes. It could be that the minority of internals who attributed political outcomes to individual effort achieved their high sense of efficacy within the arena of radical political activism, while the majority of internals, who attributed political outcomes to systemic factors, achieved their high sense of efficacy via participation in more conventional modes of political activity.
The combined contribution of these two independent factors to boycott is substantial.

6) **Finding**

Both internals and externals of low economic status boycotted classes, particularly externals. Externals of high economic status also boycotted. Internals of high economic status did not boycott classes. A multiple correlation of .71 was arrived at in predicting boycott from economic status and locus of control. Thus, when locus is external and economic status is low, a high level of predictability of boycott exists.

We note in this group of findings that one's external locus of control always determined boycott, particularly where the external subject was of lower economic status.
Interpretation

It may be that the boycott provided for externals of low economic status a political issue and a political milieu, via identification with the strikers,* that promised to gratify their need for control over events. This may also explain why those of higher economic status who were externals boycotted classes. This latter group may have identified with the strikers and joined in support of them not out of sympathy, altruism, or mutual economic interest, but on the basis of a common external locus of control. In other words, it is contended that the boycott of classes was motivated not by the nature of the economic issue, per se, but by the provision of a context for achieving an internal locus that was offered by the extra-conventional context of the strike action.

Some Theoretical Implications of the Results

One of the major findings indicates that the subject who scores as internal on the Rotter scale does not believe that political outcomes are determined by individual effort but rather that outcomes are determined by systemic forces, while those scoring as externals on the Rotter scale believe

*cf. The theoretical speculations offered in the review of political participation literature concerning identification as a basis of voting patterns along ethnic lines (Chapt. 2).
that political outcomes are determined by individual effort. The locus of control or belief in one's control over events is thus not the same as the belief that one actually does exercise control over events.

This definition of locus of control is in keeping with Rotter's original formulation of the concept. In the text, above, we offered some speculative comments to attempt to explain the internals' attribution of outcome to systemic forces and the externals' attribution of outcome to individual efforts. These comments center around the hypothesis that internals are more attuned to the complex network of structural forces that in the world of political reality actually determine outcomes and that this determines their attribution of outcome to systemic forces.

Following from this divergence in the definition of locus of control and political efficacy as two discrete dimensions of the need for control variable we may offer the following tentative conclusion: that the need for personal control may be viewed from two vantage points, i.e., from the vantage point of one's position in the extant political reality and from the vantage point of some future, hoped-for reality. Let us be more specific. Let us assume, as we have throughout this study, that a need for personal control does exist. If this is the case, we may hypothesize that the individual will engage
in and support activities that encourage a belief in his or her personal control over events. It is maintained that each individual will desire this belief in their control. So what distinguishes the internal from the external subject? The hypothesis offered is that the internal locus of control subject will participate in (political) actions within the extant political framework since that existing framework offers him the opportunity to believe that he exercises personal control within it. The external locus of control subject will, on the other hand, participate in (political) actions outside the extant political framework since the existing framework does not offer him the opportunity to believe that he exercises personal control within it. To support this hypothesis we note that the external subject engages in the radical, extra-conventional boycott action. The external's participation in the boycott may offer him a specific context wherein the belief in his personal control is or promises to become operative. According to this explanation, we may see the external locus of control subject's belief that political outcomes are determined by individual effort as a rationale motivating or strengthening his motivation to attempt to create a context favorable to a belief in his personal control over events. The internal locus of control subject has no need for this rationale,
since the existing structure already provides for him a belief in his personal control. The internal locus of control subject is content to believe that structural or systemic factors determine outcomes.

According to the above speculations, locus of control must be defined as a general need for a belief in one's control over events. Rotter defines this as the internal locus of control. What is being postulated here is that this locus of control is a general motivational force that exists in all individuals. What distinguishes an internal from an external locus of control is not the presence or absence of this motivational force nor a belief that one has or does not have control in any general sense over events in one's life. It is postulated that what does distinguish an internal from an external locus of control is a belief as to whether the existing context within which the individual operates provides the opportunity to exercise a sense of personal control.
The external locus of control subject will be defined by the inability of the existing contextual reality to provide the opportunity or rewards necessary for believing in his personal control. For this external locus of control subject, (political) behavior will be engaged in within a context that does provide some challenge to the existing, alienating network of structural forces. Where the existing political context does not offer the opportunity to exercise political belief in one's control (external), coalitions will be forged among various segments of the population along lines that strive to create an alternate contextual framework for the exercise of personal control. These coalitions may be formed among segments of the population that have, for example, different socio-economic positions, but who nevertheless feel mutually or commonly alienated from the present reality's inability to provide them with a belief in their personal control. Thus, those who engaged in boycott of classes came from both higher and lower economic status positions but were external in their locus of control.

The specific issue of wages addressed by the boycott of classes may have provided the (external locus of control) student supporters of the strikers with an opportunity around which their alienation from the existing reality could coalesce. It is in this sense that we may understand the vicarious obtaining of economic rewards by
external locus of control, student supporters of the boycott, these students identified, it is hypothesized, with the strikers' inability to believe in their personal control over events and utilizing the economic issue as a focus for creating a political reality within which personal control might be exercised. Internal locus of control subjects had no need to create a new context, since the present alignment of forces provided for them a belief in their personal control over events.

The above formulation of locus of control points to the necessity of defining this concept within specific contextual frameworks. These contextual frameworks, involving political processes in the present study, are themselves multi-dimensional and must be assessed in terms of the opportunities provided to the individual to believe in his or her sense of personal control. As several studies critical of Rotter's original locus of control concept have made clear, (Cf. Sanger and Alker), certain segments of the population (e.g., females) are not innately "external" in Rotter's sense but have, because of their sense of powerlessness to effectuate change within the status quo, become alienated from the extant political and social order. In our sample, we note that females were external in locus of control and that they did support the boycott of classes to an extent that just missed achieving statistical significance.
Admittedly, the above discussion provides no more than an ad hoc explanation of the results obtained. We have attempted to provide a logical theoretical framework for a collection of somewhat contradictory findings. Still, the multi-dimensionality of the political participation process and the hypothesized "motivational" drive of a multi-dimensional conception of personal control do demonstrate the importance of taking into account the specific context within which a personality attribute is operative in order to assess its functioning.

For the political organizer and policy-planner as well as for the social and political scientist, this study seems to move away from the concept of political participation as based solely or primarily on the economic or social rewards that may be obtained by engaging in various political actions. What may be more helpful is a concept of interest groups that is based not on the material or economic benefits that may accrue to the individual but rather on the opportunity to experience a sense of control that can be provided for the individual when he or she either attempts to maintain the present structure of political forces (for the internal locus of control subject) or create an alternate set of political conditions (for the external locus of control individual). Interest group politics would thus assess the various coalitions and identifications among individuals as
phenomena pertaining directly to their sense of personal control vis-a-vis the existing political context. This would provide an opportunity to explain many seemingly contradictory coalitions within the political realm, e.g., when poor and rich citizens join a radical political party as well as many situations that are presently explained by invoking conventional single-interest economic and social motives. In essence, the definition of locus of control introduced herein relates the behavioral concept to the psychoanalytic theory of motivation as espoused by ego psychologists like Robert White, who speaks of a need for competence that motivates behavior, and Heinz Hartmann, who discusses the ego's adaptation to reality as one of its major functions. Rather than viewing internal-external locus of control as a fixed, static attribute of the personality that is triggered or put into operation on the basis of some previously learned reward system, as Rotter's definiton of the concept seems to imply, the present formulation views the concept in a dynamic manner, attempting to account for various (political) behaviors in terms of an interaction of personality and environment whose goal it is to achieve for the individual a more satisfactory adaptation to reality and, more important, since we are discussing a process of political participation, an adaptation that takes into account the individual's active attempts to
manipulate and master the outside world in order to make it more accommodating to his inner needs. Indeed, many of the findings reported above relating locus of control to participation or relating a specific demographic factor (like marital status) to a specific type of participation (like extra-party activity) may have less to do with the sense of control per se than it has to do with the groups that people involve themselves with and the types of activities those groups engage in. Married couples may therefore engage in extra-party activity more out of a sense of identification with the reference group "married couples" (who may engage in extra-party activity for a number of reasons) than because extra-party activity itself is a means of achieving an internal locus of control.

For the political organizer and policy strategist, these considerations may prove to be of some importance in assessing the rewards that motivate individuals to support particular political activities and policy options. These rewards, as this study has attempted to show, do not always involve direct economic or social benefits but may have more to do with the individual's sense of control both over external outcomes and over internal feelings of congruence and incongruence in various socio-political contexts.
Some Implications for Social Work

In concluding this study with an outline of some of the possible implications for social work it is necessary to state that social work is itself a multi-dimensional task with a variety of practitioners in each sub-area of specialization. The results will thus impact on each of these sub-specialities in specific ways.

The multi-dimensionality of the political participation variable indicates to the policy strategist and planner that policy will impinge on the various forms of political participation in specific ways. Thus, policies that promise to reward the participant with higher economic status may be more appropriately carried out within a
political context that includes participants who are able to identify with each other on the basis of common low economic status; radical political activity may be pursued within a context that includes external locus of control subjects, whose hypothesized need to establish internal control will be provided for in a political milieu that establishes an alternative political framework for the exercise of personal control.

The political organizer would do well to be aware of the finding that seemingly similar modes of political participation may in fact attract different types of potential participants. For example, the individual who has engaged in general radical activity in the past was not necessarily a participant in the more specific radical activity of boycott of classes. Thus, the intrinsic nature of specific political actions should be assessed. In this study we noted, for example, that empathy for the strikers and the need to establish an internal locus of control (especially where the existing external locus was incongruent with the individual's higher economic status) may have represented extra-political motives for engaging in the boycott action. Thus, radical activity will attract different participants at different times, depending in part on the needs of the potential participants and the degree to which the specific action promises to fulfill those needs.
In assessing the specific needs of potential participants it is also necessary to recognize the multi-dimensionality of the personal control variable. Personal control has itself been shown to be too global a concept. In assessing the relation of internality to attribution to the system for political outcomes we have an unexpected finding that indicates the importance of viewing the concept of internality within a context of information-seeking behavior. Thus, the internal subject, because of his or her greater propensity to seek information relevant to decision-making may be more informed about the importance of systemic factors than the external subject. The degree to which the organizer is aware of these factors that more precisely define and supplement the concept of personal control, the more likely he will be to organize his efforts in conformity with them.

In assessing the relations of participation and control, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the control variables are differentially related to the types of participation engaged in. Thus, locus of control has been found to be related to participation in boycott, while the efficacy dimension was found to be related to extra-party participation. The boycott may, as hypothesized earlier, have attracted the external subject because of the possible reward of achieving an internal locus of control or a locus of control that is
congruent with the individual's economic position, while extra-party participation, because it required greater initiative on the participant's part may have attracted to it individuals who required a context that would enable them to exercise the greater sense of efficacy embodied in a higher-initiative activity. That system blamers vote but do not necessarily engage in intra- or extra-party activity is another finding that supports the notion of specificity of the participation and control variables and the relations between them.

The analyses of variance indicate the importance not only of specificity of the variables but of taking into account the combination of variables and the resulting effects on participation. We note, for example, that efficacy has the greatest impact on radical activity (Renshon Scale) when accompanied by internal locus and attribution of outcome to individual effort. This finding may indicate that radical activity is motivated by those personal control attributes that concern the individual's focus on himself as a prime mover of political and non-political outcomes.

The latter speculation brings to the fore the question of causality. Is the radical activity engaged in because the participant is internal in locus, high in efficacy, and attributes outcomes to individual effort, or is the radical activity engaged in in order to bolster
the sense of internality, of efficacy, and of the individual's power to control outcomes? The former line of causation assumes that pre-existing personality and attitudinal attributes are necessary to engage the individual in radical political acts, while the latter line of causation views the political act as the means for achieving the personality attributes in question. If the latter line of causation is applicable at a particular moment for a particular individual, it is of relevance to the caseworker whose goal it may be to aid the client in bolstering various aspects of his self-esteem by helping him to achieve a greater sense of internal control, efficacy, and individual power over political outcomes. In other words, just as the individual's existing personality attributes may be essential in enlisting his participation in specific political activities, so may the political activity itself be useful as a means whereby the individual's internal development and needs can be shifted and perhaps strengthened. The mutual influence of these variables may, in the end, contribute to the individual's feeling that he or she is in fact an integral member of the political context in question, that the "fit" between inner needs and external reality can provide for growth in both areas.
APPENDICES

Preceeding the test battery is a copy of the instructions introducing the questionnaire to subjects.
"Please answer each of the items included in this battery of questions separately, i.e., without reference to answers you have provided in other sections of the questionnaire. Answer each question, even though there is some repetition. This will be important for convenience in statistical analysis of the data. Please take each Index separately, noting the specific type of response requested in each (e.g., one index requires that you circle (a) or (b); another requires that you provide information in the blank spaces; another that you answer "yes" or "no" to the question posed).

Thank you very much for your help. I will be more than happy to discuss with you the nature of the study I am undertaking once I have obtained the completed questionnaires."
Appendix A : Political Salience

1) Thinking about the federal government, how much effect do you think its activities, the laws passed and so on, have on your life?
   a) a lot
   b) a little
   c) none

2) Thinking about the local government, how much effect do you think its activities, the laws passed and so on, have on your life?
   a) a lot
   b) a little
   c) none
Appendix B: Political Efficacy

Please answer agree or disagree in each of the following:

1. I don't think that public officials care much what people like me think.

2. The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country.

3. Voting is the only way that people like me can have a say about how the government runs things.

4. People like me don't have much say about how the government runs things.

5. Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.

Items 1, 3, 4 and 5 are coded as efficacious if the answer is "disagree" while item 2 is scored as efficacious if the answer is "agree".
Appendix C: Civic Duty

Citizen Duty Scale (SRC)

Please answer either true or false.

1. It isn't so important to vote when you know your party doesn't have a chance to win.

2. A good many local elections aren't important enough to bother with.

3. So many other people vote in the national elections that it doesn't matter much to me whether I vote or not.

4. If a person doesn't care how an elections comes out, he shouldn't vote in it.
Appendix D: Woodward - Roper Political Participation Index

Index of Political Participation (Woodward and Roper)

Please check each of the following items which you have engaged in:

\[ \text{(Scoring method used here)} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Voting once or more times in the last four years (since 1974)} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Frequently discussing public issues with others and either taking an equal share in the conversation or, usually trying to convince others he is right} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Belonging to any organization that takes a stand on public issues} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Having ever written or talked to an elected official regarding a public issue} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Having ever worked for the election of any candidate} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Having ever contributed money to a political party or candidate} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\text{Having attended any meetings in the last four years at which political speeches were made} & \quad 1 \text{ point} \\
\end{align*}

Total Possible Points 7 points

Appendix E : Renshon Political Participation Index

Please check each of the following in which you have engaged:

1. Attended a mass demonstration.

2. Broken a law to dramatize opposition to a law or policy.

3. Taken part in a sit-in.

4. Taken part in a physical confrontation (pushing, shoving, etc.) during any of the above.

* The four items are taken from a larger scale of political participation devised by S. Renshon, *op cit* p. 275. These items were chosen because they request information on participatory activities not covered by either the Woodward-Roper Index (Appendix D) or the Nie and Verba Index (Appendix F).
Appendix F: Nie and Verba Index
Of Specific Political Activities*

Please check each of the listed actions in which you have engaged:

1. Persuade others how to vote
2. Actively work for a party
3. Attend political meetings
4. Contribute money to a party
5. Membership in political clubs
6. Vote regularly in national elections
7. Voted in 1976 presidential election +
8. Voted in 1972 presidential election +
9. Frequency of local vote (voted in last mayoral or local election
10. Work with others on local problem
11. Form a group to work on local problems
12. Active membership in community problem-solving organization
13. Contact local official with others
14. Contact extralocal official with others
15. Contact local official on social matter
16. Contact extralocal official on social matter
17. Contact local official on particularized problem
18. Contact extralocal official on a social matter

* Adapted from Nie and Verba, "Political Participation", Handbook of Political Science, Vol. IV, op cit

+ Year of election is altered from Nie and Verba study
Appendix G: The Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale*

Please circle (a) or (b)

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

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

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

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

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

6.a. Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7.a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8.a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9.a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10.a. In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
   b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
11.a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12.a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13.a. When I make plans, I am most certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14.a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everybody.
15.a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16.a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17.a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18.a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck".
19.a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20.a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21.a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22.a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.

b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23.a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.

b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24.a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.

b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25.a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

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

b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27.a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.

b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28.a. What happens to me is my own doing.

b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

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

*score is the number of "external" items indicated by respondent
1. There has been a lot of talk recently about the deterioration of the quality of life in this country. Some people feel that each individual person is responsible while others feel that the real responsibility lies with certain powerful groups in government and industry. How do you feel?
   a. The individual is primarily responsible
   b. Powerful groups in government and industry

2. Do you feel that the best way to improve the way things are is to stress that each person must begin to take responsibility for the way things are, or do you feel that change is better brought about by pressure and collective social action?
   a. via the individual's responsibility
   b. via collective social action.

3. There's been a lot of talk recently about racial discrimination. Some people say that it is lack of skills and ability that keep people from getting jobs, while others say that even if a black were qualified, a white person with the same training would get the job. Which do you feel is closer to the way things are:
   a. individual skills and ability
   b. system or structural factors are more important

*Choosing (a) is an indication of individual attribution, (b) of attribution to systemic factors.

*From S. Renshon, op cit, pp. 273-274
Appendix I: Questionnaire

Please answer each of the following:

1) Age: ________________

2) Ethnic Class: ______________________

3) Gender: ______________________
   A) Are You:
      a) married
      b) single
      c) living at home with parent
      d) living away from parent

4) Economic Status
   $5,000 or less ______
   $5,000-10,000 ______
   $10,000-25,000 ______
   $25,000 and more ______

5) Years of social work related work experience (paid or volunteer): __________

6) Degree sought at Columbia:
   MS ______
   DSW ______

7) Social Work Specialization:
   DSW ______  MSW ______
   Practice ______  Concentration 1 ______
   SPPO ______  Concentration 2 ______
   Research ______  Concentration 3 ______

8) Personal Political Ideology:
   Conservative ______
   Liberal ______
   Radical ______
   Other ______
Addendum

Did you boycott classes during the recent strike of office personnel at CUSSW so as to demonstrate your support of that group's wage and benefit demands?

(1) No
(2) Yes
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