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SELF-CONCEPT AND LOCUS OF CONTROL
AS MODERATING INFLUENCES OF NEGATIVE LIFE EVENTS

Contemporary life with its advanced technology, increased mobility and pace of living is implicated in increased adaptation requirements on individuals and society as a whole (Toffler, 1971). It has been asserted that change itself, in terms of adaptation, is taking its toll on individuals in excessive stress and strain resulting in physical, mental and/or emotional disturbances (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Lazarus, 1966; Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974). Magnitude of change, however, does not consistently predict the degree of distress an individual experiences. Variations in adaptive responses appear to arise from each person's perception of the impact of events (Lundberg, Theorell & Lind, 1975; Byrne & Whyte, 1980). Further, perception of events as negative has been demonstrated to be a significant predictor of physiological response (Pardine & Napoli, 1983), and a more accurate measure of life stress than total life change (Solvesson-Lane, 1980). Other research has reported that total negative events are the best predictors of psychological disorder (Sarason, Johnson & Siegel, 1978), and that unit weighting of negative events yields an efficient index of stress (Ross & Mirowsky, 1979).
Adversity in life is a natural consequence of living. Individual variation in the perception of negative events and consequent responses introduces a problem: What unique personal characteristics influence some individuals to successfully adapt and utilize adversity which to others pose a threat?

The identification of personality factors which moderate the effects of negative life events is important because it improves the prediction of outcome of exposure to such events and because it enhances theoretical understanding of the process by which individuals cope successfully with stressors. Additionally, information concerning personality characteristics of persons who cannot successfully cope with distress would provide guidelines for emphasis in therapy.

Personality characteristics is a broad category. It is conceivable that the greatest influence on perception of the environment is the unique self perception in relationship to the environment. Two such characteristics of self perception may be locus of control and self-concept.

Rotter (1966) defines the locus of control concept as follows:

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 (p. 1).

Empirical evidence directly supports the locus of control characteristic as self perception in relationship to the environment. Results of a study investigating perception of life events indicated that locus of control influences a person's perception of events and consequently the degree of distress experienced (Tyson, 1981). Scores on Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale did not correlate with normally computed scores on the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS). They did, however, correlate with SRRS scores when these were based on the subject's own rating of degree of stressfulness, with externals tending to find life events more stressful than those with an internal locus of control.

Consistent with these results, police officers with an external locus of control were more likely to report aspects of their jobs as stressful than those with an internal orientation, and they are more likely to report higher levels of subjective stress (Lester, 1982).

Locus of control, however, was not found to correlate with total negative events in a study by Sandler and Lakey (1982). It is notable that the correlations between locus
of control and negative events are found to be significant when subjects rate their own degree of stress experienced.

Another personality characteristic attributable to self perception is self-concept. Few publications have been produced examining this characteristic as related to negative events and subjective distress indicating that it has been subject to little direct research. Other studies have given indirect support of that notion. Teschbachan and Singer (1971) found that persons low in self-esteem experience more threats to their egos when confronted by different situations. A lowered stress tolerance was generally exhibited, with more symptoms of maladjustment, and stress was experienced more acutely.

Solvesson-Lane's study (1980) showed that self-concept, flexibility-rigidity and locus of control discriminate significantly between a group of people evidencing few symptoms of maladjustment and a group of people evidencing many symptoms of maladjustment as measured by the Langer Scale (Langer, 1962). Petrie and Rotheram (1982) examined levels of self-esteem and assertiveness as personal attributes which insulate firefighters from high occupational stress. These attributes were found to be significantly inversely related to stress with assertiveness contributing to self-esteem and self-esteem directly related to stress.
High self-concept is important for adequate functioning according to many existing theories. Self-concept is considered to be demonstrated by three major components: (1) what an individual thinks he is, (2) how he feels about himself, and (3) what he does (Fitts, 1965). In the Petrie and Rotheram study (1982), a behavioral expression was examined. It was indicated that assertiveness is a subcomponent of self-esteem and it was suggested that further research might identify other subcomponents of self-esteem in order to provide improved intervention strategy. Locus of control may be another such subcomponent. Friedburg (1982), in finding a significant negative correlation between externality and high self-concept, suggested that understanding the relationship between these two personality characteristics is important in conceptualizing and treating individual cases.

In summary, cited empirical evidence has indicated that: (1) the degree of distress an individual experiences can most effectively be measured by perception of life events and individual ratings of the impact of these events, (2) total negative events is an effective predictor of stress experienced, (3) the level of locus of control is significantly inversely related to self-concept and (4) a low self-concept is significantly related to symptoms of maladjustment and stress.
The purpose of the study was to utilize this evidence by examining the influence of self-concept, locus of control, positive life events and negative life events on perceived stress. Objectives of the study were as follows: To demonstrate that joint effects of the "independent variables," locus of control, negative life events, positive life events and self-concept would produce a significant multiple correlation with experienced stress over and above the correlations afforded by the individual independent variables; and to evaluate their unique contributions to the relationship.
METHOD

Subjects

The participants in the study were 89 college students at the University of Central Florida, including 51 females and 38 males. The subjects ranged in age from 18 to 28 ($\bar{X} = 20.6$, SD = 1.8). Subjects were recruited from an Introductory Psychology class and two University Organizations: Peer Group Advisors and O-Team. Volunteers were solicited by requesting assistance in a study concerning life events of college students. Participants were from various disciplines and levels of undergraduate study.

Measures

Three instruments were used in the study: (1) College Student Life Events Schedule (LES), (Sandler & Lakey, 1982); (2) Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, Counselling Form, (TSCS), (Fitts, 1965); and (3) Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale), (Rotter, 1966).

The College Student Life Events Schedule is a 112-item questionnaire, including five validity items to check for random responding. This instrument was developed specifically for conducting life stress event research with a student population.
Test-retest reliability of the scores derived from this instrument was assessed using a separate sample of 70 undergraduate students. Reliability coefficients for the scores were as follows: the total event score $r(68) = .92$, positive event score $r(68) = .92$, and negative event score $r(68) = .89$. The negative event scores were found to correlate positively $r(68) = .62$ with the Life Experiences Scale (Sarason, Johnson & Siegel, 1978) and with measures of psychological disorder $r(93) = .48$ with the Langer 33-item instrument (Langer, 1962); $r(93) = .55$ with the Beck Depression Scale (Beck, 1967); $r(93) = .46$ with the Discomfort Scale of the PSI (Lanyon, 1970).

The College Student Life Event Survey was used to measure three variables of the study: total unit weighted positive life events; total unit negative life events occurring to subjects during the past year; and degree of stress experienced by subjects' subjective rating of negative events based on a five-point scale, 1 = minimal amount of stress, 3 = moderate amount of stress, and 5 = extreme amount of stress. This five-point scale rating is a modification of Sandler and Lakey's (1982) rating which provided for very negative, slight negative, slight positive and very positive effect perceived. The purpose for the modification was to expand the range of perceived effects of negative events.
Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale is a 29 item forced choice questionnaire including six filler items designed to disguise the purpose of the test. Each item consists of a pair of statements of belief about the locus of control of reinforcement from which one statement is chosen which is most consistent with the subjects' general point of view. The instrument is scored in the external direction; the higher the score, the more external the orientation of the individual.

In terms of reliability, Rotter (1982) cites test-retest correlations ranging from .49 to .83 for one month and two-month administrations. In a one year test-retest reliability study with a sample of 122, a correlation of .72 was found (Hersch & Scheibe, 1967). Internal consistency estimates are relatively stable with correlations ranging from .65 to .76 in three different studies with split-half Spearman-Brown and Kuder-Richardson designs (Rotter, 1982).

Hersch and Scheibe (1967) reported also on discriminant validity; they found low and non-significant correlations between the Rotter I-E Scale and measures of intelligence, a finding that was confirmed by Strickland (1965) and Ladwig (1963). Adams-Webber (1963) compared the Rotter I-E Scale with results of a story completion test. The "projective" test of tendency to see punishment for
moral transgression as being externally imposed was significantly related \((p < .001)\) to I-E scale scores. The reliability and validity of the I-E construct and scale are adequately and firmly established by these and numerous additional studies (Rotter, 1982).

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is composed of 100 self-descriptive items of which 90 assess the self-concept and 10 assess self-criticism. A major score derived from these items is the Total Positive Score, reflecting the overall level of self-esteem. High scores indicate a high self-concept. This total positive score has been found to correlate \(-.70\) with the Taylor Anxiety Scale, \(-.56\) with Cornell Medical Index, \(.64\) with an Inventory of Feelings Scale and \(-.43\) with Locus of Control. Reliability data for all scores on the test are based on test-retest with 60 college students over a two week period. The Total Positive Score \((P)\) reliability was found to be \(.92\).

The Self-Criticism Score \((SC)\) is composed of 10 mildly derogatory statements taken from the L Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Most people admit that these statements are true. High scores generally indicate normal openness and capacity for self criticism, and low scores indicate defensiveness, suggesting that the P Scores may be artificially elevated by
this defensiveness. Test-retest reliability for the SC is .75 and the correlation with the MMPI L Scale is -.48.

The reliability and validity data cited above are published in the Manual of the TSCS (Fitts, 1965), together with additional confirming data.

Procedure

Five one-hour monitored periods were scheduled in prearranged classrooms for subjects to attend and complete the assessment instruments. The questionnaires, together with written instructions and informed consent forms were distributed at the beginning of the periods and collected at the end of the periods. (See Appendixes A, B and C) After collection, the instruments were inspected for completion and scored using standardized scoring procedures. Validity scales on the LES and TSCS were examined in order to retain or discard data. The criteria for exclusion was three or more SC items on the TSCS denied and/or three or more validity items on the LES.
RESULTS

By observation, the mean $P$ Score on the TSCS ($\overline{X} = 347.79$, SD = 31.31) was similar to the mean $P$ score of the 626 subjects of the TSCS norm group, ($\overline{X} = 345.57$, SD = 30.70), (Fitts, 1965). The descriptive data obtained for the I-E Scale: $\overline{X} = 9.44$, SD = 3.53. The mean number of negative life events reported by the subjects in this study ($\overline{X} = 12.83$, SD = 8.23) is higher than obtained on the same instrument in Sandler and Lakey's study (1982) ($\overline{X} = 6.60$, SD = 4.70).

As a preliminary analysis, the interrelationships between Self-Concept, Locus of Control, Positive Events, Negative Events and Perceived Stress were assessed using Pearson's Product-moment correlation. The results are shown in Table 1.
TABLE 1

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT (SC), LOCUS OF CONTROL (LC), POSITIVE EVENTS (POS E), NEGATIVE EVENTS (NEG E) AND PERCEIVED STRESS (PER STRESS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>POS E</th>
<th>NEG E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS E</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG E</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER STRESS</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P  
**<.05  
**<.001

In analyzing the relationships among the four independent variables, locus of control was found to correlate significantly only with self-concept. The negative relationship indicates that individuals with a high external locus of control score tend to be low in self-concept (r = -.24).

Negative events were related, significantly, with two other independent variables, self-concept (r = -.45) and positive events (r = .55). Individuals experiencing a high number of negative events tend to experience a high number of positive events as well; however, they also tend to evidence a low self concept.

Among the relationships between the dependent variable, perceived stress, and the various independent
variables, the negative events-perceived stress relationship \((r = .92)\), was the strongest bivariate correlation found in the study. Individuals experiencing a high number of negative events have high levels of perceived stress. A significant correlation was also observed between perceived stress and self-concept \((r = -.42)\), indicating that individuals with high levels of perceived stress tend to have low self-concepts. Perceived stress and positive events are also significantly correlated \((r = .44)\), suggesting that individuals with low levels of perceived stress experience fewer positive events than those perceiving high levels of stress. Locus of control was not significantly related to perceived stress.

The independent variables, locus of control, self-concept, positive events, and negative events, were then analyzed for joint relationship with the dependent variable, perceived stress, by multiple regression analysis. The multiple \(R\) obtained was significant \((R = .92, p<.001)\). The semipartial relationships obtained were: self-concept \((sr = .02, p>.05)\), locus of control \((sr = .06, p>.05)\), positive events \((sr = .08, p>.05)\), and negative events \((sr = .72, p<.001)\). Since negative events is the only independent variable having a significant semipartial relationship, the multiple \(R\) reduces to the bivariate Pearson \(r\) between negative events and perceived stress \((r = .92)\).
DISCUSSION

The only significant unique contribution to produce perceived stress is negative events. The relationship that the other independent variables, self-concept and positive events have with the dependent variable, perceived stress, is via their relationship to negative events.

Locus of control, positive events and self-concept are frequently viewed as moderator variables which alter the impact of negative life events on ones perceived stress (Lester, 1982; Solvesson-Lane; Teschbachan & Singer, 1971). The present study raises serious questions about the validity of this view by showing that these moderator variables are only indirectly related to stress by their direct relationship to negative events. Thus the moderator variables make no unique contribution to stress level and do not alter the direct negative events - perceived stress relationship.

The results of the present study provide evidence that self concept is related to negative events and thus only indirectly to perceived stress. This self-concept - negative events relationship is supported indirectly by previous stress research. Self-concept has been associated with anxiety, depression and psychosomatic disorder. Solvesson-Lane's study (1980) evidenced that self-concept
discriminates effectively between persons evidencing maladjustment in terms of depression and psychosomatic symptoms. Further, the P Score on the TSCS has been shown to be significantly inversely related to measures of anxiety, illness, maladjustment and neuroticism. Negative events have also been found to correlate significantly with anxiety and depression (Sandler & Lakey, 1982) and physiological response (Pardine & Napoli, 1983). Although directionality or a causal relationship cannot be determined in correlational studies, the implication has been that the events preceded the disorder.

The locus of control variable was found to be related to self-concept but not associated with perceived stress or negative events. These results were not surprising as locus of control did not correlate significantly with negative events in the Sandler and Lakey (1982) study. Their assertion that locus of control moderates the effects of stress is based on its significant relationship with anxiety, which has also been associated with self-concept. The Sandler and Lakey study (1982) as well as the present study supports the hypothesis that locus of control may be a subcomponent of self-concept, but a subcomponent that is not included in the self-concept-stress relationship.

As stated previously, causality cannot be determined in correlational studies. Doherty (1983), in a
longitudinal study which does evidence causality, examined the impact of divorce on locus of control orientation. Results showed that this life event caused a significant short term effect of increased externality, followed by a return over the next five years to levels of locus of control comparable to that of the group who remained married. The sample contained 1,814 white women, ages 32-46 years who were in their first marriage in 1969. Marital status and locus of control data (as measured by an 11 item abbreviated version of Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale) were collected in 1969, 1972 and 1977. Of the original group, 27 women divorced between 1969 and 1972. Although there were no significant initial differences between the married group and the divorced group, in 1972, the divorced were significantly more external than the marrieds \( F(1, 1,172) = 5.47, p = .02 \).

The term, moderating personality variables, implies that the individual's personality is fixed in terms of coping with or interacting with the environment and that the personality either defends him from or makes him vulnerable to the stress and strain of life events. It is just as plausible for negative events to contribute to lowered self-concept, a self perception of helplessness and ineffective functioning, as for the converse to occur.
The evidence that positive events did not appear to mediate the impact of negative events was unexpected. Subjects scoring high in negative events tend to score high in positive events as well. We may postulate that individuals experience more total events due to an attempt to alleviate the stress of negative events, or they may generally be more active people. Also, the relationship between positive events and self-concept was not significant.

A valuable contribution of this study to stress research is considered to be the validation of a simple unit weighted life event survey which predicts the amount of stress the individual is experiencing. The high correlation between number of negative events and subjective rating of negative events suggests that an event perceived as negative is essentially the same as rating the degree of stress experienced. Although this result failed to confirm the expected prediction, that subjective rating of events provides an improved stress index, the data substantially validate the College Student Life Event Survey as a population specific instrument which can be used to predict the degree of stress an individual is experiencing by unit weighting negative events.

The major contribution of the present study is considered to be the direct relationship found between
negative events and stress. The lack of a self-concept or locus of control relationship to stress is also of interest. These findings can be utilized to provide new guidelines for stress intervention models. Possible implications are relevant to clinical attempts to alleviate perceived stress levels. The results suggest that attempts to bolster self-concept, and/or enhance feelings of control would not significantly moderate the perceived levels of personal stress discomfort arising from negative life experiences. Also, seeking out more positive events in an attempt to "balance" negative experiences is not supported as a viable strategy.

Following the present findings, clinical attempts at managing personal stress discomfort should focus on the number of negative events experienced. Two major areas of effort seem to hold promise. One would involve interventions designed to enhance competence in those areas which now frequently lead to negative consequences of failure and frustration. Another potentially productive emphasis would involve reduction in expected levels of achievement or other ways of altering personal goals to enable less frequent negative events.
APPENDIX A
CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this study is to investigate life events and personality variables of college students. You will be requested to complete three questionnaires which will require approximately one hour of your time. Your answers are coded by number and will be treated anonymously.

1) I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time, without penalty.

2) I understand that I am free to withhold any answer to specific items or questions.

3) I understand that any data or answers to questions will remain confidential with regard to my identity.

Your signature below acknowledges that you have read and understand the above and are willing to participate in this study.

_________________________
Name

_________________________
Date

_________________________
Age

_________________________
Sex

Research conducted by: Frances Rogers
Graduate Student

Faculty Supervisor: David W. Abbott
Professor of Psychology
APPENDIX B
The attached questionnaire contains a list of events which may or may not have occurred in your life during the past 12 months. We would like you to tell us three things about each event.

I. If the event did not occur, skip it and go on to the next item.

II. If the event occurred, show whether its effect on you was a good one or a bad one. You can indicate this on the answer sheet by circling the appropriate letter [P = positive effect (good) or N = negative effect (bad)].

III. If the event occurred and had a negative effect on you, rate the degree of stress this negative event caused you. You can indicate this on the answer sheet by circling the appropriate number. (1 = minimal stress, 3 = moderate stress, 5 = extreme stress)

Rate ONLY the negative events which occurred.
1. Terminated intimate relationship (boyfriend/girlfriend)
2. Marriage
3. Became a parent
4. Became engaged
5. Negative personal encounter with a professor
6. Marital separation or divorce
7. Increased separation from children
8. Reestablished old personal friendship
9. Developed a good personal relationship with a professor
10. Beginning or increased sexual activity
11. Had a disagreement with friend (small or large disagreement)
12. Personal rejection by a close friend or lover
13. Started a love relationship
14. Increased amount of dating
15. Separation from parents or siblings
16. Separation from close friend due to moving
17. Chose to terminate relationship with close friend
18. Relationship with boyfriend or girlfriend became worse
19. Decreased number of friends
20. Significantly improved your relationship with boyfriend/girlfriend, or close friend
21. Learning that a close friend/relative is very different than you thought (e.g., sexual behavior, involvement in serious drugs, criminal activities, etc.)
22. Relationship with relative (parents, siblings, etc.) became worse
23. Relationship with relative (parents, siblings, etc.) became better
24. Began living with lover (excluding marriage)
25. Decreased amount of dating
26. Relationship with spouse became worse or much worse
27. Relationship with spouse improved
28. Decreased sexual activity
29. Difficulty with sexual performance
30. Developed relationships with people who have new and interesting ideas or life style.
31. Became an aunt or uncle  
32. Marriage of close friend or relative  
33. Death of a friend  
34. Friend or relative encountered serious trouble or failure experience  
35. Parents' financial status became better or much better  
36. Received a visit (or visited) family  
37. Worsening of parents' financial status  
38. Friend or relative had important positive experience  
39. Health of a close relative/friend became much worse  
40. Death of a close relative (parent or sibling)  
41. Parents separated or divorced  
42. Remarriage of parent  
43. Serious conflict between members of your family  
44. Significantly increased your level of debt  
45. Fired or lost job  
46. Quit job  
47. Received positive recognition at job (promotion, significant praise)  
48. Major change in work or school hours  
49. Significantly increased economic difficulties  
50. Acquired a car  
51. Won a large amount of money (over $10,000) in a lottery or sweepstakes  
52. Significantly improved your financial status  
53.Began a new job (part or full time)  
54. Increased difficulty with a job  
55. Discharged from the military  
56. Improved mastery of academic material  
57. Significantly improved your course grades  
58. Transferred to a new school  
59. Began college for first time  
60. Encountered increased difficulty with school regulations or facilities  
61. Withdrawal from a college or university  
62. Completed an assignment for school  
63. Returned to school after prolonged absence
64. Graduation from high school or junior college
65. Applied to graduate or professional school
66. Decided on a major or career
67. Increased demands from academic coursework
68. Increased problem with academic performance (coursework, grades, GRE's, etc.)
69. Accepted into graduate or professional school
70. Moved out of parents' home
71. Moved back into parents' home after living away
72. Change of residence
73. Serious conflict with roommate
74. Improved living conditions (e.g., housing, roommate)
75. Difficulty with landlord/landlady
76. Moved to a new city
77. Improved physical appearance
78. Physical appearance became worse or much worse
79. Physical health became worse or much worse (due to illness or accident)
80. Began or increased use of illicit drugs
81. Improved your physical health
82. Hospitalization of self
83. Improved your personal health/habits
84. Worsening of personal health/habits
85. Did not experience fatigue
86. Decreased use of illicit drugs
87. Female: Possibility of an unwanted pregnancy
   Male: Possibility of girlfriend/wife's unwanted pregnancy
88. Female: Had an abortion
    Male: Girlfriend/wife had an abortion
89. Involvement in accident
90. Began counseling or psychotherapy
91. Began volunteer work
92. Received recognition or award for achievement
93. Victim of crime
Life Events Questionnaire
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94. Problem with the law (arrested, detained, etc.)
95. Acquired a pet
96. Major change in or renewed dedication to philosophy of life
97. Selected for a leadership position in an organization
98. Loss of a pet through death or runaway
99. Traveled to a new and interesting place
100. Increase in amount of leisure time
101. Decreased involvement with hobby or task
102. Joined a social organization
103. Won an award at an international athletic competition
104. Increased exposure to cultural or entertainment experiences
105. Accomplished a goal in a hobby or recreational activity
106. Major increase in religious commitment
107. New or increased involvement in hobby or recreational activity
108. Not accepted into a social organization you desired
109. Organization you belong to (club, team, etc.) failed to accomplish an important goal
110. Organization you belong to (club, team, etc.) accomplished an important goal
111. Increased use of alcohol
112. Rejected by all graduate or professional schools you desired to attend
**ANSWER SHEET**

Name: __________________________

P = Positive effect  
N = Negative effect

**Stress Scale**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Minimal
- Moderate
- Extreme

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
20. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
21. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
22. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
23. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
24. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
25. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
26. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
27. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
28. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
29. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
30. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
31. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
32. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
33. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
34. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
35. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
36. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
37. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
38. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
39. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
40. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
41. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
42. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
43. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
44. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
45. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
46. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
47. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
48. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
49. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
50. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
51. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
52. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
53. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
54. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
55. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
56. P N 1 2 3 4 5  
57. P N 1 2 3 4 5
P = Positive effect
N = Negative effect

Stress Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. P N 1 2 3 4 5
59. P N 1 2 3 4 5
60. P N 1 2 3 4 5
61. P N 1 2 3 4 5
62. P N 1 2 3 4 5
63. P N 1 2 3 4 5
64. P N 1 2 3 4 5
65. P N 1 2 3 4 5
66. P N 1 2 3 4 5
67. P N 1 2 3 4 5
68. P N 1 2 3 4 5
69. P N 1 2 3 4 5
70. P N 1 2 3 4 5
71. P N 1 2 3 4 5
72. P N 1 2 3 4 5
73. P N 1 2 3 4 5
74. P N 1 2 3 4 5
75. P N 1 2 3 4 5
76. P N 1 2 3 4 5
77. P N 1 2 3 4 5
78. P N 1 2 3 4 5
79. P N 1 2 3 4 5
80. P N 1 2 3 4 5
81. P N 1 2 3 4 5
82. P N 1 2 3 4 5
83. P N 1 2 3 4 5
84. P N 1 2 3 4 5
85. P N 1 2 3 4 5
86. P N 1 2 3 4 5
87. P N 1 2 3 4 5
88. P N 1 2 3 4 5
89. P N 1 2 3 4 5
90. P N 1 2 3 4 5
91. P N 1 2 3 4 5
92. P N 1 2 3 4 5
93. P N 1 2 3 4 5
94. P N 1 2 3 4 5
95. P N 1 2 3 4 5
96. P N 1 2 3 4 5
97. P N 1 2 3 4 5
98. P N 1 2 3 4 5
99. P N 1 2 3 4 5
100. P N 1 2 3 4 5
101. P N 1 2 3 4 5
102. P N 1 2 3 4 5
103. P N 1 2 3 4 5
104. P N 1 2 3 4 5
105. P N 1 2 3 4 5
106. P N 1 2 3 4 5
107. P N 1 2 3 4 5
108. P N 1 2 3 4 5
109. P N 1 2 3 4 5
110. P N 1 2 3 4 5
111. P N 1 2 3 4 5
112. P N 1 2 3 4 5
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE I-E SCALE

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 most 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.

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 black-in the space under the number 1 or 2 which you choose as the statement more 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.
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 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 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 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.
I-E Scale Continued

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

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

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

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