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ABSTRACT

THE INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL CONSTRUCT AND CHILD ABUSE

by

Tsehainesh Asmelash

Master of Arts in Education,
Educational Psychology,
Counseling and Guidance

Department of Educational Psychology

August, 1977

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between child abuse and the level of internal versus external locus of control of child abusing parents. The proposed hypothesis of this study was that child abusing parents or potential child abusers will exhibit a greater degree of externalization of their feelings and emotions than non-child abusers. Therefore, they tend to blame their environment for their actions and/or mistakes.

The subjects for this study were sixteen child abusing parents and sixteen non-child abusing parents. Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was used to assess the internal-external locus of control
of the subjects. Personality characteristics, particularly those related to internal versus external control of child abusing parents were also examined.

The growing humanistic and social concern for the effects of child abuse and the abused child's subsequent effect upon society suggested the need for this kind of study.

Sixteen parents with substantiated histories of child abuse were compared with an equal number of parents without such histories.

All of the parents that participated in this study were native-born Americans. None of the parents had less than twelve years of education; some had completed college. Most of the parents were employed; their occupations ranging from a truck driver to a management level position. Income, residence and class categorizations were determined by a questionnaire.

Figures were analyzed using a mean comparison and a t-test to test the hypothesis.

Results supported the main hypothesis of this study. In addition to the main hypothesis, some of the other significant conclusions reached from this study include:

1. Child abuse is not restricted to any age group, race or class of people.

2. Child abuse occurs in all communities.

Recommendations for future studies were suggested.
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Child abuse is increasing and it is not an isolated phenomenon confined to any one area. It occurs in every community, from the affluent suburb in any metropolitan area to a medium or small-sized city or a slum. Neither is it an isolated phenomenon confined to any privileged or underprivileged group of people. Contrary to the popular belief, child abuse is widespread among parents ranging from those who are mentally unstable to those who are apparently successful and well adjusted.

The reasons that compel parents to abuse children are extremely complex. A large amount of material has been written about the daily stress, intolerable social pressures, parents who were themselves abused as children, marital problems and emotional instability.

In moments of anger parents may spank harder than is actually meant or shout louder than usual. This researcher's curiosity was focused on why some parents, who seem perfectly "normal" in most instances manage to hit their children so violently that bones or even skulls are broken. Why can't they put on the brakes like other parents do? Why is their breaking level so low, while at the same time they love their children? Are they so external that they are more threatened by their children and their environment and tend to lose control...
faster than the "normal" parents, or are they more stressed than the rest of the population? Why have there not been preventive measures devised for emotionally unstable parents similar to preventive medicine? What can be done to recognize child abusers and to prevent child abuse?

Depending on a parent's internality or externality one can come close to predicting and/or preventing child abuse. Therefore, the level of internal versus external locus of control of child abusing parents has prevailed as the most important factor of this study.

Statement of the Problem

The pattern of increasingly severe attacks against children is there, and the end depends on whether or not successful intervention arrives in time. The current so-called remedial suggestions are all post facto.

The main problem lies in the lack of recognition of the abusive behaviors in parents. All the social welfare agencies are very busy looking after the physical well-being of pregnant mothers and would-be fathers and the new born children. But the parents' emotional and mental health or stability is ignored.

Child abuse usually takes place in the home where it is difficult or impossible for outsiders to witness the incidence. Also, children (especially younger children) are unable to report their mistreatment to
authorities or to any outsiders. Therefore, the problem does not surface until it is too late. By determining parents' perceived level of internal-external locus of control some light could be shed on the problem of child abuse. Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale is sensitive to individual differences in perception regarding control over one's destiny in life.

Rotter (1972) explains that, the role of reinforcement, reward, or gratification is universally recognized as a crucial one in the acquisition and performance of skills and knowledge. However, an event regarded by some persons as a reward or reinforcement may be differently perceived and reacted to by others. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behavior or attributes versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself and may occur independently of his own actions. The highly external person is an alienated, helpless person who feels he is at the mercy of his environment. He feels unable to control his own emotions and thus blames results of his actions on some uncontrollable force. Rotter goes on to point out that:

The alienated individual feels unable to control his own destiny. He is a small cog in a big machine and at the mercy of forces too strong or too
vague to control. (p. 263).

Other psychologists also place great importance on this concept. Merton (1949) for instance stresses its importance in his study of asocial behavior. And Seeman (1969) has linked the concept of alienation as it refers to powerlessness, to internal-external control as a psychological variable.

A highly internal person, on the other hand, would have a commendable control of his emotions and his actions. DeCharms (1968) differentiated between internals, people who perceive their behavior to be determined by their choices, and externals, those who perceive their behavior to be determined by external forces. The theoretical basis for this study is the distinction made by Rotter regarding internal and external locus of control. Rotter's original definition is as follows:

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent on 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 on his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this belief in internal control. (1966, p. 1).

This study will not advocate analysis or professional evaluation of all parents. Rather it will be an
exploratory report designed to lead to a more extensive and precise investigation by prospective researchers into the importance of the level of internal versus external locus of control of child abusing parents.

Definitions

Child Abuse

Child abuse, as a term, encompasses several different forms of mistreatment committed against children. For the purpose of this study the term child abuse is operationally defined as the non-accidental use of force by parents in or around the home.

Sexual abuse of children and the violent acts by some teachers and other authority figures against children are beyond the scope of this study.

The I-E - Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale

A test developed by Julian B. Rotter (1966). The Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, usually referred to as the I-E Scale, deals with a person's perception of contingency relationships between his own behavior and events which follow that behavior. When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, it is 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, it is labeled as a belief in external control. If, on the other hand, the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, it is labeled a belief in internal control. The I-E Scale consists of twenty-three pairs of questions, using a forced-choice format and six filler questions intended to make somewhat ambiguous as to what the purpose of the test is.

Limitation of the Study

Several studies have been conducted that dealt with analysis of the problem of child abuse. Attention has been paid to reviewing the problem and proposing and evaluating various theoretical models for treating abusive parents. But there is still very little done regarding the recognition of abusive behaviors in potential child abusing parents and preventing it before the children are hurt.

Because of limited access to the sample population and time, all the possible variables were not tested. Also, due to some limitations the question "why are abusive parents more external" has not been explored.

Participants for the study were selected from thirty-seven subjects who completed a questionnaire dealing with age, annual income, occupation etc.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between child abuse and the level of internal-external locus of control of child abusing parents. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was tested:

Hypothesis

Child abusing parents or potential child abusers will exhibit a greater degree of externalization of their feelings and emotions than non-child abusers. Therefore, they tend to blame their environment for their actions and/or mistakes.

Summary

As mentioned earlier, several studies have been conducted regarding the personalities and emotional instability of child abusing parents. To this researcher's knowledge this is the first study relating the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale to child abuse. Thus, this study is unique in that it is the first study conducted applying the I-E Scale to the problem of child abuse.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

This section will discuss some of the major studies pertaining to child abuse and the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. The topics to be covered will include: (1) A historical overview of child abuse; (2) Theoretical studies of child abuse; (3) Who are the child abusers?; (4) Common personality characteristics of child abusing parents; (5) The Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale; (6) Understanding the I-E Scale concept; (7) Current status of theories and research into the I-E Scale with emphasis on anxiety and depression; and a Summary section.

A Historical Overview of Child Abuse

During the past few years a great deal of attention has been given to the problem of child abuse. In reviewing the literature one cannot help but notice the numerous newspaper articles, film documentaries, radio and television programs devoted to this problem. The problem of child abuse, however, is not a unique product of our time.

Fontana (1973), for instance, discusses the fact that the child-destructive instincts of the human race goes as far back as the biblical time.

Throughout the Bible there runs a theme of child murder and abuse, of the destruction of the first
born, of the laying of a child's bones into the foundation of a new edifice, of a child chosen as a burnt offering to a capricious god (p. 4).

Kellum (1974) describes the existence of massive infanticide in the middle ages. Fontana (1973) also describes the routine massacre of babies in parts of Polynesia, East Africa and South America because the babies were cumbersome on the march or just simply in the way.

Reasons for sacrificing children include: (1) The child being a nuisance; (2) Families already having too many children; (3) The child being defective; (4) The child being unwanted; (5) Interfering in the parents' existing life style; (6) Revenge for one parent's misbehavior against the other.

Langer (1974) wrote that infanticide has been an accepted procedure for disposing not only of deformed or sick infants, but also of all such newborns that might strain the resources of the family or the community.

In the nineteenth century, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals succeeded in removing a maltreated child from his parents on the grounds that children were members of the animal kingdom and are entitled to protection under the same laws that protected animals (Redbill, 1968). This measure in turn precipitated the foundation of the Society for the Prevention
of Cruelty to Children in 1871.

Langer (1974) also mentions that infanticide is still employed by underdeveloped people as a measure of population control.

The more recent concern about the problem of child abuse was originated with the advance of pediatric radiology which began in the early nineteen hundreds when it became possible to document repeated injuries to a child over a period of time and confirm suspicions of abuse.

A number of theories have been derived in relation to the child abuse problem. Some of the theories focus on the degree of abuse (Boisvert, 1972); others focus on the reasons for abuse (Flammang, 1970); and some on the psychological and physical effects of abuse on the children themselves (Birrell, 1968; Bloch, 1966). Several studies, however, point to other forms of malfunctions in the family, such as the marital problems of parents (Johnson and Morse, 1968).

Other studies point to the social and economical pressures as well as social isolation of parents (Brown, 1968).

Still other studies claim socioeconomic differences as the problem (Zuckerman, 1972). Some studies, however, have not found socioeconomic factors to be one of the problems. This could be because upper-class individuals
go to private doctors who at times might be willing to let the abuse go unreported while the lower-class individuals must go to the public clinics which in turn are required to make a report of any suspected abuse. This fact also makes reliable data on socioeconomic differences impossible to obtain.

Some of the problems mentioned in several investigations that allegedly cause parents to abuse their children are emotional problems, confusion in identities between the mother or the father and the baby, and severe personality problems of parents such as psychoses, anxiety and depression (Flynn, 1970). Some social problems such as alcoholism and drug addiction were also reported in some studies. A combination of physical as well as emotional problems of individuals leading to child abuse have also been noted (Elmer, 1971; Grumet, 1970).

Some other studies not mentioned specifically in this report also point to displaced hostility against a child, the stress of mothering, accumulated stresses within the family which are precipitated by socioeconomic factors or the birth of several children close together and a special physical or emotional handicap on the part of the child.

In short, the increasing isolation of the modern day family from relatives and friends puts parents (particularly mothers) on a 24-hour-a-day work schedule, seven
days a week. Consequently, when there is no relief from the pressures of this or any other demanding task the stress is likely to result in some sort of a blow up, usually towards the most defenseless member of the family, the child.

Steele and Pollock (1968) found that child abuse is often a result of the child’s failure to meet various expectations of the parents. Also there is the problem of ignorance on the part of the parent. Therefore, the parent might often see innocent behavior as wilful disobedience because some of these parents cannot recognize appropriate behavior in their children. Furthermore, they mistake the concept of how to rear children, failing to guide them and give them support at various stages in their development.

It is recognized in social anthropology that patterns of child rearing, whether good or bad, are passed on from one generation to another. Thus the abused child becomes the abusing parent in the cycle of what is called the "battered-child syndrome". Psychologically this phenomenon could be described as an identification of the child with the aggressive parent.

Theoretical Studies of Child Abuse

Theoretical studies of the problem of child abuse have explored several different variables – psychological, sociological, racial and cultural. Although many of the
studies explore several types of variables, the majority of these studies analyze only a single type. In terms of psychological variables, several factors have been studied—especially that of intimate social contact among the family members. Goode (1969) noted that one reason people who are intimate commit violence against each other is because they are in each other's presence a lot; and few others can anger one so much as those who are close. Kopernik (1964) suggests that the feeling of rejection which aggressive children have in a family is caused by a separation from parents, birth of another child, or parental indifference.

On the other hand, Gelles (1973) feels that a better approach to the problem of child abuse is to focus on sociological variables associated with child abuse rather than strictly from a psychopathological point of view. From this implication one can conclude that since unemployment and social status are important sociological variables, then strategies to prevent child abuse should be aimed at alleviating the disastrous effects of being poor.

The most frequently discussed theory deals with socialization of aggression. This theory suggests that parents who punish more severely tend to produce children who are more aggressive. And the children in turn tend to punish their offspring more severely. This theory is
structure during childhood, the more the person learns to use it. According to Gil, creation of educational programs to change these values will lead to the reduction of violence in homes and violence against children.

Who are the Child Abusers?

Contrary to the popular belief, child abuse occurs among all cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups. There seems to be a higher incidence of child abuse among minority and/or low income families. But the fact remains that these families have more contact with agencies which have legal reporting requirements (e.g. The Welfare Department, and Public Health Clinic). Furthermore, the socioeconomic stress factors in these families might be higher than that of the middle or upper-class families.

Nearly all of the literature on child abuse supports the fact that data is hard to obtain. Obviously no one wants to admit to such a behavior and child abuse is a relatively easy behavior to hide with the exception of severe child abuse or homicide cases. However, nearly all of the investigation seems to support the fact that child abuse is most prevalent in minority and low income families.

The number of child abusing parents who are psychotic or psychopathic is very small. Researchers indicate a variety of factors are associated with child abuse, many
also well documented in the studies of child abuse where the abused child becomes the abusing parent. This is because punishment frustrates and provides the child with a model of effectively implementing aggression (Silver, 1969).

Unlike the social theories of violence which say the source of the problem originates within the family, the cultural theories hold that the source of the problem begins outside the family. Therefore, Gil (1971) stated that massive societal abuse of children is more serious than individual abuse of children. According to Gil, societal abuse is manifested in the statistics on infant hunger and malnutrition, morality, poverty, inadequate medical care, poor education and officially sanctioned abuse in schools, correctional institutions, child care facilities and the juvenile justice system. In discussing the attitudes and values of a culture which sanctions violence as a way of life, Gil claimed that the reason there is considerable child abuse in American Society is because the cultural norms of child rearing allow the use of a certain amount of physical force towards children by the adults caring for them.

In short, this "culture-of-violence" theory assumes that there is a system of values which justifies and supports violent behavior in society. This theory also assumes that the more violence present in the social
of which apply to general population.

In general, who are the child abusers? This is a difficult question to answer. Some of the studies categorize child abusers as parents who, as children, experienced deficient childhoods; consequently using on their children the same destructive techniques that were practiced on them. They are individuals who often reverse roles with their children which means the parents expect and demand love and care from their children, but at the same time they have difficulty providing these emotional necessities to their offspring. They are mostly individuals who either suffer from their own childhood or just lack understanding of the needs and abilities of their children. They are individuals usually described as immature, incompetent, anxious, depressed, and untrusting. Other characteristics include a poor self image, little or no self confidence and a low level of control of their aggression.

Again, one should keep in mind that child abuse is seldom, if at all, a result of any one factor. Rather it is a combination of circumstances, personality types and behaviors.

It is difficult to pinpoint which individuals might be abusers. Light (1973) reported a statistical analysis of Gil's original findings using a method which permitted a preliminary isolation of two-variable relationships.
that differentiate child abusing parents from non-abusers. A number of suggestive findings derived from this analysis include the unemployment status of the father which was a discriminating variable that interacted with housing variables:

Abusing families where the father is unemployed are much more likely to live in an apartment than in a house relative to comparable non-abusing families where the father is unemployed... Second, abusing families with an unemployed father or a less educated fathers are much less likely to share their quarters' with other persons of families (p.587).

In short, the fathers' employment was the variable that showed up most often in the Light analysis and is found to be consistent with a sociological emphasis on family stress due to unemployment.

Other studies have been conducted using variables such as family mobility, general economic development, educational level, rural/urban differences and the socio-economic status of mothers in the community (Garbarino, 1974).

Common Personality Characteristics of Child Abusing Parents

Most of the literature regarding classification of child abusing parents is still rather vague in its isolation of the distinctive personality traits of child abusers. Nevertheless, it still seems to be a fashionable strategy to discuss characteristics that are frequently found among child abusing parents. In most of the
literature this pattern involves the listing of personality traits that characterize abusive parents derived either from standardized personality tests or clinical interviews and diagnosis.

To date, the most systematic and well-controlled study of child abusers' personality traits seems to have been that of Melnick and Hurley (1969). Melnick and Hurley compared groups of ten abusive and ten control mothers that were comprised of lower-class black women matched for age, social class education and eighteen other variables. The California Test of Personality (CTP), the Family Concept Inventory (FCI), the Manifest Rejection Scale (index of general harshness of parental disciplinary policies), and twelve TAT cards were used in this study. The test results implied that the abusing mothers revealed lower self-esteem (CTP), less family satisfaction (FCI), a higher pathogenic index (TAT), less need to give nurturance (TAT), higher frustration of need dependence (TAT), and a less openly rejectant stance toward children.

Needless to say even a well-controlled study such as the one conducted by Melnick and Hurley has its limitations. Using such a small and highly select group of mothers leaves doubt as to whether similar traits would be applicable to fathers, middle-class or upper-class parents and other ethnic groups. Therefore, the generalizations inferred from the findings of the
personality tests remains questionable.

Other researchers have also offered their own versions of personalities of abusing parents ranging from rigid and domineering (Johnson and Morse, 1968), to impulsive, immature, self-centered and hypersensitive (Kempe etc, 1962).

However, there has been very little success in compiling a consistent set of personality traits of child abusing parents. Spinetta and Rigler (1972) concluded that:

A review of opinions on parental personality and motivational variables leads to a conglomerate picture. While the authors generally agree that there is a defect in the abusing parents' personality that allows aggressive impulses to be expressed too freely (Dempe etc., 1962; Steele & Pollock, 1968; Wasserman, 1967) disagreement comes in describing the source of the aggressive impulses (p. 299).

In another recent review, Gelles (1973) found that of nineteen traits noted by various researchers, there was agreement by two or more authors on only four traits; the remaining fifteen characteristics being unique to one particular author.

Some studies have attempted to discover clusters of traits (rather than the specific single trait approach) that might adequately characterize child abusing parents (Delsordo, 1963; Merrill, 1962; Zelba, 1967). To this researcher's knowledge, there has not been an attempt to experimentally validate or cross-validate these findings.
Therefore, their usefulness in either detecting high risk parents or in organizing findings from other studies of personality traits remains to be determined.

There are other problems that limit the usefulness of the current literature on the personality traits of child abusing parents. With the exception of a few studies (Melnick and Hurley, 1969), there are no comparison groups of non-abusers that are drawn either from other types of clinical populations or from non-clinical "normal" populations. Therefore, it is difficult to assess whether these traits are unique to child abusing parents. Steele and Pollock commented:

Such adjectives are essentially appropriate when applied to those who abuse children, yet these qualities are so prevalent among people in general that they add little specific understanding (1968, p. 109).

Another problem is that the samples of child abusive individuals used in developing the traits were drawn from a universe of known child abusers only.

Most of the data is gathered from cases that medical or psychiatric practitioners have at hand. Thus, the sample cannot be considered truly representative of child abusers since many or most are not seen in clinics (Gelles, 1973, p. 614).

These and other similar criticisms do not imply that a more carefully conducted study will not reveal specific or unique personality traits that can be useful in screening potential child abusing individuals. But given the evidence of the limited relationships between
personality traits and actual behavior (Mischel, 1968, 1968, 1973) this does not appear to be a very fruitful approach.

The one general conclusion that can be safely drawn from the literature concerning the child abusers' personality is Spinetta and Rigler's:

A general defect in character—from whatever source—is present in the abusing parent allowing aggressive impulses to be expressed too freely (1972, p. 300).

Although there is only limited, if any, agreement on the personality characteristics of abusive parents, nearly all of the studies agree on one aspect; child abusing parents were abused children themselves and that whatever personality traits they might have is related to the distinctive deprivation of a sense of being cared for. According to Steele & Pollock (1968) the lack of mothering, a lack of the deep sense of being cared for and cared about from the beginning of one's life, is the basic factor in the genesis of parental abuse.

The Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale

A number of studies have been conducted examining the relationships between the internal-external locus of control construct dimension and several other personality and behavioral test instruments. The psychological literature reveals an over abundance of interest in locus of control. Researchers indicate that the I-E Scale has proven to be a very fruitful measure in attempting to predict behaviors.

Excellent bibliographies have been prepared by several researchers such as Prociuk and Lussier (1975), Thornhill Thornhill,
and Youngman (1975), MacDonald and Davis (1974), MacDonald (1972), Throop and MacDonald (1971), and others. The studies and bibliographies consist of issues ranging from locus of control measurement to attribution of casualty to academic achievement to alcoholism and drug abuse to cross-cultural comparison (Prociuk, 1975) with application of the I-E Scale. However, to this researcher's knowledge, no studies have been directed at the issue of child abuse employing the I-E Scale.

**Understanding the I-E Concept**

The hundreds of psychological studies that have been conducted using the internal-external locus of control scale have demonstrated the potential applicability of this instrument to most human problems. A forced-choice scale, the I-E was developed by Rotter in 1966. The internal-external locus of control deals with the extent to which people attribute an event to themselves (internals) or to elements and forces outside themselves (externals).

It is important to note that the internal-external locus of control scale does not deal directly with whether an individual feels in control of his behavior but with whether or not the individual believes he can control his environment or reinforcements. In other words, locus of control refers to what a person believes about who is in charge rather than to what is actually true as to how much power a person has. It has been mentioned that the locus of control is too broad a concept and it might simplify things and produce more accurate results if it was broken down somewhat. Levenson (1973) wrote that externals may be of two different types.
Those who believe that events take place by chance and those who believe that events do take place by chance but that powerful others are in control. Levenson's theory has led to the creation of "powerful others and chance scales" which serves as an alternate to differentiate the two externals' situations. Other researchers have developed a test that distinguishes between the internal individual who takes responsibility for any occurrence for purposes of success and the other type of internal individual who blames himself for his failures. However, most studies and experiments on locus of control are still geared to addressing I-E differences on an overall basis. Although it appears that in some studies subdividing the I-E concepts might make the studies less complicated, there is still value in considering simply the overall difference between the two.

Current Status of Theories and Research into the I-E Scale

Since its inception, the internal-external locus of control concept has been considered to be an extremely valuable personality dimension for understanding the role of one's environment in a wide range of situations. For more extensive review of the various areas of research that have been conducted concerning the I-E, the reader is referred elsewhere (Lefcourt, 1976; Rotter, 1966; Joe, 1971). For the purpose of this research particular
interest is directed to studies that have been designed to examine relationships between the I-E concept and personality.

Numerous attempts have been made to link internality/externality to a wide range of personality characteristics. The related literature indicates that an internal is a better adjusted person with better capabilities to cope with social or personal pressures than an external person. Butterfield (1964) and Brissett and Nowicki (1973) have found that internals report more constructive reactions to frustrations than do externals. Internals in contrast to externals demonstrate more coping behavior on a perceptual task (Phares, 1962); score lower on tests of suicide potential (William and Nickels, 1969) and have more accurate information about their environment (Seeman and Evan, 1962). Internals are also more successful in school (Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall, 1965; McGhee and Crandall, 1967) and are less apt to demonstrate extreme and non-adaptive behavior (Du Cetee and Worlck, 1972). Externals do not know themselves and they are less clear about what kinds of people they think they are (Organ, 1973). A study conducted by Jacobs (1976) also concluded that:

The individual who feels that he lacks control over his environment tends to score higher on the neuroticism/psychoticism dimensions while the more internally controlled individual is more likely to have academic and leadership traits (3, pt. 2, 1170).
A study by Warehime and Woodson, (1971) suggested that:

For males, internality was significantly related to feelings of personal freedom, satisfaction with present work, feelings of alertness and clarity of thought processes, acceptance and expression of own needs, and feelings of self-assurance and adequacy regarding one's capabilities. For females, internality was significantly related to general feelings of abundance and satisfaction in the life situation, calmness and freedom from anxiety, and feeling cheerful and free of depression (P. 443).

At this point it is significant to compare locus of control with a number of personal and emotional personality characteristics to determine how the relationship might effect the feelings and the resulting behaviors of child abusing parents with respect to depression and anxiety.

**Depression**

Studies have indicated that externality and depression are related. Research conducted on college students concluded that the more external the student, the more frequently the student reported incidents of depression (Abramowitz, 1969). Warehime and Woodson (1971) reported that externals acknowledge experiencing negative effects including depressive feelings more than internals.

Goss and Morosko (1970) found a positive correlation between external locus of control and depression in their study of the dimension of I-E locus of control and the depressiveness subscale of the MMPI among three samples of alcoholic patients.

The studies conducted so far are, for the most part,
inconclusive and their findings seem rather sketchy. But of the findings that are available, most indicate that externals are more likely to admit to depressive feelings than internals.

**Anxiety**

Available data indicates that those individuals who perceive themselves as internals differ in the ways they deal with or the frequency to which they experience anxiety compared to externals. Joe (1971) concluded that externals perceive themselves as more anxious and less able to overcome frustration than internals. Externals seem to be more preoccupied with fear of failure. Externals also focus on pessimism rather than optimism on the possibility of success. In short, the literature indicates that externals admit to more experience of anxiety than internals (Feather, 1967; Ray and Katahn, 1968; Watson, 1967). Other researchers (Burness, Brown, and Keating, 1971; Goss and Morosko, 1970; Powell and Vega, 1972) have also concluded that externality is related to admission of anxiety and depression.

**Summary**

Experts on social problems, lawyers, social workers, social scientists and writers have acknowledged the fact that the phenomenon of parents abusing their children has been with us a long time. Only recently, however, has a great deal of interest been focused on the topic.
Similarly, a great deal of interest has also surfaced involving confusion of the various issues dealing with child abuse.

There is implication in almost all the literature concerning child abuse that the child abusing parent is abnormal or seriously ill, and that there are unique personality characteristics that distinguish abusing parents from non-abusive parents. Failure to isolate distinctive personality traits of child abusing parents dominates the literature. Similarly, how to go about overcoming this social problem is highly disputed among the experts. Research into the various methods that have been tested for effectiveness to solve the problem is rather sketchy.

Most experts agree that child abusing parents are besieged by depression, anxiety and hostility. Child abusing parents are said to receive very little, if any, support from relatives and friends. Child abusing parents usually expect to be rejected by society and in most cases their expectation is affirmed. They tend to be reversing roles with their offspring in their effort to receive the love and fulfillment they never had during their childhood.

Very few child abusing parents are said to enjoy health social or psychological adjustment or a sound mental health. Those parents who injure their
children were also found to be the ones who revealed anxiety, depression and hostility more than the non-abusive parents.

Economic and social status of child abusing parents in most cases matches their personal outlook and condition. Most of them live in slums with inadequate facilities. The majority are said to be plagued by marital problems, high rate of mobility, social pressure, and unemployment.

Frequently found characteristics among child abusing parents include, immature and dependent personalities, they lack self esteem. They usually are young and have unrealistically high expectations of their children and if the child fails to live up to their expectancies they resort to violence.

There are some prominent problems in approaching child abuse as a social problem. The causes of child abuse, according to literature, is inconsistent. Some authors imply that child abusing parents are sick people in one way or another while others state that child abusing parents are not different from the rest of the population.

Still another problem seems to be the lack of agreement among experts as to the personality traits that characterize the child abusing parents. The fact that most of the research on child abuse in general and the personality make up of the abusers specifically is
only conducted on known child abusers is still another problem that dominates this field. Thus researchers conclude that child abusing parents are emotionally unstable or that they have high levels of aggression. But it is obvious that any parent who injures a child is emotionally unstable and is incapable of aggression control.

Most of the studies (with few exceptions e.g. Melnick and Hurley, 1969) fail to compare child abusing parents with non-abusers to find out whether child abusing parents are indeed different from the rest of the population. Furthermore, the parents that are used in the studies are not truly representative samples of the sub population of child abusers because they are hand picked from clinic files.

In general, understanding the causes of child abuse, isolating the personality traits of child abusers, treatment of child abusing parents and the predicting and/or prevention of child abuse seems to have proven elusive and may even be beyond the reach of the modern social sciences. However, one promising outlook does exist. The awareness of the gravity of the situation and the complexity of child abuse is widely acknowledged which in itself is a preliminary approach to what needs to be known about child abuse and its prevention.

The internal-external locus of control scale has
been used in several studies with a high percentage of
the researches using Rotter's Scale. Detailed reviews are
available in other articles, (Joe, 1971; Lefcourt, 1966
and Rotter, 1966) but it is indicated that there are
individual differences in perception of one's control
over one's destiny in life and that the Rotter's Internal-
External Locus of Control Scale is highly sensitive in
detecting the differences.

Glancing at the available literature Rotter's
Internal-External Locus of Control Scale has been used
more often with college students. It has also been used
frequently with adolescents as well as older people.

The internal-external scale is important to those
dealing with child abusing parents because a parent's
perception of who is in control might affect the way the
parent deals with the child, the way the parent views or
approaches the task and responsibility of parenthood and,
of course, the way a parent feels about himself.

The relationship between internality and externality
and parenthood seems vital because predicting child abuse
and/or preventing it could be evaluated depending on the
parent's internality or externality. Since internals'
outlook on life's pressures differ from that of externals',
these differences should be taken into account when
dealing with the problem of child abuse.
CHAPTER THREE

Method

The particular concerns of this study were the following variables: The dependent variable was an index of written performance on the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale - the degree to which child abusing parents and non-abusers could be categorized as internals/externals. The independent variables were the child abusing parents and non-child abusing parents.

Subjects

The participants for this study were sixteen child abusing parents and sixteen non-child abusing parents to provide a comparison sample. Group one (the child abusing parents) were selected from Parents' Anonymous, a self-help parents' group, Public Social Services Agency, C.A.A.N. (Child Abuse and Neglect) and Interface Community Clinic.

Most of the participants in group one (the child abusing parents) have been convicted of child abuse offenses and attended the above mentioned self-help therapy programs as a condition of their probation. The others attended these programs voluntarily. The sample in both groups contained an equal number of male and female parents.
Subjects in group two (the non-child abusers) were drawn from a variety of sources. These parents were volunteer participants who work at a local community medical clinic and some were homemakers. They have had no record of child abuse offenses.

The test was administered to individuals as well as to small groups comprised of three to six subjects. Both groups were matched by education (twelve years or more), age (twenty to fifty years old), and ethnic background. The two groups were also matched by income level ($5,000-$30,000) except in two cases where the respondents' income exceeded the criterion (see Appendix C).

Instrument

Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was the instrument used to determine the generalized expectancy for internal versus external control of reinforcement.

The instrument consists of twenty-three question pairs, using a forced-choice method, and six filler questions. Internal statements were paired with external statements. One point was given for each external statement chosen; scores ranging from zero (most internal) to twenty-three (most external). The internal-external scale can be completed in about fifteen minutes under standard instruction conditions. The instrument was given at various sessions.
A brief biographical questionnaire was developed and given to subjects to acquire information on age, ethnic background, yearly income, education, number of children, and religious affiliation.

Procedure

The process took six weeks to administer. Testing was done at the North Valley Y.M.C.A. as well as in private homes for group one (the child abusing parents) and at a local clinic and in private homes for group two (the non-child abusers).

Subjects were told what the test was intended to measure. They were also given instructions on how to take the test. The subjects were told that the test could be completed in approximately fifteen minutes but that they could take more time if necessary. The instruction given was as follows:

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 are 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.

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 are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice. Do not be influenced by your previous choices.

Design

This study was a comparison of the degree of internality/externality of child abusing parents versus non-child abusers. The dependent variable was the degree to which child abusers and non-child abusers could be categorized as externals or internals.

The statistics employed in this study were means and standard deviations and a t-test was used to determine statistical significance between the two groups at the .05 level of significance.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between child abuse and the level of internal versus external locus of control of child abusing parents. The following hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance:

Child abusing parents or potential child abusers will exhibit a greater degree of externalization of their feelings and emotions than non-child abusers. Therefore, they tend to blame their environment for their actions and/or mistakes.

Statistical computations were performed at the California State University, Northridge Computer Center. In the experimental group (the child abusing parents), two subjects failed to state their age, and one did not give the annual income. For statistical purposes these subjects were given the mean age and annual income of the group they were in. Two others admitted having taken the test earlier and their test scores were omitted from the study.

The Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was administered to thirty two subjects at various groups sessions as well as to individuals. The two groups' (the child abusing and the non-child abusers) scores were compared using means and standard deviations.
Means and standard deviations of the experimental group (the child abusing parents), and the control group (the non-child abusing parents) are presented in Table I:

**TABLE I**

Means and Standard Deviations of Child Abusing and Non-Child Abusing Parents on the I-E Locus of Control Scale

(N = 16 per group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Abusing Parents</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Child Abusing Parents</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 6.70 \]

High score on the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale means that the subject is more external. When the mean scores were subjected to a t-test for statistical significance the obtained \( t \) of 6.70 was significantly greater than a one-tail critical \( t \) of 1.697 with 30 df. The obtained \( t \) of 6.70 was significant beyond .001. Therefore, the data confirmed the major hypothesis of this study that child abusing parents or potential child abusers will exhibit a greater degree of externalization of their feelings and emotions than non-
child abusers. Thus they tend to blame their environment for their actions and/or mistakes.

Discussion of the Results

The result of this study indicates that child abusing parents are external which suggests that they perceive themselves as alienated, helpless individuals who feel they are at the mercy of their environment. As Rotter pointed out:

The alienated individual feels unable to control his own destiny. He is a small cog in a big machine and at the mercy of forces too strong or too vague to control (1972, p. 263).

A closer look at the magnitude of the within group's standard deviations of the child abusing parents' group strongly suggests the similarity of the group on the external scale.

The finding of this study established a relationship between child abusive behaviors and externality which suggests that child abusing parents lack a commendable control of their emotions and actions. DeCharms (1968) explained, externals are people who perceive their behavior to be determined by external forces.

The main substance of the internal-external locus of control concept is that individuals place the controlling factors in their lives inside or outside of themselves. Therefore, the individual who believes he can control his destiny places his control internally
while the individual who believes whatever happens to him is based on luck or some sort of external force is placing his control externally.

The internal-external locus of control does not determine whether or not an individual is in fact in control of his behavior. But it does indicate whether or not an individual believes he is in charge and the extent to which he perceives the power he possesses in controlling his destiny.

The above concept is important in understanding the problem of child abuse. A parent's belief as to who is in control (therefore who is threatening) will affect the way that parent deals with his child and others as well as affecting the perceived concept of himself as an individual.

Studies have linked internality/externality to a range of personality characteristics. Studies indicate that internals are better adjusted individuals with a better ability to cope with daily social or personal pressures than externals. Internals reveal more constructive reactions to frustrations than do externals (Butterfield 1964; Brissett and Nowicki 1973). And, internals demonstrate more coping behavior on a perceptual task (Phares, 1962) score lower on tests of suicide potential (William and Nickels, 1969), have more accurate information about their environment (Seeman and Evan, 1962)
and they are less apt to demonstrate extreme and non-adaptive behavior (DuCette and Worlk, 1972). A study by Jacobs (1976) also concluded that externals tend to score higher on the neuroticism/psychoticism dimensions than internals.

To summarize this study's significant findings:

A relationship exists between externality and child abusive behaviors. And, among other factors, the child abusing parents' perception of who is in control and who should be held responsible for one's action is important to all social scientists if the problem of child abuse is to be solved.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The main concern of this study was whether child abusing parents or potential child abusing parents will score significantly higher on the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale than non-child abusers.

The findings established a statistically significant relationship between externality and child abusive behaviors.

On several occasions researchers have linked personality traits of child abusing parents to those behaviors associated with externality. Some of the characteristics and behaviors attributed to child abusers are that they are highly self-centered, have low self esteem, less satisfaction with family and life in general, higher level of frustration of need dependence, immaturity, impulsivness, and insecurity. These qualities are also prevalent among people who perceive themselves as externals.

The correlation between the I-E and child abuse established in this study lends support to a need for research relating personality variables to the study of child abusive behaviors.

It was hypothesized that child abusing parents or potential abusers will exhibit a greater degree of externalization of their feelings and emotions than non-
child abusing parents. Therefore they tend to blame their
environment for their actions and/or mistakes.

During the Spring 1977 thirty-two subjects were
tested using the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of
Control Scale as the instrument. There were twenty-three
items and six fillers.

The test was administered to both child abusers and
non-child abusers. A questionnaire was developed for the
purpose of matching the experimental group to the
control group.

The data was then analyzed using means and standard
deviations, and a t-test to determine statistical
significance between the two groups at the .05 level
of significance. The dependent variable was the degree
to which child abusing parents and non-child abusers could
be categorized as external or internal. The independent
variable was the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of
Control Scale.

Results revealed that child abusing parents are
more external than non-child abusers.

The findings in this study indicate that there is
a significant relationship between externality and child
abusive behaviors.
Conclusions

Although at first glance the whole picture of the problem of child abuse seems simple to understand, causes and effects of child abuse are obscure. Social workers, physicians, psychologists, law enforcement agencies all have different versions of how they perceive the problem. The parents, on the other hand, tend to exhibit feelings of failure. And little, if any, is known about the children's view. Therefore child abuse seems to be plagued by myths, tragedies, fears of punishment, fears of criticism, and rejection.

The findings of this study were quite clear - that abusive parents or potential abusers are more external in the way they perceive themselves than non-child abusers.

The data also has emphasized the importance as well as the sensitivity of the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale in producing a reliable result for the detection and prevention of child abuse. Furthermore, the findings of this study have provided support for the use of the I-E scale in determining which parents are more likely to be child abusers and in the identification of potential abusers based on the extent of internality/externality within the individual.

Even with enough skilled experts, a well articulated theory that would aid in solving the problem of child abuse could be missing a method of identifying child
abusers or potential abusers. The importance of early identification of child abusers should be the first step in any comprehensive treatment program. But to fully accomplish this goal it is necessary to have the appropriate tools, methods and resources to work with in identifying the abusive parents. As it stands now, the child abusing parent is given "another chance" with the child. This "second chance" then becomes a permission or a license to further abuse the child. This is due to lack of sufficient resources for prediction, diagnosis, treatment and/or prevention of child abusive behaviors in parents.

It is apparent that no one has the simple formula that will produce all the answers to the problem of child abuse. But the internal-external locus of control might be one way to arrive at some reliable and workable answers. These answers might, among other things, include assessing and evaluating the emotional state of parents and prospective parents and devising the appropriate preventive programs should they become necessary. By understanding the characteristics of the internally or externally oriented individual it might be possible to perceive what triggers the violent actions in the parent and what should be done to combat that rage.

There seems to be no pattern of child abuse. It occurs in all walks of life - college graduates, low,
middle, high income people, professionals or school dropouts as well as all ethnic, religious and cultural groups. Therefore, the traditional explanation of child abuse being a problem associated with certain ethnic groups and the poor or the uneducated is a thing of the past.

The internal-external locus of control scale could be helpful in developing a method of finding the differential factors which might be helpful in identifying which parents are capable of the responsibilities of parenthood. Besides helping to make a safe home for children this information could be used to identify parents who need help early enough, before child abuse occurs.

There must be a way of discovering which children need protection from their parents and which parents need help in coping with parenthood.

All the currently available method does is protect a child that might be in danger after the first incidence. This is assuming the child has already been abused and identified as such by physicians or other authorities. This also implies that the reporting physicians should have a well documented evidence of child abuse. Not only are these types of charges difficult to prove but punishing the parents might precipitate further acts of abuse rather than change their behavior. Also, should these charges fail to stick then the parents may feel
even more justified to continue abusing the child. Furthermore, the exposure that is caused by the charges against them could also make it more difficult to help these parents.

**Implications**

The finding of this study suggests that child abusing parents are more external than non-child abusers. Thus their perception of themselves and their environment are significantly related to that of an external individual's. They exhibit feelings of little or no personal freedom, dissatisfaction with their self concept or status in life, little or no feeling of alertness and clarity of thought process. They also tend to avoid responsibilities for their behavior by blaming it on luck or some sort of external force, and reject or deny their needs while experiencing feelings of low self image and self assurance, insecurity, and a high sense of inadequacy regarding their capabilities to parenthood or other daily pressures.

On the other hand, the data revealed that the behaviors of non-child abusing parents in this study appears to be that of an internal individual. Feelings of satisfaction in their life situation, calmness and freedom from anxiety and depression, and feeling cheerful and secure, willing to take responsibility for their actions and ability to cope with daily personal and social pressures (Warehime and Woodson, 1971).
The data would suggest that child abusing parents like themselves very little and feel others do not like them either which is one of the many characteristics of externals (Bryant, 1972).

According to Organ (1973) externals do not know themselves; they are less clear about what kinds of people they think they are. These parents, then have less chance of appreciating and enjoying life or their children as they are. Thus when a child is not what they believe he or she should be these parents are likely to easily loose control and resort to violence. Since these parents do not believe they assume any responsibility for their own life (because external forces control success, failure, or events in general), they do not try or are unable to change their behavior or their environment to suit their needs. The question then arises, what sort of change is best in solving the problem of child abuse? Changing the child abuser's behavior so he or she can cope better or changing the overall social environment to make it more responsive to the abuser's needs and provide an atmosphere that will facilitate growth of internal behaviors? Future research might provide some definite answers to these questions,
What it all Means in Terms of Counseling

Identifying and categorizing parents as internals or externals is hardly worthwhile in any research unless it means something in terms of helping child abusers once they are identified. What then does the data from this study mean in terms of counseling child abusing parents? Assuming that implementation of internality is desireable and helpful in solving child abuse, what can counselors do to help develop an atmosphere in which a feeling of internal control is provided to potential or abusive parents?

It is important for a counselor to help these parents acquire a feeling of internal control to facilitate responsible behaviors and to help them enjoy life and things as they are as well as help them get the feeling that they are able to change themselves or their environment for the better. Helping to increase the internal orientation of child abusing parents then seems to be a reasonable goal in counseling.

Limitations

Following analysis of the data and their interpretations certain limitations should be taken into account. It should be noted that further research on the question of child abuse and internality/externality is certainly needed and this study should be treated with caution until such time.
Although participants were instructed to select the statements they believed to be true, some had difficulty avoiding selection of statements they thought they should choose or the one they would have liked to be true on the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale test.

Because of limited resources, all the possible variables that might have been applicable were not tested. Questions that might have shed more light into the study and the problem of child abuse and how to solve it but were not examined in this study include:

1. What were the conditions that led to the development of more externality in some parents and not in others?
2. What is the relationship between parenthood and externality; did the pressures of parenthood cause these parents to become externals or would they have scored as high as they did before they became parents?

Suggestions & Recommendations for Future Research

The correlation between the internal-external locus of control and child abusive behaviors lends support to a need for further research relating personality variables to the study of child abusive behaviors.

Therefore, this study has provided a new research
idea as well as raise questions for further research. The study has suggested that extensive research and investigation is needed in the study and prevention of child abuse by using the Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale.

Further study into the implementation of a program of identifying, treating and educating parents aimed towards predicting and preventing child abuse is needed. Professionals seem to doubt that prevention of child abuse is possible at all. It is true that the complete prevention might be difficult to achieve. However, this study suggests that the I-I construct can be the first step towards reaching the objective of prevention of child abuse by identifying certain abusive characteristics in parents.

Furthermore, investigation into the possibility of helping child abusing parents to change their locus of control might not be sufficient in itself to solve the problem of child abuse, but it seems to be necessary. Thus, further research is suggested into the possibility of creating a safe environment in which these parents can feel in control of their destiny rather than feel threatened by it.

It might also be important to consider the feasibility of a method of predicting child abuse by using the I-E scale during pre-pregnancy or pre-child birth counselings.
Research dealing with the most workable method of solving child abuse should also be considered. Is it more feasible to try to change the abusers' behavior so they can cope better or is it more feasible to try to change the overall social environment to make it more responsive to their needs and/or provide an atmosphere that will facilitate growth of internal behaviors?
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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 one is 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 on how nice a person you are.
21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good 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.
KEY

I. AGE:
   1. 20 - 30 years old
   2. 30 - 40 years old
   3. 40 - 50 years old
   4. 50 years and over

II. ETHNIC BACKGROUND:
   1. Black
   2. Caucasian
   3. Mexican-American
   4. Other

III. ANNUAL INCOME
   1. Under $5,000
   2. $5,000 - 15,000
   3. $15,000 - 20,000
   4. $20,000 - 30,000
   5. $30,000 - 40,000
   6. $40,000 and over

IV. EDUCATION:
   1. 1 - 8 years
   2. 8 - 12 years
   3. 12 or more years
APPENDIX C

Personality Inventories and
I-E Scale Score Distribution for:
Group I, Child Abusers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS NO.</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</th>
<th>ANNUAL INCOME</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>I-E SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Personality Inventories and I-E Scale Score Distribution for:
Group II, Non-Abusers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS NO.</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</th>
<th>ANNUAL INCOME</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>I-E SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>