University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1975

Internal-external control and attitude toward disability.

Kathleen. Navarre
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Navarre, Kathleen., "Internal-external control and attitude toward disability." (1975). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2477.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/2477>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL AND ATTITUDE
TOWARD DISABILITY

by

Kathleen Navarre
B.A., Saginaw Valley College, 1971

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Psychology in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts at
The University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

1975

© Kathleen Navarre 1975

558203

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if the personality characteristic of internal-external locus of control affects the way in which a disabled person is evaluated by a non-disabled person. In order to investigate this, an interview situation was utilized with the following manipulations: 1) competent versus incompetent job performance; and, 2) presence or absence of a physical disability. The specific hypotheses were: 1) employee evaluations in terms of qualifying for a job promotion will be more positive when job performance is competent than when such performance is incompetent; and, 2) when called upon to evaluate competent job performance, externally-controlled individuals will be more distracted by the presence of a physical disability than internally-controlled individuals, which will result in externally-controlled individuals evaluating a disabled employee more negatively than a non-disabled employee. With regard to internally-controlled individuals, it was expected that they would make no distinction between disabled and non-disabled employees.

The subjects of the present study were 160 undergraduate business students at the University of Windsor. Rotter's Internal-External Control Scale was administered to provide extreme groups of internals and externals. In a subsequent session groups of subjects viewed one of four videotapes. All tapes consisted of a bank employee interviewing a person applying for a loan. In the first tape the interviewer was incompetent and non-disabled; in the second he was incompetent and

disabled; in the third he was competent and disabled; and the fourth he was competent and non-disabled. After viewing one of the tapes, subjects were asked to evaluate the interviewer on a 4-point scale ranging from a highly positive to a highly negative decision regarding promotion. Subjects were also asked to rate the interviewer on a 33-adjective semantic differential.

The results showed, as predicted, that the competent condition was evaluated more positively. Also, as predicted, under the competent condition, internals did not differ in their evaluation of disabled and non-disabled persons, while externals did differ in their evaluation of disabled and non-disabled persons. However, the direction for the externals was not in the predicted direction; that is, externals were found to evaluate a disabled person more positively than a non-disabled person. The results on the semantic differential resulted in general support for the above findings in that externals tended to rate the disabled more positively than the non-disabled, whereas internals did not show this tendency. These findings suggest that externals as opposed to internals are more vulnerable to irrelevant external cues, such as a physical disability.

PREFACE

I wish to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Henry Minton for sharing his time and his knowledge. Also, my appreciation goes to my committee members, Dr. J. La Galpa and Dr. A. Ragab, whose input and concern were needed and valuable.

Very special thanks to Anne Oberheuser who collected my data, which took endless patience, effort and time. To all the people who helped by proof reading, typing, etc. or just by putting up with me when the going got rough--what can I say but you're beautiful!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Preface	iv
List of Tables	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHOD	13
III. RESULTS	21
IV. DISCUSSION	43
REFERENCES	52
APPENDIX A. The Internal-External Control Scale	55
APPENDIX B. Free Comment Form	58
APPENDIX C. Semantic Differential Scale	59
APPENDIX D. Promotion Decision Questionnaire	61
APPENDIX E. Perceptual Accuracy Form	62
APPENDIX F. Disability Scale	63
APPENDIX G. Script from Video Tapes	64
APPENDIX H. Instructions to Subjects	67
APPENDIX I. Raw Data	68
VITA AUCTORIS	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Subject Groupings	19
2	Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores for Promotion Decision	20
3	Mean Scores for Promotion Decision	23
4	Specific Comparisons within the Three-Way Interaction for Promotion Decision	24
5	Mean Scores for Groups Within the Locus of Control x Disability Interaction for Promotion Decision	27
6	Specific Comparisons within the Two-way Interaction for Promotion Decision	28
7	Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores for Thirty-Three Adjective, Semantic Differential	29
8	Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant Univariate Fs for Disability versus Non-Disability	34
9	Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant Univariate Fs for Locus of Control x Disability	39
10	Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant Fs for Competence x Disability	41
11	Analysis of Variance on the MacDonald Disability Scale	42

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The general purpose of the present study was to examine personality characteristics as they affect perception. The specific focus concerned the way in which an individual perceives the world, that is: Does he see himself as master of his own fate or does he see himself as an ineffectual agent of his own fate? The present study investigated the situational variable of a non-disabled person's perception of the disabled individual in an employment setting. It is suggested that discrimination in hiring practices of the physically disabled might stem from the personality characteristics of the employer. An employer who is threatened, uncomfortable or unable to cope with the physically handicapped individual in his own life may be prejudiced in hiring or working with such a person.

The present study began with a general overview of reactions to the physically disabled. Secondly, it examined empirical studies which have shown personality characteristics, specifically internal-external locus of control, effect on an individual's perception of the physically disabled.

Reaction to Physical Disability

In considering the debilitating effect of a physical impairment it was necessary to distinguish between the problems imposed by the physical disability per se and the handicap imposed on the disabled individual by his environment. Hamilton (1950) presents a distinction between the terms "handicap" and "disability". Hamilton states "a

disability is a condition of impairment, physical or mental, having an objective aspect that can usually be described by a physician... A handicap is the cumulative result of the obstacles which disability interposes between the individual and his maximum functional level." (p. 27).

Thus, a handicap includes elements that are outside the physically disabled individual. These elements include barriers imposed by the physical environment and those imposed by the social environment. Social interaction for the physically disabled can be broken down into two basic aspects. On one hand, we have the disabled individual with all his personal characteristics, only one of which is his particular disability. On the other hand we have attitudes toward the disabled individual from those with whom he comes into contact.

The latter attitude is usually a result of stereotyping or what Wright (1960) calls "spread"; that is, when an individual is labeled with certain characteristics based solely on his being a part of a larger group with certain presumed characteristics. Spread refers to the "fact that physical deviation is frequently seen as the central key to a person's behavior and personality and largely responsible for the important ramifications in the person's life" (Wright, 1960, p. 118).

The phenomenon of spread affects both the disabled person and the people with whom he comes into contact. Wright states that abilities and acceptabilities of a person are often judged by that person's physical attributes.

In an empirical study by Mussen and Barker (1944), subjects were asked to rate crippled individuals on 24 personality and character traits. The results showed publicly expressed attitudes toward persons

with physical disabilities were generally favorable. Adjectives such as conscientious, self-reliant and kind were chosen to describe such individuals. In regard to spread not only are the results important, but equally as interesting is the fact that the task of evaluating individuals when only one dimension (their physical disability) is known was considered sensible by the subjects. In other words, the subjects did not hesitate to make judgements regarding a wide range of personality traits based on the knowledge of one physical characteristic. In a similar study by Ray (1946) a group of high school students were shown a photograph of a boy in a wheel chair and another group were shown the same picture with the wheel chair blocked out. The boy that was viewed as crippled was judged to be more conscientious, to feel more inferior, to get better grades and to be more unhappy. Again it was shown that spread occurs when individuals are asked to rate another's multi-dimensional personality based on one dimension, namely physical impairment.

The findings related above are not peculiar to our present society or time. Maisel (1953) compiled data on more than 50 tribes and societies drawn from books, articles and records of an anthropological nature. The data shows the manner in which these primitive tribes deal with the physical deviate among them. Although we find positive and negative attitudes toward the physically atypical in different societies, it is easily seen that the negative attitude is a dominate force. It appears likely that all societies place a value on the "body beautiful", "body whole" concept. However, this concept can vary greatly from society to society. Hentig (1948a), relates that

among certain sections of the Orient the absence of a beard is as great a deformity to the features as the absence of a nose would appear to most societies.

The heritage handed down from ancient Hebrews where illness and physical defect marked the person as a sinner can still be seen today. In the Old Testament illness was considered a punishment and an atonement. Twelve blemishes are mentioned in the Bible that disqualify a man from becoming a priest. Among those mentioned are "a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose". According to Hentig (1948a), a man with a physical infirmity can not be ordained a Catholic priest. Empirical data connecting physical abnormality with negative reactions show that when subjects were shown pictures of persons with facial anomalies the persons were perceived as evil. Such comments as "he might be a follower of a gang", "a dope addict", "he seems to look like a maniac" were used to describe the pictured person (MacGregor, Abel, Bryt, Lauer, & Weissmann, 1953).

Attitudes and behavior toward the physically deviant can arise out of emotional prejudice or learned beliefs felt to be sound and comprehensible. The latter may be termed over-learning. For example, one may be taught to look for a cause-effect relationship in everything encountered in life. In addition, we are usually taught positive effects derive from positive causes, negative effects from negative causes. As Heider (1944) states "a state of harmony or balance exists if entities which belong together are all positive, or if they are all negative". (p. 353). Our sense of justice seems to subscribe to the belief that reward and virtue are common bedfellows as are punishment

and evil. Therefore, it is reasoned a physical disability which is a negative reality must have a negative cause. Following this line of thinking, we find a negative aura surrounding the disabled person.

Sommers (1944) investigated attitudes of mothers of handicapped children and found four prevailing guilt related feelings regarding their handicapped children. The handicap was seen as a symbol of punishment, a cause of societal ostracism, result of negligence to moral code, and a personal disgrace. Such cause-effect relationships are reinforced in children when parents use illness as a threat of punishment. For example, parents often say "If you stay up late, you'll get sick" or "If you go without your rubbers you'll get a cold." While this type of cause-effect relationship does have a basis in reality, it also teaches that sickness is a punishment for misbehavior.

Personality Variables

The attitude of the perceiver of the disabled person will now be considered. A series of studies on reactions to the disabled have investigated personality variables of the nondisabled as they might affect attitudes toward the disabled. A study by Noonan, Barry and Davis (1968) evaluated several personality constructs and their validity in predicting negative reactions to individuals possessing a visible disability that would be easily perceived. Five theoretical constructs were investigated as determinants of nondisabled attitudes toward the disabled: 1) cultural conformity, 2) ego strength, 3) body satisfaction and body concern, 4) authoritarianism, and 5) field independence. The subjects were 240 college females. The criterion measures were two paper and pencil tests used to measure

attitudes toward the visibly disabled. Of the four relationships found to have correlations in the predicted directions, only degree of authoritarianism, as measured by the California F Scale, was free enough of social desirability response style to be considered a relevant predictor of attitudes toward the disabled. The correlation found high authoritarianism negatively correlated with positive attitudes toward the disabled. Noonan, Barry and Davis explain the inverse relationship between high authoritarianism and positive attitudes toward the physically disabled as arising out of the authoritarians' need to be associated with the strong in the society, therefore, they find a weak minority group such as the disabled, provoking feelings of avoidance, discomfort and contempt.

Another personality characteristic found to influence attitudes toward the physically disabled is internal-external locus of control.

Internal-External Control

Rotter (1966) developed a twenty-three item forced choice scale to measure perceived expectancy of reinforcement. The scale measures the degree of internal or external control of reinforcement perceived by an individual. External locus of control is luck, chance, fate or powerful others and not necessarily contingent on behavior. Internal locus of control is defined as perceiving reinforcement as following from one's own behavior, therefore being predictably under control and contingent on behavior.

The items on Rotter's Internal-External Control (I-E) Scale deal exclusively with the subjects' belief concerning generalized expectancies

about how reinforcement is controlled. Research using the I-E Scale has proven to be prolific in the past eight years. Review articles have been published by Lefcourt (1966a, 1966b, 1972), Rotter (1966), Minton (1972), and Joe (1971). Throop and MacDonald (1971) compiled in bibliographic form 339 articles pertaining to the locus of control construct.

Differences in behavior characteristics between Internals and externals have been extensively investigated. For example, a study by Seeman and Evans (1962) showed persons scoring at opposite ends of the Internal-external dimension tend to differ in their attempts to control the environment. It was found that internal patients in a tuberculosis hospital knew more about their own condition, questioned doctors and nurses more, and were less satisfied with the amount of feedback they were getting about their condition than were externals. Seeman (1963a) found the same type of relationship regarding information seeking and I-E in reformatory inmates as stated above.

A difference has been shown to exist between Internals and externals in achievement motivation. It is suggested that because Internals tend to perceive what happens to them as dependant on their own actions they will be higher in achievement motivation than are externals. Rotter and Mulry (1965) found support for stronger motivation in Internals in achievement situations. In the Rotter-Mulry study Internals took longer to make a judgement about a matching decision under skill conditions and externals took longer under chance conditions showing a greater involvement and value reinforcement for Internals under skill conditions than for externals. Internals and externals show a difference in resistance to subtle suggestion.

Strickland and Getter (1962) found greater resistance to external, experimenter manipulation in a verbal learning task by Internals as opposed to externals when subjects reported post experimentally that they were aware of the intended manipulation.

Relationship of Internal-External Control with Disability

A study by Lipp, Kolstoe, James and Randall (1968) investigated the perception threshold of physically handicapped Internals and externals for stimuli relevant to them. A series of slides, some of which portrayed a physically handicapped person, were micro-momentarily exposed to the subjects. The hypothesis tested by Lipp et al. predicted that Internals having a lower threshold, would recognize handicap relevant stimuli more quickly than externals. This prediction was based on the suggestion that externals would be more defensive than Internals regarding physically disabled persons because physical deviation is more threatening to an individual who bases his perception of the world externally. Results found externals perceived physically disabled persons more quickly than Internals, that is, externals as opposed to Internals were found to have a lower threshold for stimuli relevant to physical disability. Lipp et al. discussed this finding in terms of defensiveness. They found externals less defensive about a physical handicap than Internals. Lefcourt (1973), however, suggests there is a selective attention to relevant stimuli factor that could be important in interpreting Lipps et al.'s findings. Lefcourt suggests the Internal individual has, perhaps over a period of time, come to accept his disability. The disability per se, therefore, is not a salient feature in his life. The external person is perhaps more vigilant about

handicap-related material and therefore has a lower threshold to slides of physically disabled individuals. Thus, the internal handicapped person who has learned to cope with his disability may be less attentive to handicap related stimuli. The external individual who is still finding difficulty coping with his disability can be seen to be more attentive, thus having a lower threshold in the perception of handicap relevant material.

Another study employed Rotter's I-E Scale as related to disability. MacDonald and Hall (1969) investigated locus of control as a personality characteristic and its effect on perception of disability. It is suggested that internals may feel more threatened by negative comments regarding their personality since personality is an internal characteristic related to emotionality. Emotional disability may be more salient to internals because it means loss of inner control and internals believe in and value more internal control than do externals. On the other hand, externals may feel more threatened by visible physical disabilities that may elicit negative reactions in the external world. These negative reactions stem from the perception that disabled persons are "different" (Neff & Weiss, 1965) and an underprivileged minority group (Wright, 1960). Therefore MacDonald and Hall hypothesized that persons falling on the external range of the I-E Scale would perceive physical disability as more debilitating than persons internally oriented. Further, it was hypothesized that internals would perceive emotional disorders as more debilitating than externals.

Subjects were 30 male and 20 female graduate students. The subjects were asked to rate the debilitating effect of four major classes of

disability: 1) Internal, e.g., heart disease, diabetes; 2) sensory disorders, e.g., impaired hearing or speech; 3) cosmetic disorders, e.g., loss of limb, facial scarring; and 4) emotional disorders, e.g., Irrational fears, extreme depression. Subjects were asked to rate the debilitating effect of the disabilities as they would affect a 28-year-old male, married with two children. The data showed a significant correlation in the predicted direction. Internals perceived emotional disorders as more debilitating than did externals. No significant correlations were found between locus of control and sensory, internal or cosmetic disorders. This lack of relationship may be due to the fact subjects were asked to rate disabilities affecting another person rather than affecting the subject himself. Lipp et al. employed the handicapped person himself.

In a follow-up study MacDonald and Hall (1971) investigated Internals and externals in their perception of the debilitating effect of a given disability on "self" and "other". Under the "self" condition subjects were asked to rate the seriousness of a given disability as it would affect the subject himself both in his feelings about himself and in relationships with other people. In the "other" condition, subjects were asked to rate the seriousness of a disability for a 28-year-old male, married with two children as it would affect his feelings about himself and his relations with other people. Subjects were 211 male and 268 female undergraduate students. Externals were defined as those subjects scoring in the upper 27% of the distribution of the I-E Scale and Internals were defined as the lower 27%. It was hypothesized that externals would rate physical disabilities, that is, internal,

8

11

cosmetic, sensory, as more debilitating than would Internals for both "self" and "others". It was further hypothesized that Internals would rate emotional disorders as more debilitating for "self" and "other" than would externals. Externals found physical disability (Internal, sensory and cosmetic disorders) more debilitating than Internals in their feelings both about themselves and in their social relationships. No significant difference was found for Internals and externals in rating physical disability as it would affect another either in his feeling about himself or in his social relationships. In no case were Internals and externals found to differ significantly in their ratings of emotional disorders. Thus, the correlation found by MacDonald and Hall (1969) between internality and emotionality was not upheld by the above analysis. In a further analysis, however, to compare ratings of emotional disorders relative to physical disorders it was found that while both Internals and externals rated physical disorders more debilitating than emotional disorders, the Internals did not vary as greatly in their ratings as the externals. Internals found emotional and physical disabilities debilitating to a similar extent while externals tended to rate physical as much more debilitating than emotional.

Specific Purpose of the Present Study

Personality characteristics of an individual affect to a large extent perceptions of that person (Noonan et al., 1968; Lipp et al., 1973; MacDonald & Hall, 1969, 1971). It is suggested specific personality characteristics are an important element in determining perceptions of disabled individuals by the non-disabled. In the present

study the personality dimension of internal-external control, as it relates to the perception of a physically disabled person, is under investigation. The finding of Lipp et al., as interpreted by Lefcourt, suggests the lower threshold found in the external, as opposed to the internal, physically disabled subjects for the perception of disability related stimuli is possibly the result of the externals' constant awareness of his disability. It has been found by MacDonald and Hall that Internals rate emotional disability more debilitating than do externals. In a follow-up study MacDonald and Hall found evidence that externals rated physical disability for themselves more debilitating than do Internals. It is thought that externally controlled individuals tend to be more aware of disability, find physical disability more debilitating and therefore perhaps more threatening, than do internally controlled individuals.

The present investigation looked for possible relationships between externality and negative evaluation of a co-worker based on a visible, physical disability. Following this line of reasoning it is suggested that in a real-life employment situation an individual scoring externally on the I-E Scale will show negative evaluation of a disabled co-worker even though the co-worker is highly competent. The internal individual, on the other hand, will show no difference in evaluating a competent disabled as opposed to non-disabled co-worker. It is further suggested, Internals and externals will both show negative evaluations of an incompetent co-worker whether disabled or non-disabled.

Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses under investigation are stated: (1) Employee evaluations in terms of qualifying for a job promotion will be more positive when job performance is competent than when such performance is incompetent; and (2) When called upon to evaluate competent job performance, externally-controlled individuals will be more distracted by the presence of a physical disability than internally-controlled individuals. Such a distraction will result in externally-controlled individuals evaluating a disabled employee more negatively regarding a job promotion than a non-disabled employee. On the other hand, internally-controlled individuals will make no distinction between disabled and non-disabled employees.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Data were gathered on 160 male, commerce students in third and fourth year classes at the University of Windsor during March through May, 1974.

Instruments

Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E) consists of 29 items, six of which are filler items. It is a forced-choice inventory with alternative expectancy statements: 1) statements characteristic of internal control; 2) statements characteristic of external control. The I-E Scale is scored in the direction of externality (See Appendix A).

The I-E Scale has been shown to be reliable with a test-retest reliability ranging from .49 to .83 (Rotter, 1966). Sex differences, social desirability, and intelligence have shown a non-significant correlation in most studies (Lefcourt, 1972). Good construct validity for the I-E Scale have been determined by multimethod measurement. Rotter (1966) reported a significant relation of scores between the I-E Scale and a story completion test. Externals were more likely to see punishment as being externally imposed and Internals were more likely to see punishment stemming from immoral behavior. Rotter also reported a high degree of correspondence between interview ratings of individuals classed as Internals or externals and scores on the I-E scale.

Free Comment Form. The free comment form was specially constructed for the present study. The form asked for a list of five important characteristics of a person who was observed. The characteristics listed were rated as positive or negative by two independent judges. The scale was used in order to get an overall impression of the feelings of the rater for the person being rated (see Appendix B).

Semantic Differential Scale. Using the semantic differential form (see Osgood, 1957), 33 pairs of opposite adjectives were presented. Rating was made by placing an X on a seven point continuum to best express the characteristic of the person being rated. The 33 adjective pairs were specifically chosen for the present study. The adjective pairs had a more positive and less positive choice and were used to give an overall impression of the individual being described (see Appendix C).

Promotion Decision. The promotion decision questionnaire was specially constructed for the present study. It had four categories ranging from "Should be recommended for promotion" to "Should not be allowed to continue in his present employment position." To test the hypothesis under investigation, subjects (Ss) were asked to make a decision by checking one of the four choices (see Appendix D).

Perceptual Accuracy Form. The perceptual accuracy questionnaire measured six specific areas of audio and visual observation. The questionnaire asked questions regarding what was seen and heard in the content of a video tape. The form was specially constructed for the present study for the purpose of making sure the Ss were attentive

to the video tape they were observing (see Appendix F).

Disability Scale. The disability scale used in the present study was adapted from the MacDonald and Hall Disability Scale (1969). The scale consisted of the description of five debilitating disorders. Ss rated these disorders on a continuum ranging from "externally debilitating" to "not much debilitating". The rating was done on a four point scale. The Disability Scale was used for comparison to check MacDonald and Hall's findings (see Appendix F).

Video Tapes. The video tapes were of two drama students playing the roles of a bank employee and a man applying for a loan. The setting was a small private office with a desk, a file cabinet and no decorations on the walls. The man needing the loan entered the door and was seated across the desk from the bank employee. The text of the interaction was written specifically for the purpose of this study. The interaction was kept as neutral as possible (see Appendix G).

There were four tapes: 1) a physically disabled bank employee that appeared incompetent; 2) a physically disabled bank employee that appeared competent; 3) a physically non-disabled bank employee that appeared incompetent; and 4) a physically non-disabled bank employee that appeared competent. The physical disability was in the form of confinement to a wheel chair. Incompetence was defined as showing unsureness, tension, poor eye contact and inefficiency in carrying out the interview.

A brief pilot study to check the competent-incompetent variable was performed on an independent group of subjects. Fifteen students

In an Environmental Psychology class were asked to view all four tapes and rate them as to level of competency. The rating was on a seven point scale ranging from "extremely competent" to "extremely incompetent". The median rating for the competent non-disabled group was "quite competent" and for the competent disabled group the median rating was "neutral". In both incompetent conditions the median rating was "slightly incompetent".

Procedure

Ss were given the Rotter I-E Scale in their class room during regular class time. The Ss were informed by their instructor that cooperation was asked for but completely voluntary. The instructor left the room during administration of the scale. The experimenter (E) was a fourth year psychology student at the University of Windsor. She was presumably unknown to the Ss. Ss were asked to place their name and student number on an IBM answer sheet. Ss were told that individual scores would be made known only to the E's involved from the psychology department. Ss were told that the E was gathering data to standardize the "Social Reaction Inventory" (I-E Scale), (see Appendix H).

After the I-E Scales were collected, Ss were asked to participate in another research project involving a typical business type situation. Ss were then shown one of the four tapes in their class room. The E gave the following instructions:

You are a manager in the loan and mortgage department in a large bank. The personnel manager asks you to evaluate a tape of an interview. The tape is of a loan specialist interviewing a person requesting a loan. The bank employee (loan specialist) is applying for the position of your assistant manager. You have to make a recommendation to the personnel manager. You are to evaluate the bank employee by filling out questionnaires after you view a tape of the bank employee interacting with a person requesting a loan.

After the viewing of one of the four tapes, Ss were asked to evaluate the bank employee on the following questionnaires presented in booklet form:

- 1) Free Comment Form
- 2) Semantic Differential
- 3) Decision of Promotion
- 4) Perceptual Accuracy Form
- 5) Modified MacDonald Disability Scale

Subjects were divided into 3 groups on the bases of their scores on the personality questionnaire Internal-External Control Scale (Rotter, 1966). Internals were defined as those people scoring 0-7 (N=53), middles 8-11 (N=55) and externals 12-21 (N=52). The I-E Scale was scored in the direction of externality with a possible 23 points.

Subjects were distributed in the following manner as shown in Table 1:

TABLE I
Subject Groupings

	Internal	Middles	External
Disabled	Competent (Tape 2) N=12	N=10	N=11
	Incompetent (Tape 1) N=13	N=13	N=15
Non-disabled	Competent (Tape 4) N=17	N=16	N=14
	Incompetent (Tape 3) N=11	N=16	N=12

Table I consists of the three independent variables: locus of control, level of competency, presence or absence of disability.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The hypotheses under investigation were: (1) Employee evaluations in terms of qualifying for a job promotion will be more positive when job performance is competent than when such performance is incompetent; and (2) When called upon to evaluate competent job performance, externally-controlled individuals will be more distracted by the presence of a physical disability than internally-controlled individuals. Such a distraction will result in externally-controlled individuals evaluating a disabled employee more negatively regarding a job promotion than a non-disabled employee. On the other hand, internally-controlled individuals will make no distinction between disabled and non-disabled employees.

In order to test these hypotheses an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the dependent measure of promotion decision. The independent variables were locus of control, competence, and disability. The results of the ANOVA (see Table 2) produced a significant main effect for locus of control. The mean promotion scores for the three locus of control groups were 2.85 for the internals, 2.85 for the middles and 3.23 for the externals. A significant main effect was found for competence with the mean for the competent condition 2.57 and the incompetent condition 3.65. A significant main effect was also found for

¹ High promotion scores represent a more negative rating.

TABLE 2
Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores
for Promotion Decision

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Locus of Control (A)	5.917	2	2.958	4.876**
Level of Confidence (B)	29.316	1	29.316	56.316****
Level of Disability (C)	4.827	1	4.827	9.272***
A x B	1.242	2	0.621	1.195
A x C	5.449	2	2.724	5.315*
B x C	1.197	1	1.197	2.300
A x B x C	5.749	2	2.874	5.522***
Error	21.041	14	1.503	

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

****p < .001

disability with mean scores of 2.78 for disability and 3.14 for non-disability. The other significant results in the ANOVA were a two-way interaction effect for locus of control x disability, and a three-way interaction of locus of control x competence x disability.

In line with the first hypothesis the main effect for competence shows the significant difference to be in the direction of competence being rated more positively than incompetence on the promotion decision ($\bar{X}$ for competence = 2.57, $\bar{X}$ for incompetence = 3.65). The second hypothesis was tested by the three-way interaction of locus of control x competence x disability (see Table 3 for $\bar{X}$ s). As reported, a significant three-way interaction was found. Scheffé tests were performed under the high competent condition for comparisons of locus of control in relation to disability and non-disability (see Table 4). The results of the Scheffé tests indicate that the second hypothesis was supported in part. Externals did make a distinction in their ratings between disabled and non-disabled employees. However, the direction of this distinction was positive rather than negative. Externals evaluated a disabled person significantly more positively than a non-disabled person under the competent condition. Furthermore, in line with the second hypothesis, Internals did not differ in their evaluation of a disabled and non-disabled person under the competent condition. Although no prediction was made for the middle group, it was found that this group, like the external group, evaluated a disabled person more positively than a non-disabled person within the competent condition.

TABLE 3
Mean Scores for Promotion Decision

		Disabled	Non-disabled
Internal	Competent	2.54 N=12	2.24 N=17
	Incompetent	3.23 N=13	2.62 N=11
Middles	Competent	1.94 N=10	3.12 N=16
	Incompetent	3.22 N=13	3.31 N=16
External	Competent	2.50 N=11	3.14 N=14
	Incompetent	3.54 N=15	3.60 N=12

TABLE 4
Specific Comparisons Within the Three-Way Interaction
for Promotion Decision

Source	df	F
Disabled vs. Non-disabled		
Internal-Competent	1	1.13
Middles-Competent	1	23.17**
Externals-Competent	1	5.12*
Disabled vs. Non-disabled		
Internal-Incompetent	1	2.00
Middles-Incompetent	1	1
Externals-Incompetent	1	1
Competence vs. Incompetence		
Internal-Disabled	1	5.33*
Middles-Disabled	1	20.50**
Externals-Disabled	1	14.44**
Competence vs. Incompetence		
Internal-Non-disabled	1	27.14**
Middles-Non-disabled	1	1
Externals-Non-disabled	1	2.62
Internal vs. Middles		
Competent-Disabled	2	4.50
Competent-Non-disabled	2	12.83*
Incompetent-Disabled	2	1
Incompetent-Non-disabled	2	2.00
Internals vs. Externals		
Competent-Disabled	2	1
Competent-Non-disabled	2	13.50*
Incompetent-Disabled	2	2.00
Incompetent-Non-disabled	2	1

Table 4 (cont'd)

Source	df	F
Middles vs. Externals		
Competent-Disabled	2	5.14
Competent-Non-disabled	2	1
Incompetent-Disabled	2	1.80
Incompetent-Non-disabled	2	1.29

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

There were other significant findings in the specific comparisons of the three-way interaction. It was found that competence vs. Incompetence under the disabled condition showed Internals, middles and externals rating the competent condition significantly more positive. However, competence vs. Incompetence under the non-disabled condition found only the Internals rating competence significantly more positive. Under locus of control, holding the condition of non-disability constant, significant differences were found between Internals and middles and also Internals and externals in the competent condition with Internals being more positive in both cases.

Scheffé tests were performed for specific comparisons of the two-way interaction of locus of control x disability (see Tables 5 and 6). It was found that middles and externals rated the disabled significantly more positive than the non-disabled. Under the non-disabled condition it was found that Internals were significantly more positive than externals on the promotion decision.

Scheffé tests on the main effect of locus of control found a significant difference between Internals and externals ($F = 7.00$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$) and middles and externals ($F = 7.00$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$). In both cases, externals made more negative evaluations on the promotion decision than did Internals and middles.

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the thirty-three adjective pairs of the semantic differential (see Table 7). The independent variables used in this analysis were locus of control, competence, and disability. The dependent variables were positive

TABLE 5
Mean Scores for Groups Within the Locus of Control x
Disability Interaction for Promotion Decision

	Internal	Middle	External
Disabled	2.87 N=23	2.45 N=26	3.04 N=23
Non-disabled	2.83 N=30	3.21 N=29	3.66 N=29

TABLE 6
Specific Comparisons within the Two-way Interaction
for Promotion Decision

Source	df	F
Disabled vs. Non-disabled	λ	
Internals	1	$p < .1$
Middles	1	14.00**
Externals	1	9.50*
Internals vs. Middles		
Disabled	2	4.25
Non-disabled	2	3.50
Internals vs. Externals		
Disabled	2	$p < .1$
Non-disabled	2	17.25**
Middles vs. Externals		
Disabled	2	8.50
Non-disabled	2	5.06

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 7

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Scores for Thirty-Three Adjective, Semantic Differential

Source	Multivariate		Univariate F Values								
	df	F	df	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I-E (A)	62,232	1.19	2,148	2.01	.36	2.08	.67	2.82	.91	1.14	.31 **
Competent (B)	33,116	8.83	1,148	25.60	11.43	17.89	100.48	73.66	5.35	29.40	17.69
	33,116	1.35	1,148	10.20	.82	6.56	6.75	.99	.08	.23	.35
Disabled (C)											
A x B	66,232	<1	2,148	1.75	2.96	1.87	1.07	.03	.49	1.22	.10
A x C	66,232	1.33	2,148	3.67	1.70	2.04	4.64	3.47	.88	1.25	2.13
B x C	33,116	1.44	1,148	.10	3.78	.32	.41	1.69	.03	.10	3.21 *
A x B x C	66,232	1.13	2,148	.36	2.55	1.79	1.58	.09	3.9	.45	1.82

1. Ambitious - Lazy
2. Nonassertive - Assertive
3. Approachable - Distant
4. Confident - Unsure
5. Effective - Ineffective
6. Undependable - Dependable
7. Incompetent - Competent
8. Firm - Soft

*p < .10

**p < .05

***p < .01

****p < .005

Table 7 (cont'd)

9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
2.90*	3.52***	1.30	1.48	2.39*	3.86**	2.62*	4.60***	.75	1.63	2.00
25.09****	49.54****	7.05***	57.35****	43.50****	35.10****	3.04*	38.39****	1.92	10.83****	14.49***
2.58	5.04**	3.22*	7.19***	8.71****	8.36****	4.92**	14.68****	7.07***	4.69**	4.11**
3.34**	2.42*	1.60	.53	1.81	.78	.36	.63	1.12	.56	1.39
.50	.16	.57	2.98**	.63	.85	.05	1.20	.39	2.55*	2.46*
1.48	.00	.01	.08	.01	1.62	.29	3.78**	2.70	2.20	1.18
.23	.26	.20	1.19	1.18	1.18	.50	.68	.32	.76	1.07

9. Enjoyable to work with. - Hard to work with

10. Forceful - Wish-washy

11. Friendly - Unfriendly

12. Gets things done - Inefficient

13. Respected - Unadmired

14. Intelligent - Not bright

15. Unlikeable - Likeable

16. Mature - Immature

17. Obnoxious - Congenial

18. Open-minded - Close-minded

19. Sincere - Insincere

*p < .10

**p < .05

***p < .01

****p < .005

Table 7 (cont'd)

20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1.25	3.14**	.55	5.36***	4.41***	5.28***	1.67	4.07**	.71	1.33	1.77
25.15***	183.78***	118.87***	47.25***	28.87***	89.61***	9.22***	26.86***	81.76***	34.48***	25.15***
5.79**	6.54***	1.61	9.78***	6.81***	2.03	6.07**	5.62**	.64	4.82**	6.69**
.20	1.08	.09	1.14	1.57	.58	2.99**	3.70**	.84	1.63	2.24
.29	1.32	1.99	2.42*	3.59**	3.44**	.85	.08	1.23	1.63	1.16
.09	2.90*	2.15	.03	0.00	.05	.44	.80	.70	2.72	0.00
.68	.94	.15	2.49*	.39	.06	2.33	.71	.10	2.27	1.99

20. Dynamic - Bland
 21. Thinks ahead - Disorganized
 22. Decisive - Indecisive
 23. Tactful - Tactless
 24. Makes a good appearance - Makes a poor appearance
 25. Uses his head - Flighly
 26. Warm - Cold
 27. Appears to be a follower - Leadership qualities
 28. Uninformed - Informed
 29. Tense - Relaxed
 30. Socially awkward - Social adept

*p < .10
 **p < .05
 ***p < .01
 ****p < .005

Table 7 (cont'd)

31	32	33
.35	1.76	3.23**
34.98****	92.18****	98.16****
4.33**	4.72**	.14
.99	2.53*	.74
1.21	.19	1.89
1.36	.48	1.30
6.20****	3.88***	1.41

*p < .10

**p < .05

***p < .01

****p < .005

31. Empathic - Indifferent

32. Communicates well - Communicates poorly

33. Listens well - Listens poorly

or negative ratings on the semantic differential. A significant multivariate F was found for the main effect of competence. Trends approaching significance were found among multivariate Fs for the main effect of disability, the interaction of locus of control x disability, and the interaction of competence x disability.

For the main effect of competence all but one of the adjective pairs (item 17, congenial-obnoxious) showed a significant univariate F. On almost every item each of the adjectives were evaluated more positively under the competent than the incompetent condition. A few exceptions to this finding of competence being rated more positively were: middle subjects rating non-disabled employees as more assertive under the incompetent condition; external subjects rating non-disabled under the incompetent condition as more empathetic, warm, congenial, and sincere than under the competent condition; and, externals' rating the disabled as more friendly under the incompetent as opposed to the competent condition.

There were 23 adjective pairs with significant univariate Fs for disability.² Holding locus of control and competence constant, mean scores for these 23 adjectives are shown in Table 8. By viewing the means it is seen that on all 23 adjective pairs means for the disabled were lower, therefore more positive, than for the non-disabled.

²The reason for marginally significant multivariate Fs with highly significant univariate Fs is correlation among the variables, see Winer (1953.)

TABLE 8

Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant Univariate

Fs for Disability versus Non-Disability

	Ambitious- Lazy*	Approachable- Distant*	Confident- Unsure*	Forceful- Wishy-Washy*	Friendly- Unfriendly*	Gets things done- Inefficient*	Respected- Unadmired*
Disabled	3.94	3.99	4.19	4.62	3.30	3.94	4.24
Non-disabled	4.62	4.66	4.77	5.07	3.73	4.54	4.64

*Scored in negative direction.

Table 8 (cont'd)

	Intelligent- Not bright	Unlikeable- Likeable	Mature- Immature	Obnoxious- Conventional	Open-minded- Close-minded	Sincere- Insincere	Dynastic- Blatant
Disabled	4.02	3.82	3.70	3.76	3.84	3.79	4.99
Non-Disabled	4.61	4.31	4.48	4.31	4.50	4.28	5.50

• scores in negative direction.

Table 8 (cont;d)

	Thinks Ahead- Disorganized *	Tactful- Tactless *	Makes a good appearance- Makes a poor appearance *	Warm- Cold *	Appears to be a follower- Leadership qualities *
Disabled	4.36	4.34	3.62	3.99	4.65
Non-disabled	4.92	5.05	4.30	4.61	5.10

*Scored in negative direction.

Table 8 (cont'd)

	Tense- Relaxed*	Socially Awkward- Socially adept*	Emathic- Indifferent*	Communicates well- Communicates poorly*	
Disabled	3.92	4.16	4.14	4.16	
Non-disabled	4.36	4.67	4.59	4.61	

*scored in negative direction.

Univariate Fs for the locus of control x disability interaction show 9 adjective pairs to be significant (see Table 9). Looking across the means for locus of control x disability, holding competence constant, it can be seen that on all but one item (item 5 for externals) the disabled condition is rated more positively for middles and externals. Internals did not show this kind of blanket distinction between the disabled and non-disabled condition. Internals rated the disabled more positively than the non-disabled on 4 items and more negatively than the non-disabled on 5 items.

There are 4 significant univariate Fs for the interaction of competence x disability (see Table 10). In viewing the means for the significant items, specifically items 2, 8, 16, and 21, it is seen that incompetence is rated more negatively than competence in all cases. It is also seen that the non-disabled are rated more negatively than the disabled in 6 of the 8 interactions.

The multivariate analysis of variance performed on the disability scale found only marginal significance for competence x disability (see Table 11). The locus of control variable showed no significant multivariate or univariate Fs across the 5 disability categories.

The free comment form was not analyzed because of insufficient data by a number of subjects.

TABLE 9
Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant Univariate
Fs for Locus of Control x Disability

	Arbitious- Lazy*	Confident- Unsure*	Effective- Ineffective*	Gets things done- Inefficient*	Open-minded- Close-minded*	Sincere- Insincere*
Internal	Disabled 4.10	4.61	4.73	4.21	3.92	4.09
	Non-Disabled 4.47	4.28	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.08
Middle	Disabled 3.30	3.78	4.04	3.41	3.90	3.69
	Non-Disabled 4.77	5.14	5.18	4.72	4.16	3.92
External	Disabled 3.92	4.18	5.08	4.20	3.68	3.59
	Non-Disabled 4.62	4.90	5.06	4.58	4.94	4.84

*Scored in a negative direction

Table 9 (cont'd)

	Tactful- Tactless*	Makes a good appearance- Makes a poor appearance*	Uses his head- Fillythy*
Disabled Internal	4.26	2.06	4.34
Non-disabled	4.28	3.82	4.34
Disabled Middle	4.14	2.91	3.86
Non-disabled	5.30	4.24	4.20
Disabled External	4.60	3.90	4.12
Non-disabled	5.57	4.82	5.04

*Scored in negative direction.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Mean Adjective Scores for Significant
Fs for Competence x Disability

	Non-assertive- Assertive *	Firm- Soft *	Mature- Immature *	Thinks Ahead- Disorganized *
competent- disabled	3.71	3.65	3.30	3.13
competent- non-disabled	3.92	3.42	3.68	3.33
Incompetent- disabled	4.92	4.15	4.10	5.59
Incompetent- non-disabled	4.27	4.78	5.27	6.52

*Scored in negative direction.

TABLE II
Analysis of Variance on the MacDonald Disability Scale

Source	Multivariate		F Values-Univariate					
	df	F	df	1	2	3	4	5
I-E (A)	10,288	1	2,148	1.35	1.00	1	1	1.64
Competent (B)	5,144	1.99*	1,148	1	1	4.01**	1	2.14
Disabled (C)	5,144	2.00*	1,148	1	1.27	1	4.80	1
A x B	10,288	1	2,148	1.12	.03	.46	1.54	1.12
A x C	10,288	1	2,148	1.98	1	1.48	2.21	.19
B x C	5,144	1	1,148	1	1	2.51	1.07	1
A x B x C	10,288	1.09	2,148	1	1.08	1	1.55	1

*p < .10

**p < .05

1. Internal Disorder
2. Sensory Disorder
3. Disfigurement
4. Amputation
5. Emotional

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study were generally consistent with the two hypotheses that were tested. The first hypothesis that competent job performance would be evaluated more positively than incompetent job performance was confirmed. This finding of differences between evaluations of the competent and incompetent conditions lends support to the experimental manipulation of levels of competency. The second hypothesis that Internals and externals would differ in the degree to which their ratings of promotion would be affected by the presence of a disability was partially supported. Consistent with such a difference, externally-controlled individuals were more distracted by the presence of a physical disability than internally-controlled individuals. The effect of this distraction however, was not in the predicted direction. Results showed that externally-controlled individuals evaluated a disabled employee, in comparison to a non-disabled employee, more positively rather than more negatively regarding a job promotion. As predicted, internally-controlled individuals made no distinction between disabled and non-disabled employees. Thus, the basic prediction that Internals would not be affected by the presence of a disability, whereas externals would be affected by the presence of a disability, was supported.

Subjects scoring in the middle range of the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale were in all cases similar to externals in their evaluation of disabled and non-disabled individuals. The middle

group showed the same positive attitude toward persons with a physical disability as did externals. Thus, the internal-external locus of control dimension showed a skewness in its distribution with externals and middles alike as opposed to internals.

Externals sensitivity to disability suggests that externals are more susceptible to Wright's (1960) concept of spread or stereotyping; namely, in being aware of one characteristic of an individual, in this case physical disability, externals appear to be affected by letting that characteristic influence their opinion of the person being evaluated. Perhaps externals perceive physical disability as a very relevant, important aspect of an individual and therefore, generalize from this one aspect to other unrelated aspects. The finding that internals are not influenced in their judgments of an individual by the presence of a physical disability indicates that internals do not use such external cues in impression formation. On the other hand, externals appear to be generally more sensitive to external cues.

In viewing the group means on the promotion measure, it is seen that externals are more generally negative than internals under all conditions except for the competent-disabled condition. That is, externals are not more positive to the disabled compared to internals but rather externals are more positive to the disabled relative to their generally negative bias in rating others with respect to promotion. Along with MacDonald and Hall's findings that externals see a physical disability more debilitating in feelings about himself and in social relationships than do internals, it appears that

externals find physical disability threatening and therefore may over-compensate by a positive attitude toward the disabled. The suggestion of MacDonald and Hall that physically disabled individuals may be perceived as "different" or an underprivileged minority group, thereby eliciting negative reactions in the external world, supports the suggestion that externals may tend to overcompensate because of threat and social desirability. The idea of over-compensation may explain the findings of the present study that externals are more positive rather than negative toward the disabled. The idea stated in the hypothesis that externals would be more negative to disability may be theoretically sound based on an extension of MacDonald and Hall's findings, however, behaviorally the opposite was found in the present study. This finding could be due to over-compensation on the part of the external subjects.

The results of the choice of adjectives on the semantic differential to describe the bank employee support the findings on the promotion decision variable. Externals were more positive in their ratings of the disabled individual as opposed to the non-disabled on nine of the thirty-three adjective pairs. Externals rated the disabled more positively than the non-disabled on ambition, confidence, effectiveness, gets things done, open-minded, sincere, tactful, makes a good appearance, and uses his head. Internals did not show this kind of distinction between disabled and non-disabled ratings on adjective pairs.

Another interesting finding is the fact that externals and middles did not rate the incompetent non-disabled significantly more

negatively than the competent non-disabled. One explanation of this finding of non-differentiation between competence and incompetence under the non-disabled condition for externals and middles is that externals and middles do not find the lone internal characteristic of competency a salient feature in evaluating a person. They are perhaps only alert to competency when it is paired with an obvious physical disability because they find the external attribute of a physical disability distracting and relevant due to greater sensitivity to environmental stimuli. Thus, they overcome their generally more negative attitudes by showing differentiation only according to the presence or absence of a physical disability. On the other hand, competency, which is an internal feature, is more salient to the internally controlled individual than the external feature of a physical disability, thus his differentiation between levels of competency.

It is also possible that an artifact present in the fourth tape could have contributed to the finding that externals and middles did not differentiate between levels of competence in the non-disabled conditions. The fourth tape depicted the competent non-disabled condition, however, it appeared that the actors were not portraying the competent condition as well as they might have because of fatigue. The fourth tape was the last one made and the actors appeared tired from the strain of taping. Therefore, the discrimination between levels of competency under the non-disabled condition may have not been as great as intended. If this is indeed the case, it did not affect the internals who are found to rate the incompetent non-disabled

condition significantly more negatively than the competent non-disabled condition. Also a brief pilot study showed median ratings for the competent condition as positive or neutral whereas median ratings for the incompetent condition were slightly negative.

The MacDonald Scale showed no meaningful significant results. The findings of MacDonald and Hall (1969, 1971) were not replicated. Externals and Internals did not make a significant distinction regarding the debilitating effect of emotional, sensory, internal, disfigurement, and amputation disorders. It should be pointed out that the present study did not replicate the methodology used by MacDonald and Hall. The fact that the subjects were all exposed to a tape prior to the filling out of the scale and that the content of the tape consisted of material with varying relevancy to the scale could be an explanation of the nonreplication. However, in the non-disabled condition any situational "set" about disability was controlled. Also, the fact that only Commerce students were used as subjects in the present study, the MacDonald Scale was at the end of the booklet filled out by the subjects and the same instructions regarding rating as "self" and "other" in different situations were not given, all would appear to contribute to the nonreplication of the MacDonald and Hall study regarding the MacDonald Scale by the present study.

The general findings of the present study appear to be consistent with the findings of Lipp et al (1968) as interpreted by Lefcourt (1973) which suggest that externals are more vigilant regarding physical

disability as a relevant stimulus for selective attention. In other words, Internals are not affected by the presence of a physical disability because it is not an important variable in evaluating an individual. Externals find physical disability a relevant and important feature to be considered in evaluating an individual. In the Lipp et al. study, the Internals and externals were physically disabled themselves. Lefcourt suggests that externals have a lower threshold for the external cue of handicap relevant stimuli because they are overly concerned and preoccupied with their disability. Internals, on the other hand, have come to terms with their disability and are no longer overly alert to handicap relevant stimuli. There is a parallelism between the Lipp et al. study and the present study even though the subjects were disabled in the Lipp et al. study and non-disabled in the present study.

It is important to emphasize two aspects of a physical disability: (1) the objective reality of physical impairment and (2) the handicap imposed by the environment. This environmental factor includes not only physical structures such as steps, curbs, etc. but also attitudes imposed by the non-disabled or those whose disabilities are not in a visible, physical form. The present investigation concludes that the personality characteristic of internal-external locus of control does affect the non-disabled individual's attitude toward a disabled person. It is suggested that externals as opposed to Internals are more prone to form impressions using external cues, such as physical disability and that Internals are more prone to use internal cues, such as degree of competency, when forming an opinion about a

person. It is further suggested that externals tend to stereotype, be influenced by the social desirability factor, and perhaps feel threatened by a physical disability therefore engaging in over-compensation. A study using internal-external locus of control as an independent variable and giving subjects the task of attributing personality characteristics to persons with physical disability might be of value in investigating the above suggestion. Such tasks were investigated by Mussen and Barker (1944) and Ray (1946), the results showing subjects attributing characteristics to persons on the basis of a visible physical disability but did not use the personality characteristics of the subjects as an independent variable.

Conclusions

Implications of the present study provide further construct validity for Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale in that the personality characteristic measured by this scale was seen to affect the way in which a person perceives his world. Seeman (1962) also found a differentiation between Internals and externals and their manner of perceiving the world. The knowledge seeking behavior of Internals and externals in a tuberculosis hospital and in a prison were found to differ. Internal patients and prisoners were found to be much more active in seeking knowledge that would affect their personal life. In the present study, Internals were more knowledgeable concerning accurate relevant stimuli, thus less distracted in their perceptions than were externals. Both

studies indicate that Internals are more knowledgeable with regard to relevant stimuli, which would be consistent with a feeling held by Internals that they can manipulate their environment.

The main weakness of the present study was the artificial method in which the subjects were exposed to the stimulus situation which they were asked to evaluate. Further research involving a real life role-play interaction on a one to one basis between a disabled applicant or employee and an employer is suggested as an empirical study with far reaching applicable ramification. Another weakness may be that mass testing in a classroom setting may have added to the response set of social desirability. It is felt that the relevancy of the employment situation to business students as subjects is an important feature of this study even though the use of a particular group of subjects limits the generalizability to other samples. Within a few years many of these subjects will be faced with real-life situations regarding employment of a disabled person. On the other hand, disabled persons will be dealing with such people as personnel managers, etc. and it is felt that any light shed on the dynamics that will have to be dealt with in these interactions is valuable light indeed.

The sex factor is, of course, a relevant factor in this study since all subjects were male and the tape depicted two males in an interaction. The disabled male is perhaps a more deviant and disturbing figure than the female in that the passive or helpless connotation that may be associated with disability is more fitting

with the female stereotype in our society. It is suggested that further research be done using female subjects as this might involve another set of values which would affect the outcome of a study.

REFERENCES

- Hamilton, L. W. Counseling the handicapped in the rehabilitation process. New York: Ronald, 1950.
- Held, F. Social perception and phenomenal causality. Psychological Review, 1944, 51, 358-374.
- Hentig, H. von. The criminal and his victim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.
- Joe, V. C. Review of the Internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 619-640.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research. Vol. 1, New York: Academic Press, 1972, Pp. 32-50.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Unpublished manuscript, University of Waterloo, 1973.
- Lipp, L., Kolstoe, R., James, W., & Randall, H. Denial of disability and internal control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 72-75.
- MacDonald, Jr., A.P., & Hall, J. Perception of the disabled by the non-disabled. Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 653-660.
- MacDonald, Jr., A. P., & Hall, J. Internal-external locus of control and perception of disability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 338-343.

- MacGregor, F. C., Abel, T. M., Bryt, A., Lauer, E., & Weissmann, S.
Facial deformities and plastic surgery. Illinois: Thomas, 1953.
- Maisel, E. Meet a body. New York: Institute for the Crippled
 and Disabled, 1953.
- Minton, H. L. Power and Personality. In Social Influences Processes.
 Chicago: Aldine, 1972.
- Mussell, P. H., & Barker, R. G. Attitudes toward cripples. Journal
of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1944, 35, 351-355.
- Noonan, J. R., Barry, J. R., & Davis, H. C. Personality determinants
 in attitudes toward visible disability. Journal of Personality,
 1970, 38(1), 1-15.
- Osgood, P., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. A. The measure of meaning.
 Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external
 control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966,
80, No. 1, (Whole No. 609).
- Rotter, J. B., & Mulry, R. C. Internal versus external control of
 reinforcement and decision time. Journal of Personality and
Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 598-604.
- Seeman, M., & Evans, J. W. Alienation and learning in a hospital
 setting. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 772-783.
- Seeman, M. Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. American
Journal of Sociology, 1963, 69, 270-284.

Sommers, V. S. The influence of parental attitude and social environment on the personality development of the adolescent blind. New York: American Foundation for the Blind, 1944.

Winer, B. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wright, B. A. Physical disability--a psychological approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

APPENDIX A

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL SCALE

I more strongly believe that:

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.

I more strongly believe that:

10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work, that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost 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 his mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

I more strongly believe that:

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.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX B

FREE COMMENT FORM

List five of the most important characteristics you would mention in describing the bank employee.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Semantic Differential

EXAMPLE: if you feel neutral

[illegible]

Thinks
ahead

Disorganized

Decisive

Indecisive

Tactful

Tactless

Makes a good
appearance

Makes a poor
appearance

Uses his
head

Flightly

Warm

Cold

Appears to
be a follower

Leadership
qualities

Uninformed

Informed

'Tense

Relaxed

Socially
awkward

Socially
adept

Empathic

Indifferent

Communicates
well

Communicates
poorly

Listens
 well

Listens
poorly

APPENDIX D

DECISION OF PROMOTION

Please check one of the following statements regarding the possibility of promoting Mr. Blackwell (loan specialist) to your assistant manager.

- ☐ 1. Should be recommended for promotion.
- ☐ 2. Should probably be recommended for promotion at a later time.
- ☐ 3. Should probably be recommended for promotion at a later time only if he shows improvement in job performance.
- ☐ 4. Should not be allowed to continue in his present employment position.

APPENDIX E

PERCEPTUAL ACCURACY FORM

Please answer yes or no to the following questions.

1. Did the man applying for a loan have a university education? _____
2. Did the bank employee mention his own name in the interview? _____
3. Was the applicant for the loan presently employed? _____
4. Was the bank employee wearing a tie and suit coat? _____
5. Did the bank employee smoke during the interview? _____
6. Was the applicant over twenty years old? _____

APPENDIX F

DISABILITY SCALE

Please make a check mark in the appropriate space to show the degree of seriousness with which you view the following disabilities.

1. Internal disorders (i.e., hearing condition, back condition, diabetes)
extremely debilitating _____ not much debilitating
2. Sensory disorders (i.e., blindness, deafness, speech loss)
extremely debilitating _____ not much debilitating
3. Disfigurements (i.e., scarred face, extreme overweight, hunched back)
extremely debilitating _____ not much debilitating
4. Amputations (i.e., amputated leg, hand or arm)
extremely debilitating _____ not much debilitating
5. Emotional disorders (i.e., irrational fears, extreme depression, being withdrawn)
extremely debilitating _____ not much debilitating

APPENDIX G

Interview Script

Mgr.: Come In Mr. Brown, have a chair.

Ken.: Thank you.

Mgr.: My name is Mr. Blackwell. Now, what can I do for you?

Ken: Well sir, I would like to borrow some money.

Mgr.: I see, well most people borrow money now and then. How much were you planning to borrow?

Ken: I think I could get everything taken care of with \$800.

Mgr.: Eight hundred, eh? What were you going to use the money for?

Ken: Well, sir, I have just finished my last term at school and I need the money for a car and Insurance. I think that I'll need at least six hundred for a half decent car and another two hundred for Insurance.

Mgr.: Yes, I would say that you'll probably need that much to get a car on the road nowadays and Insurance rates are quite steep, especially for a person under 25. How old are you by the way?

Ken: I am 17--I'll be 18 in three months.

Mgr.: Yes. (Pause). Have you talked with anyone else about a loan?-- Have you discussed it with your parents?

Ken: I haven't been anyplace else about the loan if that's what you mean and my parents just can't afford to lend me \$800.

Mgr.: That's too bad--what is your first name?

Ken: Ken.

Mgr.: Well you see Ken we cannot lend money to anyone who is not yet eighteen unless they can arrange for someone who is eighteen or older to cosign for them.

Ken: I see.

Mgr.: Do you think your father would sign or do you have an older brother or sister who would?

Ken: I have ~~older~~ brothers but I don't really want to ask any of them to sign for me if I can help it. I am working and I'm making \$4.00 an hour. I could pay you back within six months--maybe even four.

Mgr.: You have a job already do you? That's very good. Is it around town here?

Ken: I'm working for the construction company who are rebuilding the bridge downtown.

Mgr.: Good for you Ken. However the rules I have to follow won't let me lend you money till you're 18. I'm very sorry but the only think I can do is to tell you to get someone else who will co-sign the loan form with you. For now, I can take down some general information so that when you return with a co-signer we will be able to process your loan right through. First of all, your full name is....?

Ken: Kenneth Douglas Brown.

Mgr.: And your address?

Ken: 919 North Grant

Mgr.: How long have you lived there? You do live with your parents don't you?

Ken: Yes. I've lived there all my life.

Mgr.: And your father, where does he work?

Ken: In the shipping department at Portland Cement.

Mgr.: How long has he worked there?

Ken: (Pause) About eighteen years I think.

Mgr.: And you, how long have you been working?

Ken: I started in June when school let out.

Mgr.: Is the work steady?

Ken: As far as I know. They worked all last winter on inside jobs.

Mgr.: You said you were earning \$4.00 an hour? (Ken nods). Do you have any outstanding debts Ken?

Ken: No.

Mgr.: That's about all for now. Do you have any questions?

Ken: Mmmm, nooo. I think I'll go home and talk it over with my family.

Mgr.: Okay, Ken, that's fine. We'll see you later than.

Ken: All Right. Thank you. G'bye.

Mgr.: By for now Ken.

APPENDIX H

Instructions to Subjects for Internal-External Control Scale

SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief. Obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on the separate answer sheet which has been inserted in this booklet. **FILL OUT THIS ANSWER SHEET NOW.** Put down your identification number and sex in the appropriate spaces on the answer sheet, then finish reading these directions.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Find the number of the item on the answer sheet and blacken the space under the letter which corresponds to the statement you choose as most true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

REMEMBER

Select that alternative which you personally believe to be more True.

APPENDIX I

RAW DATA

Key for interpretation of raw data.

<u>Name of item</u>	<u>column</u>	<u>code</u>
subject number	1-3	1-160
subject within condition	4,5	1-41 = tape 1 1-33 = tape 2 1-39 = tape 3 1-47 = tape 4
I-E scale	6	1 = internal 2 = middles 3 = externals
competence	7	1 = incompetent 2 = competent
disability	8	1 = disabled 2 = non-disabled
raw I-E score	9,10	0-23 scored in the direction of externality
adjectives	11,43	1-7 scored in the direction of high negative
promotion decision	44	1-4 scored in the direction of high negative
disability scale	45 46 47 48 49	1-6 internal disorder 1-6 sensory disorder 1-6 disfiguration 1-6 amputation 1-6 emotional disorder (all scored in the direction of low = extremely and high = not very debilitating)

Raw I-E Score

adjectives

promotion decision

disability scale

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																												
Page 6																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
1	1	5	0	2	1	2	2	0	3	7	1	7	7	1	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

[illegible]

VITA AUCTORIS

- 1946 - Born in Bay City, Michigan to John and Kathleen Navarre, Sr.
- 1952-1961 - Educated Privately
- 1965 - Graduated from St. Joseph High School, Bay City, Michigan.
- 1969 - Graduated with an Associates Degree in Liberal Arts, Delta College, University Center, Michigan.
- 1971 - Graduated with a B.A. Degree (Psychology), Saginaw Valley College, University Center, Michigan.
- 1971-present - Full-time graduate student at the University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.