

1-1-1977

Locus of control, social activism and sex roles among island Puerto Rican college and non-college individuals.

Julia Mercedes Ramos-McKay
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Ramos-McKay, Julia Mercedes, "Locus of control, social activism and sex roles among island Puerto Rican college and non-college individuals." (1977). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 1657. <https://doi.org/10.7275/scxt-sh76> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/1657

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

LOCUS OF CONTROL, SOCIAL ACTIVISM AND SEX ROLES
AMONG ISLAND PUERTO RICAN COLLEGE AND NON-COLLEGE INDIVIDUALS

A Dissertation Presented

By

JULIA MERCEDES RAMOS-MCKAY

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

June 1977

Psychology

© Julia Mercedes Ramos-McKay 1977

All Rights Reserved

LOCUS OF CONTROL, SOCIAL ACTIVISM AND SEX ROLES
AMONG ISLAND PUERTO RICAN COLLEGE AND NON-COLLEGE INDIVIDUALS

A Dissertation Presented

By

JULIA M. RAMOS-MCKAY

Approved as to style and content by:

Bonnie R. Strickland
Bonnie R. Strickland, Chairperson of Committee

Vonnie McLoyd
Vonnie McLoyd, Member

Castellano B. Turner
Castellano B. Turner, Member

Barbara F. Turner
Barbara Turner, Member

Ernest Washington
Ernest Washington, Member

Bonnie R. Strickland
Bonnie R. Strickland, Chairperson
Psychology Department

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Bonnie Strickland for the encouragement and many helpful suggestions which she gave on all aspects of this research. I would also like to thank Dr. Vonnie McLoyd, Dr. Barbara Turner, Dr. Castellano Turner, and Dr. Ernest Washington, for their invaluable suggestions and time.

Heartfelt appreciation goes to the Puerto Rican individuals who participated in this study. Many thanks also to Mrs. Blanca Estrada de Perdomo, director of the Centro Destrezas Ocupacionales, and Dr. Edward Richardson, director of the Department of Social Services at the Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, who gave me the opportunity to conduct the research.

Two very special individuals must not go unmentioned: first, Mrs. Helen Lansberg, who was invaluable in the data analysis, giving freely of her knowledge and time; and Mrs. Sara Ives, who prepared the manuscript at lightning speed.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother- and father-in-law, and my parents, who have stood by me through this whole endeavor and who did not hesitate in helping with the many thankless jobs which accompany all research. And, I would like to thank my husband, Ray, without whom this task would have been extremely difficult and who has given me something greater and more important--his love.

ABSTRACT

Locus of Control, Social Activism and Sex Roles
among Island Puerto Rican College and Non-College Individuals

(June 1977)

Julia Mercedes Ramos-McKay, B.A., University of Connecticut
M.S., University of Massachusetts, Ph.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Bonnie Strickland

Puerto Rican male ($n = 106$) and female ($n = 81$) island college and non-college individuals were compared on three variables: 1) Locus of Control, 2) Social Activism, and 3) Sex Roles. Subjects (Ss) were asked to fill out a questionnaire consisting of a personal data blank, the Rotter Internal-External Scale, the Gurin et al. Scale, the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Simple comparisons were performed with the data from each of the scales in order to test the hypotheses. On the variable of locus of control, no significant differences were found with the Rotter Scale data on any of the hypothesized comparisons. With the Gurin et al. Scale, both hypotheses generated were accepted. A posteriori comparisons with this scale resulted in a significant difference between college activists and non-college activists. Comparisons between the results of the present research and of a previous study indicated that a difference existed between mainland and island Puerto Ricans with the mainland individuals being significantly more adaptively external. Chi squares computed on the four factors of the Gurin et al. Scale also indicated the existence of such a difference. With the sex role scales, it was found that college females were only significantly different from

non-college males in both attitude toward the role of women and sex-role self-concepts. In the comparisons between the island and mainland groups, although several significant differences existed in attitude toward the role of women, only one comparison was significant on the PAQ. Island non-college males were significantly more liberal in sex-role self-concepts than mainland non-college males. Also presented were the results of personal taped interviews with some of the Ss concerning relevant issues on the island. The results of the study were discussed in light of the culture and the experiences of Puerto Ricans on the island and the mainland.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I. Review of the Literature and Statement of the Problem.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Historical Background of the Island.....	2
Cultural Background.....	14
Locus of Control and Social Activism.....	16
Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles.....	23
Purpose of Study and Hypotheses.....	25
CHAPTER II. Method.....	29
Subjects.....	29
Procedure.....	31
Personal Interviews.....	33
Design.....	34
Measures.....	34
CHAPTER III. Results.....	39
Locus of Control.....	39
Interviews on Social Activism.....	45
Comparisons Between the Previous Study Results and Present Study Results on the Rotter and Gurin <u>et al.</u> Scales.....	46
Gurin <u>et al.</u> Factors.....	50
Sex Role and Attitudes toward Women.....	54
Comparisons between the Previous Study Results and Present Study Results on the AWS and PAQ Scales.....	59
Other Sources of Variability.....	61
Personal Interviews.....	63

CHAPTER iv. Discussion.....	72
Locus of Control.....	72
Sex Roles and Attitudes toward Women.....	79
Other Sources of Variability.....	83
Conclusions.....	84
References.....	86
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire.....	93
APPENDIX B. Interview Format.....	117
APPENDIX C. Additional Tables.....	119
APPENDIX D. Personal Interview Questions.....	132

List of Tables

Table 1.	Age Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations.....	30
Table 2.	Cell Categories and n's.....	35
Table 3.	Range, Mean and Standard Deviations for Each Scale.....	40
Table 4.	Locus of Control Single df Comparisons.....	41
Table 5.	Locus of Control Single df Comparisons--Island Male/ Female.....	43-44
Table 6.	Locus of Control Single df Comparisons--Mainland/ Island Puerto Ricans.....	48
Table 7.	Frequencies, Percentages, Chi Squares and Levels of Significance for the four Gurin <u>et al.</u> Factors.....	52
Table 8.	Frequencies, Percentages, Chi Squares, and Levels of Significance for the four Gurin <u>et al.</u> Factors.....	53
Table 9.	Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles Single df Com- parisons--Island Puerto Ricans.....	55
Table 10.	PAQ Categories--Frequencies for Male/Female College and Non-College.....	56
Table 11.	Attitude toward Women and Sex Roles Single df Com- parisons--Mainland/Island Puerto Ricans.....	60
Table 12.	Taped Interview Results--College.....	64
Table 13.	Taped Interview Results--Non-College.....	68

CHAPTER I

Review of the Literature and Statement of the Problem

Introduction

For many years, researchers have been interested in studying the psychological differences that exist between various cultural groups (Parsons & Schneider, 1974). The absence of one particular cultural group, the Puerto Ricans, from much of this research is surprising in view of the fact that, at present, the Puerto Rican population on the United States mainland is estimated to number well over a million, with other 2.8 million living on the island (Wagenheim, 1970). Given this fact, it has now become important that those researchers who continue to be interested in cross-cultural differences turn a questioning eye toward the Puerto Rican culture as it exists here on the mainland, as well as on the island.

Once interest in Puerto Rico is generated, a number of questions arise. Why do Puerto Ricans come to the mainland? What are the results of their experiences here? And what about the Puerto Ricans who remain on the island? How do their experiences differ from mainland Puerto Ricans, and what are the results of these different experiences? It is a historical fact that Puerto Ricans have never been masters in their own home, being ruled first by Spain and then by the United States. The oppression that exists in Puerto Rico is political and economic in nature; as a result, young Puerto Ricans, particularly at the college level, have challenged American imperialism and demanded that the island be set free. It would be of interest to determine, therefore, how the separate

realities of the two Puerto Rican groups have served to bring about attitudinal changes. An earlier study (Ramos-McKay, 1976) examined a number of variables within the Puerto Rican population on the mainland. The present study is an attempt to extend this research to the Puerto Rican community on the island.

Historical Background of the Island

The first inhabitants of the island were the Indians. According to Alegria (1969), the Indians who first settled in Puerto Rico (at that time called Boriquen) may have been part of the group of Indians believed by anthropologists to have come from Asia and settled in North, Central and South America. These Indians, probably part of the Arwak group believed to have been living in the section of the United States now called Florida, may have reached Puerto Rico on rafts about 2,500 years ago. Other, more advanced groups of Indians later arrived on the island and, in time, incorporated the original group. By 1493, when Columbus discovered the island on his second voyage, the Indians who lived there were a peace loving group called Tainos (in their language this meant "the good ones") who existed primarily through agriculture.

The Indian government at that time consisted of a cacique (chief) and his/her nitainos (warriors and wise men who advised the cacique). The cacique was the ultimate authority in politics, religion and job assignment, deciding who was going to perform which job and distributing all goods equally among the people of the village. Upon the death of the chief, the heir was the oldest of his/her sister's children. If s/he had no nephews or nieces, the nitainos then chose a chief from

among the bravest warriors. War occurred only when the Tainos were attacked by the fierce, cannibalistic Caribs, who came from neighboring islands.

From this description, it can be seen that, until the 15th Century, the Puerto Rican Indians were a peaceful group of people who worked the land and waged war only when life and land were threatened. Such a threat developed with the advent of the Spanish conquerors.

It was on his second voyage of discovery, on November 19, 1493, that Columbus discovered the island of Boriquen. He named the island San Juan Bautista¹ (St. John the Baptist) and claimed it under the flag of Spain, then continuing his voyage and leaving the island which was virtually forgotten for fifteen years. On August 12, 1508, Juan Ponce de Leon embarked on the colonization of the island in the name of Spain.

After being hospitably received by the cacique of the town where he came ashore, Ponce de Leon asked the chief to plant a field of yucca for the King of Spain. He then continued to look for a suitable place to establish his colony. He encountered many difficulties and relied heavily on the Indians to provide food for his settlers. As they became comfortable in the new land, their reliance on the hospitable Indians ended and the Spaniards came to see them as so much cheap labor which they could use for their own means. The Indians, however, did not turn out to be as cooperative as expected and the Spaniards, unhappy with

¹This name was later given to the settlement established by Ponce de Leon and the name of the settlement, "Puerto Rico" (Rich Port), became the name of the island.

Indians' lack of acceptance of forced labor and the white man's faith, turned to their queen for help in this matter. Queen Isabella's answer came in the form of an edict which set the foundation for the "encomienda" (commandership) system. In this edict, the queen commanded the governor to "compel and force" the Indians to accept the Christian faith and to work for the settlers and, in return, they were to be paid a wage, but the work that they did was to be done as free people and not as slaves. They were to be treated well and no one was to harm or oppress them.

The good intentions of the queen were not shared by her subjects thousands of miles away and the governor, disregarding the actual intent of the edict, ordered each chief to turn over a number of his/her people to work, supposedly, for wages and receive instruction in the Catholic faith. The wages which the Indians received, however, were meagre and the religious instruction non-existent. The Indians were divided up like cattle and parceled out to the Spaniards. According to Irving (1828), the men were separated from their families and taken to work quite a distance away. They were fed on scraps and made to perform backbreaking work. If they escaped, they were hunted down like animals and put in chains. Due to these conditions, the majority died, but those who survived were allowed to return home until the next work term. Because their homes were usually far away and they had no provisions, worn down by the hard labor and poor conditions, many died on the road. Irving quotes Las Casas, a friar who fought for the freedom of the Indians: "I have found many dead in the road, others gasping under the trees, and others in the pangs of death, faintly crying, Hunger! Hun-

ger!" The ones who reached their homes often found that their families had either died or gone, and they had nothing left to do but lie down at the threshold of their empty homes and die of despair and exhaustion. Irving concludes his account:

. . . Suffice it to say, that, so intolerable were the toils and suffering inflicted upon this weak and unoffending race, that they sank under them, dissolving, as it were, from the face of the earth. Many killed themselves in despair, and even mothers overcame the powerful instincts of nature, and destroyed the infants at their breasts, to spare them a life of wretchedness. Twelve years had not elapsed since the discovery of the island, and several hundred thousand of its native inhabitants had perished, miserable victims to the grasping avarice of the white man.

Believing the white men to be gods, the Indians accepted all the atrocities committed by them until, seeing the decimation of their people, they decided to test this belief. The opportunity for the test appeared in Salcedo, a young Spanish gentleman, who asked a group of Indians to carry him across a river. The Indians did so but half-way across they dropped him and held him under water for several hours. After this, they took him ashore and watched him for a day, asking his forgiveness all the while since they were afraid that he might still be alive. When Salcedo showed no signs of life, they were convinced of his mortality and sent word to their chief who spread the news. Shortly thereafter, the Indians staged an uprising against the Spaniards but they were no match for their modern war implements, and even though the Indians allied themselves with their former enemies, the Caribs, the rebellion was crushed and many of them fled to neighboring islands. There were 30-50,000 Indians on the island (Morales Carrion, 1968) when the

Spaniards arrived. By 1797, however, approximately 2,312 remained (Brau, 1956). In spite of this, the rebellion was not in vain since it served to prove that the Indians were not as docile as the Spaniards believed, and in 1502 the Indians were freed.

Along with this extermination of the Indians, many of the Spaniards intermarried with them and the slaves who were later brought to take over the labor formerly performed by the Indians. From this intermarriage emerged a distinct, Puerto Rican personality type called *criollos*. These individuals adapted themselves to the climate and developed a simple, independent life-style which incorporated the peaceful attitude of the Indians. Their loyalty, therefore, was to Puerto Rico, which they called their "amada patria" (beloved homeland), rather than to Spain. But the reality was that Spain was still the ruler and Puerto Rico a colony. Political conditions on the island depended upon the political conditions in Europe and rights were given or taken away according to the fluctuations on the continent.

Some Puerto Ricans did not accept the colonial situation and a group of pro-independence patriots demanded the independence of Puerto Rico from Spain. Among these, the most vocal was Dr. Ramon Emeterio Betances who, during exile from Puerto Rico for his subversive ideas, wrote the following declaration of independence:

PUERTO RICANS!. . . The government of Queen Isabella is making a terrible accusation against us:

It says that we are bad Spaniards. The government is spreading falsehoods.

We do not want separation; we want peace and union with Spain; but it is only fair that we should also specify the conditions in the contract. They are very simple.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY

THE RIGHT TO REJECT ALL TAXES
 FREEDOM OF RELIGION
 FREEDOM OF SPEECH
 FREEDOM OF THE PRESS
 FREEDOM OF COMMERCE
 THE RIGHT TO ASSEMBLE
 THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS
 THE INVIOABILITY OF THE CITIZEN
 THE RIGHT TO ELECT OUR AUTHORITIES
 These are the
 Ten COMMANDMENTS
 of Free Men

If Spain feels capable of giving us these rights and freedoms, and does so, then it may send us a captain general or governor. . . made of straw, and we shall hang him, and have him burned during the days of carnestolandas, to commemorate all the Judases who, until today, have sold us out.

Thus, we shall be Spaniards. If not, NO.

If not, Puerto Ricans, PATIENCE! You shall be free.

Dr. Betances

St. Thomas, November 1867

Revolution was in the air and pro-independence groups began to plan for the takeover of the island. In 1868, however, Betances was apprehended in route to Puerto Rico with a boatload of arms and ammunition. Plans on the island were also discovered and many of the leaders arrested but one, Manuel Rojas, was not and on September 23, at 9 p.m. he marched on Lares and took over the town. In the history of Puerto Rico, this is known as the "Grito de Lares" (Cry at Lares) which is Puerto Rico is as significant as "The shot heard round the world." The insurrection, however, was short-lived and the rebels were defeated by the Spanish soldiers. Corretjer (1968) does not see this defeat as a total failure and writes:

The Lares insurrection has been pointed out as the historical moment in which Puerto Rico's nationhood was defined. Our nationalist leaders and theoreticians have maintained that that is the deep meaning of the Lares insurrection. National thought had developed enough to see independence as a neces-

sary condition to solve Puerto Rico's social and economic problems, and national will sufficiently developed to carry this understanding to what some consider its logical conclusion of separation by force of arms.

History, Puerto Rican life itself, shows nothing was again the same in Puerto Rico after Lares. The Spaniard became Spaniard and the Puerto Rican, Puerto Rican. . . .

The insurrection also convinced the Spanish government of the strong desire for more independence of the Puerto Ricans and, in 1897, it allowed an autonomous government to be set up on the island. This government was composed of some of the best known Puerto Rican political figures of the era and served for about five months, until July 25, 1898, when General Nelson A. Miles landed at Guanica with his North-american troops. On September 13, 1898, while aboard the steamer "Philadelphia" as it left Puerto Rico, a Puerto Rican writer, Eugenio Maria de Hostos, wrote in his diary words which were reflective of the feelings of many other Puerto Ricans:

. . . I grieved for her, and with her, for her beauty and misfortune. I thought how noble it would have been to see her free by her own efforts, and how sad, and crushing, and shameful it was to see her change from one master to another, without ever being her own. . . .

The Spanish-American War of 1898 was the first step taken by the United States towards a world-wide imperialism which was to culminate in the entanglement in Southeast Asia. Landing at Guanica, the American troops established their headquarters in Ponce. On July 29, General Miles (1898) issued a general proclamation which was to explain the plans that the United States had for the island. In it, he indicated the good will of the United States toward the Puerto Ricans and the fact

that they were there to liberate them from Spanish oppression. The United States was not there to interfere with the laws and customs of the island but to ". . .give all. . .the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization."

The Puerto Rican leaders were optimistic and the general public rejoiced at the invasion. On the United States mainland, however, opinions were not as positive. Concerning the proposed self-government on the island, an editorial in the New York Times (1898) spoke out against "putting votes into the hands of men who can make no intelligent use of them. A few years of experimenting with the natives will instruct them in the duties of freemen and ourselves in regard to their capacities." If the feeling toward the Puerto Rican people was negative, the feeling toward the island itself was not and another article in the New York Times (1898) called it "a highly productive island. . . yielding coffee, sugar, fruits, nuts and tobacco," adding that "the business of the country is in an unusually sound and healthy condition." Opinions about what to do with Puerto Rico, pro and con, were presented from all sides. Carroll (1900), in a special report to President McKinley, asked the United States to "Let Puerto Rico have local self-government. . .and she will gain by her blunders, just as cities and States in our own glorious Republic are constantly learning." Foraker (1900), on the other hand, felt that the Puerto Ricans "have had no experience that would qualify them. . .for the great task of organizing a government, with all the important bureaus and departments needed by the people of Puerto Rico."

In 1898, Governor-General Henry charged that the members of the

Autonomous Council set up by the Spanish government were uncooperative and disbanded the council. Resentment began to develop on the island and an article in the Puerto Rican newspaper, *La Democracia* (1899) warned: "Let the generals from the North remember that they were greeted as friends, they should not labor in a way that tomorrow will cause the Germans or Russians to be so welcomed."

It became evident that the United States was not about to let Puerto Rico be free, self-governing or a State in the Union. The trust which Puerto Ricans had placed on American democracy began to diminish and the words of Mariano Abril (1892) written six years before the beginning of the Spanish-American War proved to be prophetic:

To believe that the yankees will grant us all their freedoms and all their progress just for our pretty face is nonsense. Yes, they would grant us those liberties which they judged to be adequate, in exchange for guaranteed and ample exploitation. Yes, we would have elevated trains crossing our streets; big, beautiful ports, with jetties and docks; bigger factories and commerce than ever before; but all of this in their hands; taken over and exploited by them; because all those things are not achieved without large amounts of capital, which would be yankee capital, because there is nothing here to support such enterprises. And, after a few years, industry, commerce, and even our agriculture, would be monopolized by the yankees, and the Antillean would be reduced to the condition of a miserable tenant farmer, without a homeland, without a home, and without fortune. . . . And, as for liberties, we would have a yankee army, a yankee navy, a yankee police, and yankee courts, because they would need all of this to protect their interests. And this rich and beautiful Castillian would disappear from our lips, to be substituted for by the cold, barren English language. . . .

The Foraker Act, passed by Congress on April 12, 1900, made provisions for three governing bodies on the island: a governor appointed by the President of the United States, an executive Council composed of

11 Presidentially appointed members and requiring only five of these positions for Puerto Ricans, and a Chamber of Delegates with 35 popularly elected members. It was evident that the real power on the island was in the hands of the governor and the six Americans on the Executive Council since the Chamber could only deal with minor local affairs. For representation in Washington, the people could elect a Resident Commissioner who would represent them in Congress with a voice but no vote. Realizing their lack of power in their own country, the members of the House of Delegates protested by refusing to pass the appropriations bill for the following year's budget. This protest resulted in a strong rebuke from President Taft who said to Congress: "In the desire of certain of their leaders for political power, Porto Ricans have forgotten the generosity of the United States in its dealings with them. . .the present development is only an indication that we have gone somewhat too fast in the extension of political power to them for their own good."

Despair mounted on the island as pleas to the American government went unheard. When a group of island leaders went to speak with President Taft about increasing local participation in government affairs, the President, after a large meal, fell asleep while the Puerto Rican leaders were speaking with him.

Boyce (1914) apparently spoke for the American leaders when he stated: "It would not be the better part of wisdom for us to surrender the government entirely into their hands, since they are of a different civilization, not looking upon matters of government in the same light as the Anglo-Saxons. They really have no conception of the true meaning of equality and liberty." The American definition of "equality and lib-

erty" became clear in 1917 when Congress passed the Jones Act which made all Puerto Ricans American citizens. Puerto Ricans had a "choice." They could give up their own citizenship and accept American citizenship, or they could reject it. Those who chose the latter, however, would not be able to vote or hold public office on the island and would become aliens in their own country.

In the years that passed, Puerto Rico's pleas for statehood or independence were discouraged by the United States in spite of the opinion at that time that the Americanization of the people and country was the answer to the dilemma. Luis Munoz Marin (1929), who later became the first Puerto Rican governor on the island, was not optimistic about this possibility:

Will this ever come about? Will the island retain its historical personality? An unqualified answer to either of these questions would necessarily fall short of the possibilities. Perhaps a more absurd fate is in store for us. Perhaps we are destined to be neither Porto Ricans nor Americans, but merely puppets of a mongrel state of mind, susceptible to American thinking and proud of Latin thought, subservient to American living and worshipful of the ancestral way of life. Perhaps we are to discuss Cervantes and eat pork and beans in the Child's restaurant that must be opened sooner or later. Perhaps we will try not to let mother catch us reading the picaresque verses of Quevedo. Perhaps we are going to a singularly fantastic and painless hell in our own sweet way. Perhaps all this is nothing but a foretaste of Pan-Americanism.

And his words, too, proved to be prophetic.

The United States began to foster economic investment on the island and gradually the main product and industries in Puerto Rico, sugar, tobacco, coffee, fruits, etc., were taken over by absentee owners who were only interested in making large profits. The island also became the

largest importer of American goods.

The words of Abril were becoming a reality. The liberties granted by the United States were paid for in the opportunity to exploit the natural resources of the island. All of the products of civilization: electricity, telephones, big factories, and modern medicine were all in the hands of American companies and organizations. The police was patterned after American ideas of law enforcement, and the courts controlled by the United States government. The rest of his predictions came true after July 25, 1952, when Puerto Rico became an Estado Libre Asociado (Free Associated State) and entered into its present status.

Some Puerto Ricans were no longer willing to wait for the results of promises made long ago by the United States. Angry at the injustices on the island, a group of individuals, led by Pedro Albizu Campos, formed the Nationalist movement. On October 30, 1950, the same year that President Truman signed Law 600 allowing Puerto Ricans to draft their own constitution, five armed Nationalists attacked the governor's mansion in San Juan and bloody uprisings occurred throughout the island. On November 1, of the same year, two Puerto Rican Nationalists attempted to assassinate President Truman. In spite of the protests by Nationalists groups and other Puerto Rican leaders, the Commonwealth Constitution was passed by a majority of the people on November 3, 1952.

After World War II, when the economy on the mainland was on an upward swing, Puerto Ricans began to leave the island in search of a better life for themselves and their families. The economic conditions in Puerto Rico had improved but unemployment was still high, higher than on the mainland where, relatives on the island were informed, jobs were

available.

Cultural Background

Of this migration to the mainland, Maldonado-Denis writes:

This mass emigration is a forced emigration in the greatest number of cases. Due both to the high degree of unemployment and to the colonial government's encouragement of emigration, the country's poorest inhabitants are forced by circumstances to submit to an even worse ordeal in a society which scorns them.

Coming primarily from rural areas of the island, Puerto Ricans find themselves living in slums where their style of life and method of communication are no longer applicable. Maldonado-Denis states: "The result is the phenomenon of alienation: a feeling of impotence and fatalism in the face of the surrounding world."

This fatalistic aspect, however, is not a mainland phenomenon. In Puerto Rico, beginning at birth, Puerto Ricans are instructed in religious beliefs which remove responsibility for life and actions from him/her. The outcome of plans are entrusted to God and, when these plans fail, the individual may hopelessly shrug his/her shoulders and say, "ay, bendito,"² a phrase which expresses the feeling of powerlessness that s/he feels. It is as if s/he were a pawn in a chess game without the ability to direct her/his own life or be independent.

The concept of "personalismo" (personalism) (Fitzpatrick, 1971) serves to explain, in part, the world view of the Puerto Rican individ-

²"Ay, bendito" is a shortened form of "Bendito sea Dios" (Blessed be the Lord), but closer to "Ah, woe is me."

ual. A person is valued according to the inner qualities which make up his/her uniqueness and worth, in contrast to the more materialistic American valuing of the ability to compete for higher social and economic status. An added aspect of "personalismo" is that it is other-dependent. It is destiny which ordains which class one will be born into and the individual defines his/her values according to the qualities and actions regarded as good and respected in her/his social position. A sense of respect and dignity are brought about by doing what is expected of one. When the Puerto Rican arrives on the mainland s/he is faced with a myriad of problems which s/he finds difficult to surmount. When this occurs s/he has nothing to counter it with except his/her own cultural reality and the fatalistic aspect serves to mitigate the guilt which may exist for not succeeding. In measuring locus of control, the present study expects that the fatalism which appears to be an integral part of the culture will be evidenced by high external scores.

In the area of sex-role differences, a predominant concept is the concept of machismo. The Puerto Rican male is expected to present himself as being brave, calm, self-possessed and masculine. Women are to be conquered and, once conquered, the male expects obedience when he issues a command. Seda Bonilla (1973) reports that, of 200 Island individuals surveyed, 66% expected the ideal wife to be faithful in marriage; 57% indicated that a wife should not go out of the home without her husband's permission; 30%--that a wife should stay home and keep the house clean; 52%--that she should have her husband's food and clothes ready and well prepared; and 14% did not think it proper for women to have male friends outside of the family. With the advent of the women's

movement, attitudes have changed dramatically within the mainland Anglo community. It is expected in the present study that changes have also occurred within the Puerto Rican community on the island. The present study will attempt to measure present attitudes and sex-role self-concepts within this group.

Locus of Control and Social Activism

The above discussion of fatalism in the Puerto Rican culture indicates that the Puerto Rican individuals see their lives as being influenced by powerful others who are beyond their control. This orientation has been defined by Rotter (1966) as an external orientation in which the individual perceives an event as being due to luck, fate, chance, and the influence of powerful others. At the other end of the continuum is the internal individual who feels that an event is contingent upon his/her own behavior or characteristics. Rotter's (1966) and other researchers' (Lefcourt, 1966, 1972, 1976; Phares, 1965, 1968, 1970; Strickland, 1977) work has firmly established the concept of locus of control within the field of psychology. Up to the present, such aspects as powerlessness, level of aspiration, and social class (among many others) have been examined in light of the internal-external (IE) control theory. Of special interest to the present study are those studies which have researched socio-political involvement and IE.

A study on social activism was conducted by Gore and Rotter, with Black individuals (1963), in which it was hypothesized that social action behavior could be predicted from a generalized attitude of internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Results supported this hypothe-

sis. Those individuals who saw themselves as determining their own fate tended to commit themselves to more personal and decisive social action.

In a refinement of the Gore and Rotter study, Strickland (1965) assessed Black individuals who were actually participating in social action as opposed to merely indicating a commitment to social action. The results of this study supported those of the Gore and Rotter study. Individuals involved in social action were more internal in their feelings of personal control than individuals who were not involved. Escoffery (1968), on the other hand, found a significant relationship between internal control and participation in civil rights organizations, but not relationship between internal control and participation in civil rights activities.

By contrast, Sank and Strickland (1973) looked at militant and moderate Black males involved in social action movements and found that militant Blacks were more likely to be external than moderate Blacks. The conflicting evidence from the Sank and Strickland study might be explained in terms of the shift in attitudes of some of the Black civil rights workers from a moderate attitude of patience and determination acceptable to the majority, to one of demanding, and forcing issues less acceptable to the majority. As some Blacks moved toward this militant end of the continuum, the concept of IE as measured by the Rotter Scale (1966), a product of the majority culture, was no longer applicable. It appears that its previous applicability to Blacks was very likely based on the fact that, at that period of time, most Blacks involved in social change were still operating within the majority framework. This frame-

work stressed individual striving, educational preparation, patience, etc. Militant Blacks, however, challenged this framework and have discovered that, no matter how hard they work within the system, they can make little, if any, progress economically and personally. Militants attribute this, not to their own personal failure, but to the system. This attribution of blame for one's condition, however, is measured by the IE Scale as being an external orientation.

The work of Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) began to shed some light on the limitations of the concept of IE as applied to Black populations today. In their work, Gurin et al. supported the point of view that an internal orientation can be damaging to minority individuals if it involves excessive self or group blame. With this in mind, they constructed a composite scale which included Rotter's original items, items from the Personal Efficacy Scale and new items specifically written for their study. Their results led to the suggestion that, in order for the concept of IE to capture the personal level, the questions asked of Blacks would have to be put in personal rather than general cultural terms. They, therefore, wrote specific items which would measure beliefs about the role of external and personal forces in the race situation. Their results showed that, in reference to Blacks and the causes to which they attribute their conditions, it was the external and not the internal orientation which was related to more effective behaviors. An internal orientation which implies self-blame involves the acceptance of traditional restraints that have been put upon Blacks' behavior. In relation to Gurin et al.'s work, in a study of ghetto rioters, Paige (1968) demonstrated that rioting was associated with a rejection of this

self-blame.

Forward and Williams (1973) had a unique opportunity to test some of the predictions made by the locus of control theory during the 1967 Detroit riot. A year before the riot, Epps (1969) had collected a large amount of data on academic achievement in Detroit. Included in these data were questions pertaining to background, future educational and occupational aspirations, and family. Also used in the study were several personality and attitudinal scales including the Rotter and Gurin et al. IE scales. Five days after the start of the riot in July, 1967, Black interviewers went into the riot area and contacted students and former students from the Epps study who went to one of the high schools located in the riot area. The interviews concentrated mostly on the students' perception of the riot and, at this time, the Gurin et al. IE Scale was administered for the second time to the individuals participating in the study. This was the only measure which was administered both before and after the riot. New measures, such as Coleman's Personal Efficacy Scale (1966), Epps' Alienation and Fear of Success (1969), the Criticism of Education Index (Moore & Holtzman, 1965), and measures to test the blocked-opportunity theory³ (Caplan & Paige, 1968) and the alienation-powerlessness theory⁴ (Ransford, 1968) were also administered.

In their analysis of the data, Forward and Williams divided the

³The blocked-opportunity theory predicts that militants are highly motivated in terms of advancing themselves within the system.

⁴The alienation-powerlessness theory predicts that militants lack the motivation for advancement and are objectively and subjectively outside of the larger social system.

Rotter IE Scale into two factors: a personal control factor including all first-person items, and a control ideology factor including most of the items having a third person referent. The results indicated that those individuals who were most supportive of the riot had the highest scores for personal control; those reacting negatively had the lowest scores. There were no differences found among riot attitude groups for scores on the control ideology items. There were also no significant differences found for the total Rotter Scale. Forward and Williams interpreted the results for personal control as supporting the prediction of the blocked-opportunity theory and refuting the prediction of the alienation-powerlessness theory.

Keeping in mind that an internal score on the Gurin et al. Scale indicates a tendency to attribute the blame to oneself for one's condition rather than to outside factors, Forward and Williams concluded, from a comparison of the two administrations of this scale, that the riot increased the degree to which young Black militants blamed external sources for their condition, and that it had the opposite effect on non-militants who tended to blame themselves even more than before.

In discussing their results, Forward and Williams make the following statement:

The young militants, male or female, no longer accept the fatalistic stereotype that their ghetto existence is a result of their own inherent weaknesses or inability to improve themselves. Compared with non-militants, the riot supporters have very strong beliefs in their ability to control events in their own lives and to shape their own future. However, this radically new sense of self-efficacy in militants is juxtaposed with an increasingly realistic perception of those external barriers of discrimination, prejudice, and exploitation

which block any chance of actualizing their capabilities and of realizing their aspirations.

A study by Garza and Ames (1974) did not incorporate social activism but researched the concept of locus of control within a Hispanic group. This study, comparing Anglo- and Mexican-American college students on locus of control, found that Mexican-American college students scored significantly less external on the Rotter IE Scale than the Anglo-American students. Two other findings were also of interest: the Mexican-American students scores significantly less external than Anglo-Americans on the luck and fate dimensions, and on the respect dimension. Garza and Ames conclude that the results can be explained in terms of the cultural values of Mexican-Americans which suggest a belief in an internal locus of control: a family-centered orientation, and continued resistance against giving up their culture and heritage. These results, then, seem to be in opposition to the prevailing assumption that, due to their cultural background, Mexican-Americans are fatalistic in outlook (Cabrera, 1964). The fact that the subjects in this study were college students, however, may in part account for these results in light of the results of a study by Franklin (1963) which showed that students who intended to go on to college were significantly more internal than those who did not. Thus, Mexican-American college students may be more internally oriented than the general Mexican-American population. Furthermore, given the existence of prejudice and discrimination which often create stumbling blocks for those Mexican-Americans who wish to go on to college, Mexican-Americans who succeed in doing so may have developed an even more internal orientation than other Mexican-Americans.

In a study with mainland Puerto Rican college and non-college, social activists and non-activist individuals, Ramos-McKay (1976) found no significant differences between college and non-college individuals with the Rotter Scale on any of the stated hypotheses. The reverse was true with the Gurin et al. Scale. College students were significantly more external than non-college individuals; social activists were significantly more external than non-activists; and, college activists were the most externally oriented of all the groups. Ramos-McKay suggests that the Rotter Scale may not be sensitive to the Puerto Rican reality. Since Puerto Ricans are culturally different and speak a different language, the Rotter Scale, which was conceptualized and formulated on the Anglo-American values and language, may fail to measure control orientation within the Puerto Rican population. The Gurin et al. Scale, however, does tap some of the experiences encountered by many Puerto Ricans on the mainland, e.g., racism, oppression, hatred and lack of equal opportunities. With these specific variables, this instrument, therefore, was able to assess the control orientation in Puerto Ricans.

When social activism became the relevant variable, the Gurin et al. Scale again proved to be a more sensitive measure, with the Rotter Scale yielding no significant results. It was this variable, in fact, which turned out to be the greater source of variability between the Puerto Rican groups since there was no difference between college activists and non-college activists, precluding a major influence by education.

From the studies reviewed above, it can be seen, then, that Rotter's IE Scale when used with minority individuals does not measure certain aspects which make up the reality of these individuals' lives. The Gurin

et al. Scale appears to be more sensitive to these factors. The present study is a replication of the Ramos-McKay study. At this time a sample of Puerto Rican college and non-college, activists and non-activists in Puerto Rico is used and a comparison is made with the results of the two studies. For the present study, however, it is expected that, since Puerto Ricans are not a minority group in Puerto Rico, the Gurin et al. Scale will be less sensitive in measuring control orientation and that the Rotter Scale will yield some significant results.

Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles

As stated earlier, sex-role attitudes may be changing within the Puerto Rican culture. To what degree, however, is difficult to ascertain since little literature has been generated in this area. This study, therefore, attempts, in a somewhat general way, to determine the degree to which the machismo concept exists within the island college and non-college Puerto Rican populations.

A number of studies on socialization and sex-roles (Barry, Baton, & Child, 1957; Fernberger, 1948; Hartley, 1964) have been conducted with non-Puerto Rican populations which have firmly established the existence of sex-role stereotypes. More recently, Ellis and Bentler (1973) conducted a study on traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes with college students which found that "the greater the difference between males' self-perceptions and their perceptions of females, the more they favored traditional sex-role standards. Similarly, the more the females' self-perceptions difference from their perceptions of males, the more females favored traditional sex-role standards" (p. 31).

One surprising result was that the difference between self- and same sex-perceptions was not related to approval of traditional sex-role standards for either males or females. This suggests that the opposite sex, and not the same sex, serves as a primary frame of reference for the person's self-concept. In other words, "masculinity" may be defined as being "unlike females" and not "like males," while "femininity" may be defined as being "unlike males" and not "like females." The fact that Puerto Rican male-female roles have been, up to now, so rigidly maintained may be explained in light of the above results: the role of the male very much depends upon its being different from the role of the female.

Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1975) investigated college students' ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes, their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Using the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974), a scale consisting of 55 bipolar attributes which were drawn from the Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire. Ss were asked to rate themselves and to directly compare the typical male and female college student. Low magnitude correlations resulted between self-ratings, stereotype scores and the Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973), which suggest that sex-role expectations do not distort self-concepts. For men as well as women, "femininity" on female-valued self items and "masculinity" on male-valued items correlated positively and were significantly related to self-esteem. The results of the self-esteem measure supported the desirability of possessing a high degree of both femininity and masculinity--or androgyny. The least

desirable state of affairs was a low degree of both masculinity and femininity.

In the same study cited above by Ramos-McKay, results indicated that mainland Puerto Rican college men did not appear to adhere to the concept of "machismo," either in their attitudes toward the role of women or in their self-role self-concepts. College women, on the other hand, were more liberal in their attitudes toward women than non-college women, but their sex-role self-concepts were not significantly different from that of the non-college females.

The present study also replicates the study cited above with regard to sex-role self-concepts and attitudes toward women within the Puerto Rican population on the island. It was expected that the results would not differ from those of the previous study although the "machismo" concept may be more prevalent on the island where the Puerto Rican male has less difficulties with sexual identity than his counterpart on the mainland who encounters a series of incapacitating and emasculating experiences.

Purpose of Study and Hypotheses

In the present research, a replication of an earlier study by the same author (Ramos-McKay, 1976), the concept of locus of control within Puerto Rican island college and non-college populations is studied. This is done in order to determine whether the fatalistic outlook which is apparent in the Puerto Rican culture is related to an external orientation as measured by Rotter's IE Scale. Since the Puerto Ricans on the island do not have the same experience with racism as Puerto Ricans on

the mainland, the Gurin et al. Scale is used to examine island Puerto Ricans' attitudes about some of the minority issues which occur on the mainland.

It is hypothesized that Puerto Rican island residents, having been reared in a culture which teaches them that their lives are guided by powerful forces which they cannot control, and given the life experience of these individuals with political oppression, will have significantly higher external scores on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican mainland residents. As stated above, however, college students tend to be more internal than non-college individuals. It is hypothesized, therefore, that Puerto Rican island college students will be significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican island non-college individuals.

According to the Forward and Williams study, individuals who favor, or participate in, social activism (and/or rioting) evidence greater personal control and self-efficacy than those who do not. It is further hypothesized, therefore, that Puerto Rican island activist individuals will score significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican island non-activists. Since the experience of island Puerto Ricans is different with respect to racism, it is hypothesized that both island activists and non-activists will not score adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale.

Finally, it is hypothesized that, given the combination of college attendance and social activism, Puerto Rican island activist college students will be significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than island non-college, non-activists. No differences are expected due to

sex.

A second part of the study attempts to measure the present attitudes within the Puerto Rican community with regard to sex-roles and, in particular, the role of women. In the previous research cited above, it appeared that college students were more liberal in their attitudes towards the role of women than non-college individuals. It is hypothesized, therefore, in the present research, that Puerto Rican island non-college males will exhibit a significantly more traditional sex-role self-concept and attitude toward the role of women in society than Puerto Rican island college males, and that Puerto Rican island college women will be significantly more liberal in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than Puerto Rican island college and non-college males but not significantly different from Puerto Rican island non-college females.

More specifically, the hypotheses for this present study are as follow:

- 1) Puerto Rican island college students will obtain significantly higher external scores on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican mainland college students.
- 2) Puerto Rican island college students will be significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican island non-college individuals.
- 3) Puerto Rican island activists will be significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than Puerto Rican island non-activists.

- 4) Puerto Rican island activists and non-activists will not score adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale.
- 5) Puerto Rican island college activists will be significantly more internal on the Rotter Scale than island non-college, non-activists.
- 6) No differences are predicted on either scale due to sex.
- 7) Puerto Rican island non-college males will be significantly more traditional in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than island college males.
- 8) Puerto Rican island college women will be significantly more liberal in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than Puerto Rican island college and non-college males.
- 9) Puerto Rican island college women will not be significantly different in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than island non-college women.

C H A P T E R I I

MethodSubjects

The subjects (Ss) in the present study were 187 male and female Puerto Rican college and non-college individuals. The college sample of 103 Ss (62 females and 41 males) was drawn from a private, Liberal Arts, urban university in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico. The non-college sample of 84 Ss (19 females and 65 males) was drawn from an adult skill learning center in a suburban area of San Juan. In this center students are taught such skills as tailoring, autobody repair, stenography, etc. See Table 1 for the age ranges, means and standard deviations within each group. In this table a total N of 175 Ss appears due to the fact that some Ss did not specify their age.

At the university, permission to conduct the research was obtained from the dean and the director of the Psychology Department. Ss were selected from the total number of students in undergraduate psychology classes and tested in their regular classrooms. For the non-college sample, E was given permission, by the director of the skill learning center, to enter individual classrooms and test those students who wished to participate in the study. A majority (approximately 90%) of the students who were asked, at both the university and the learning center, were willing to participate in the study but, as in the previous study, some activists (about 10% including some others) were either unwilling to participate without receiving a complete explanation of the study prior to their participation, or would say very little about their

Table 1
Age Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Non-College</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Female	18	18-47	29.50	7.37
Male	62	16-55	22.66	6.07
<u>College</u>				
Female	56	17-57	22.75	6.88
Male	39	18-34	22.15	4.51
<u>Total Sample</u>	175	16-57	23.28	6.49

participation in social change activities. In spite of this, 55 Ss, or 29%, of the total sample were social activists.

Procedure

During recruitment, Ss were told that the purpose of the study was to investigate various current attitudes and opinions present in today's society. Once the Ss agreed to participate, each filled out the paper and pencil questionnaire (See Appendix A) and, upon completing it, were interviewed individually to determine their participation in social change activities and the extent and antecedents of this participation (See Appendix B for Interview Format). Interviews were conducted in the S's dominant language since some Ss, although Puerto Rican by birth, spoke English more fluently than Spanish. This fact was due, in all the cases, to these Ss having resided on the United States mainland for a number of years. These interviews were conducted privately in an office and Ss were asked the questions in the Interview Format (Appendix B). The purpose of the interviews was to determine whether the S was a social activist or non-activist. Each S who stated s/he had been, or currently was involved in any club, organization, group or individual action, which actively carried out demonstrations, protests, or picketing concerning issues in today's society, was classified as a social activist. Ss not engaging in any of the above activities, were classified as non-activists. Since some of the students at the university used in this study had recently staged a students' strike in order to protest tuition hikes, some of the Ss in the present study were among some of the participants in this strike. Social change activities, therefore,

within the college group ranged from one-time participation in the strike to involvement in the Puerto Rican Socialist Party and the Independence Party.

At the skill learning center, a similar situation existed since some of the students there had staged a strike in order to protest present conditions and obtain such extra benefits as free breakfasts, in addition to free lunches, and permission to park on the school grounds. At the time of the present study, student leaders were still in the process of meeting with the school administrators although some of the demands had been conceded. The feeling from the students was that active participation in decision-making was necessary. The Ss who participated in the study, therefore, included some of these student leaders as well as those who participated actively, those who were in agreement with the strike but did not participate, and those who were against the strike and did not participate.

The questionnaire which each S completed (see Appendix A) consisted of four parts: a personal information blank, the Rotter plus Gurin et al. Scales, the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS), and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). After the Ss completed the experiment, and since the majority of the testing was conducted in classrooms, the Ss as a group were informed as to the specific purpose of the study: To compare island Puerto Rican college and non-college individuals on the variables of sex, education and activism. The concepts of locus of control, along with the scales, was explained and questions were invited.

Personal Interviews

An additional aspect of the present study, which was not a part of the previous study, and for which no hypotheses were generated, were taped personal interviews with 11 college students and 10 non-college individuals. Given the immediate relevance of two major issues--the status of Puerto Rico in relationship to the United States, and the recent gubernatorial elections on the island, both of which were very much in the news and, therefore, hopefully on everyone's mind--the opportunity was taken to obtain some information concerning present Puerto Rican thinking on these topics as well as those of family changes and changes in the role of women today. The questions asked each of the Ss appear in Appendix D. The Ss for the taped interviews were volunteers from the total group of Ss who participated in the present study. All persons who volunteered were interviewed. The interviews were conducted privately in an office.

For ease in presenting the results, a simple numerical system was devised. As appear in Tables 11 and 12, simple response categories were employed. Since all Ss saw Puerto Rican life and society as changing, on question one, the response categories are: "change mostly positive," "change mostly negative," "change both positive and negative." For question two, responses by the Ss were made in terms of "good" or "bad" government. Question three, made up of three parts, and question four, were answered "yes," "no," and "no definite opinion" responses. Finally, on question five, made up of four basic parts, the response categories were: "Puerto Rican family is changing/not changing," "changes in family are mostly positive/negative/both positive and negative," "the

role of the Puerto Rican woman is changing/not changing," and "the changes in the woman's role are mostly positive/negative/both positive and negative."

Design

In the present study, the between-groups variable was Sex (males and females). The within-subjects variables were Education (college and non-college attendance) and Activism (activist and non-activist). Ss were placed in one of eight cells according to how their scores fit into each of the levels of these three variables. See Table 2 for the cell categories and the number of Ss in each cell.

Dependent variables were scores on the various scales and personal and demographic information. An alpha level of .05 was established and separate simple comparisons were performed for the variables of Sex, Education and Activism. In addition, there was a suspected possible operation of several other variables, e.g. Color of Skin, Socio-Economic Level (SEL), Year in School, and Opportunity to Have Visited or Resided on the United States Mainland (Visit U.S.). It was impossible to balance for these as factors in the design; however, some attempt was made to assess their import by analyzing them separately.

Measures

A personal data sheet (See questionnaire Appendix A) was used to collect the data necessary to determine college attendance or non-attendance, year in school, SEL, color of skin, and visit U.S. SEL was estimated using the Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) method.

Table 2
Cell Categories and n's

Cell Category	n
Male College Activists	15
Male College Non-Activists	26
Male Non-College Activists	21
Male Non-College Non-Activists	44
Female College Activists	16
Female College Non-Activists	46
Female Non-College Activists	3
Female Non-College Non-Activists	16

A Spanish translation (Marin, de Armengol, Goldstein, & Lombana, 1974) of Rotter's (1966) IE Scale (See Appendix A) was the first part of the questionnaire. This instrument is a forced-choice, 29-item measure used to determine whether individuals perceive the events that happen to them as being controlled by external forces or as being a function of their own behavior. For the purposes of the present study, scores were split at the mean. Internal orientation scores were established as ranging from 0 to 11, and the external range was 12 to 23. A Spanish translation (Ramos-McKay & Alvarez, 1976) of the Gurin et al. Scale (1968), also a forced-choice scale, adapted to address itself to "minorities" for the previous study, was added to the end of the Rotter Scale. Here, scores were also split at the mean--those ranging from 0-6 were labelled internal and those from 7-13 were labelled external. The Gurin et al. Scale was also scored, and chi squares were computed, for the four factors presented in the Gurin et al. study (1968). Factor I addresses itself specifically to the contrast between individual effort and group action, and measures individual-collective action. Factor II addresses itself to the degree to which the respondent sees discrimination as being modifiable through social and political action and is called a measure of discrimination modifiability. Factor III, which Gurin et al. considered to be the most relevant to their study, measures the respondent's explanation for the social or economic failure of "Negroes" (minorities in the present study). It is called a measure of individual-system blame. Finally, Factor IV addresses itself to different forms of collective action and the degree of racial militancy is measured.

The second part of the questionnaire, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974), was also translated into Spanish (Ramos-McKay & Alvarez, 1977). The present study did not follow Spence *et al.*'s procedure with the PAQ of requesting self- and typical male and female college student ratings. Instead, Ss were asked to rate only themselves, on a scale of 1 to 5, on a number of male-valued and female-valued attributes.¹ Originally, the scoring of this scale calls for the placement of Ss into four categories: 1) High female/High male (androgynous), 2) High female/Low male (traditional femininity), 3) Low female/High male (traditional masculinity), and 4) Low female/Low male (undifferentiated). For the present study, and for ease in analyzing the results, female and male scores were split at the mean. Individual male and female scores were combined to yield one single score. The mean for the present sample on the feminine-valued items was 22 and, for the masculine-valued items, 17. Scores at, or above, these means, therefore, represent an androgynous individual. The combination of these two means yields a total score of 39 and, thus, combined scores of 39 to 64 (the maximum score) were seen, in this study, as representing a more liberal, contemporary self-concept. Scores of 0 to 38 incorporate the other three categories (traditional masculinity and femininity, and undifferentiated) and, therefore, were seen as representing a less liberal, more traditional self-concept. A blind scoring system was used on all the scales.

The third part of the questionnaire, the Attitudes toward Women

¹The sex-specific items were not used in this study.

Scale (AWS) (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973), also translated into Spanish (Ramos-McKay & Alvarez, 1977), was used to assess present attitudes toward women held by Puerto Rican male and female individuals. In this scale, Ss are presented with a series of statements concerning the role of women today and are asked to mark their agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 indicating strong agreement; 2, mild agreement; 3, mild disagreement; and 4, strong disagreement. Again, following a mean split, scores between 0 and 37 were categorized as representing a more traditional attitude; scores between 38 and 75 were categorized as representing a more liberal, contemporary attitude. The Spanish translations used in the previous study were also utilized in the present study.

CHAPTER III

ResultsLocus of Control

Ranges, means and standard deviations for all the scales appear in Table 3. As in the previous study (Ramos-McKay, 1976), no significant differences were found with the Rotter Scale. The means and F values, however, appear in Table 4. No further reference will be made, in the text for this section, to the Rotter Scale results.

As stated in the design section, all analyses of the hypotheses were accomplished by simple comparisons between means. The first hypothesized comparison which was made on the Gurin et al. Scale was between island activists and non-activists. As hypothesized, neither group scored adaptively external on this scale, the mean for the activists being 6.3 and for the non-activists 5.3. The range for externality on this scale is from 7-13. However, an aposteriori comparison between the two groups yielded an F of 6.48 ($df = 1,181$), which was significant at the .05 level, indicating that the activists scored significantly more towards the adaptively external end than the non-activists.

The second hypothesized comparison on the Gurin et al. Scale was between males and females since no sex differences were expected on either scale. On this scale, however, an F of 4.75 ($df = 1,181$) was obtained indicating a significant difference at the .05 level. Puerto Rican males, therefore, are significantly more adaptively external than Puerto Rican island females. Because of this significant difference, a decision was made to investigate this further by computing all possible

Table 3

Range, Mean and Standard Deviation for Each Scale

Source of Scores:	IE	Gurin	AWS	PAQ
Range	0-18	0-13	19-72	9-58
Mean	9.64	5.72	42.58	39.59
S.D.	3.09	2.42	10.05	8.14

Table 4
Locus of Control⁺ Single df Comparisons

Comparison	Rotter Scale				Gurin Scale			
	Mean	S.D.	F*	Sig. Level	Mean	S.D.	F**	Sig. Level
PR MC (n = 35)	10.6	3.60	3.07	N/S	8.4	2.94	39.24	<.001
PR IC (n = 103)	9.5	3.35			5.4	2.88		
PR IC (n = 103)	9.5	3.35	.02	N/S	5.5	2.88	.31	N/S
PR INC (n = 84)	9.6	2.93			5.7	1.23		
PR IA (n = 55)	9.6	3.64	.07	N/S	6.3	2.53	6.48	<.05
PR INA (n = 132)	9.5	2.95			5.3	2.11		
PR ICA (n = 31)	9.7	3.68	.05	N/S	6.6	2.42	3.41	N/S
PR INCNA (n = 60)	9.6	2.61			5.6	2.06		
PR ICA (n = 31)	9.7	3.68	.14	N/S	6.6	2.42	11.71	<.01
PR ICNA (n = 72)	9.5	3.23			5.1	2.94		
PR ICA (n = 31)	9.7	3.68	.05	N/S	6.6	2.42	8.19	<.01
PR INCA (n = 24)	9.5	3.66			5.9	2.67		
PR ICA (n = 31)	9.7	3.68	.11	N/S	6.6	2.42	9.77	<.01
AOG (n = 156)	9.5	3.06			5.4	2.59		
PR INCA (n = 24)	9.5	3.66	.01	N/S	5.6	2.67	1.92	N/S
PR ICNA (n = 72)	9.5	3.23			5.1	2.94		
PR ICNA (n = 72)	9.5	3.23	.03	N/S	5.1	2.94	1.36	N/S
PR INCNA (n = 60)	9.6	2.61			5.6	2.06		
PR INCA (n = 24)	9.5	3.66	.002	N/S	5.9	2.67	.26	N/S
PR INCNA (n = 60)	9.6	2.61			5.6	2.06		
Male (n = 106)	9.2	3.11	2.31	N/S	5.9	1.84	4.74	<.05
Female (n = 81)	9.9	3.04			5.2	2.73		

⁺Rotter Scale--Internal = 0-11, External = 12-23; Gurin et al.
Scale--Internal = 0-6, External = 7-13.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 10.290.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 181 df. The value was 5.992.

PR = Puerto Rican; M = mainland; I = island; C = college, NC = non-college; A = activist; NA = non-activist; AOG = all other groups.

a posteriori comparisons between the two groups. The results, as shown in Table 5, indicated that there were significant differences between males and females but this was not consistently the case for all the comparisons between males and females. A finer breakdown comparing males with males and females with females, on all the categories indicated that the main influence in the significant effect found between the total groups of males and females appears to be due to the significantly more external orientation of the activist males. The difference, therefore, can be said to be due mainly to participation in social activism.

In order to determine whether non-hypothesized significant differences existed on the Rotter or Gurin et al. Scales, a posteriori comparisons were carried out. Again, none of the comparisons were significant for the Rotter Scale. The results appear in Table 4 but no further reference to the results will be made in the text for this section. The first of these comparisons, on the Gurin et al. Scale, was between Puerto Rican college and non-college students. The result of this comparison was an F of .31 ($df = 1, 181$), which was non-significant.

Another a posteriori comparison which was carried out was between the college activists and the non-college non-activists, which was not significant ($F = 3.41$; $df = 1, 181$; $p > .05$). Three other comparisons on activism, however, were significant at the .01 level. These were: between college activists and college non-activists ($F = 11.71$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .01$) with the college activists being significantly more adaptively external; between college activists and non-college activists ($F = 8.19$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .01$) with the college activists again being significantly

Table 5

Locus of Control Single df Comparisons-Island Male/Female

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Sig. Level</u>
College Males (n = 41)	5.54	3.07	.0004	N/S
College Females (N = 62)	5.53	2.77		
Non-College Males (n = 65)	6.09	2.13	7.69	<.01
Non-College Females (n = 19)	4.32	2.43		
Activist Males (n = 36)	6.86	2.53	4.92	<.05
Activist Females (n = 19)	5.32	2.26		
Non-Activist Males (n = 70)	5.37	1.07	.123	N/S
Non-Activist Females (n = 62)	5.22	2.87		
College Activist Males (n = 15)	7.60	2.41	4.42	<.05
College Activist Females (n = 16)	5.75	2.11		
Non-College Activist Males (n = 21)	6.33	2.54	4.86	<.05
Non-College Activist Females (n = 3)	3.00	1.73		
College Non-Activist Males (n = 26)	4.35	2.78	3.35	N/S ¹
College Non-Activist Females (n = 46)	5.45	2.98		
Non-College Non-Activist Males (n = 44)	5.36	1.86	1.25	N/S
Non-College Non-Activist Females (n=16)	4.56	2.50		
College Males (n = 41)	5.54	3.07	1.27	N/S
Non-College Males (n = 65)	6.09	2.13		
College Females (n = 62)	5.53	2.77	3.55	N/S ¹
Non-College Females (n = 19)	4.32	2.43		
Activist Males (n = 36)	6.86	2.53	8.81	<.01
Non-Activist Males (n = 70)	5.37	1.07		
Activist Females (n = 19)	5.32	2.26	.024	N/S
Non-Activist Females (n = 62)	5.22	2.87		
College Activist Males (n = 15)	7.60	2.41	2.36	N/S
Non-College Activist Males (n = 21)	6.33	2.54		
College Activist Females (n = 16)	5.75	2.11	3.19	N/S
Non-College Activist Females (n = 3)	3.00	1.73		

Table 5 (Continued)

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Sig. Level</u>
College Non-Activist Males (n = 26)	4.35	2.78	2.78	N/S
Non-College Non-Activist Males (n = 44)	5.36	1.86		
College Non-Activist Females (n = 46)	5.45	2.98	1.57	N/S
Non-College Non-Activist Females (n = 16)	4.56	2.50		

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 5.992.

¹p < .10.

more adaptively external; and between the college activists and all the other groups ($F = 9.77$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .01$) with the college activists being significantly more adaptively external. Comparisons between: non-college activists and college non-activists ($F = 1.92$; $df = 1,181$); college non-activists and non-college non-activists ($F = 1.36$; $df = 1,181$); and, non-college activists and non-college non-activists ($F = .26$; $df = 1,181$) were all non-significant. It must be cautioned that, since a large number of unplanned comparisons have been carried out, some of these will result in significance by chance. In the present study, a number of marginally significant comparisons resulted which may actually have occurred by chance. Attempts to replicate this study may, therefore, yield very different results if a more stringent alpha level is employed.

In summary, no significant differences were found with the Rotter Scale data. With the Gurin et al. Scale, only two hypotheses were made. Both of these hypotheses were accepted. Three other, a posteriori comparisons were made which again resulted in no significant differences on the Rotter Scale, but on the Gurin et al. Scale, significant differences were found between the college activists and the non-college activists, but no difference between the college non-activists and the non-college non-activists.

Interviews on Social Activism

Of the college Ss interviewed concerning their social change activities, some considered themselves followers who participated because of the importance of the issue in their lives and, among these, some had

never involved themselves in any such activity. Although the result of the strike was not positive, some of the Ss had found their interest sparked and planned to continue their participation in other activities in the future. For others, the negative results served as a deterrent of future participation. Some of the Ss identified themselves as leaders in the student strike or other activist organizations and, among these, many were frequent participants with strong political ideologies who planned to continue their activities in the future. The reasons which the Ss gave for their participation included: a strong belief in and commitment to the issue at hand; a desire to better conditions for themselves and others; a belief in human rights; and a desire to do away with oppression.

Of the non-college individuals interviewed, for some this was the first time that they participated in such an activity, with some planning to continue their participation in the future. Others had participated frequently in activities with labor parties, high school groups, political parties and Young Lords Party. The reasons given by the non-college Ss for their participation in social change activities included all of the ones given by the college Ss, with one additional category being antagonism towards authority figures.

Comparisons between the Previous Study Results and Present Study Results on the Rotter and Gurin et al. Scales

Since the present study is a replication of a previous study, it was decided that a posteriori comparisons between the data of these two studies would help to clarify the differences between Puerto Ricans re-

siding on the mainland and those residing on the island. The results of these comparisons appear in Table 6. Here, significant results were obtained with both scales.

In comparing the mainland Puerto Rican college group with the island college group, on the Rotter Scale, a non-significant F of 3.07 ($df = 1,181$) was obtained indicating that mainland Puerto Ricans do not differ from island Puerto Ricans. On the Gurin et al. Scale, however, a highly significant F of 39.24 ($df = 1,181$) was significant at the .001 level indicating that mainland Puerto Ricans are significantly more adaptively external than island Puerto Ricans. The next comparison was between mainland non-college individuals and their island counterparts. Here, the comparison on the Rotter Scale was again non-significant ($F = 3.04$, $df = 1,181$), but the Gurin et al. comparison was ($F = 7.68$, $df = 1,181$; $p < .01$), which points out that mainland non-college individuals are significantly more adaptively external than island non-college individuals. The next comparison on the Rotter Scale, between mainland activists and island activists, was significant ($F = 10.03$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .01$) indicating that mainland activists are significantly more external than island activists. This comparison was also significant on the Gurin et al. Scale ($F = 87.08$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$) indicating this time that the mainland activists are significantly more adaptively external than the island activists. The alternate comparison between mainland non-activists and island non-activists was significant on both the Rotter Scale ($F = 7.27$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .01$) and the Gurin et al. Scale ($F = 11.67$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$), indicating that mainland non-activists are, respectively, significantly more external and significantly

Table 6
Locus of Control⁺ and Single df Comparisons--
Mainland¹/Island Puerto Ricans

Comparison	Rotter Scale				Gurin Scale			
	Mean	S.D.	F*	Sig. Level	Mean	S.D.	F**	Sig. Level
PR MC (n = 35)	10.6	3.60	3.07	N/S	8.4	2.94	39.24	.001
PR IC (n = 103)	9.5	3.35			5.4	2.88		
PR MNC (n = 34)	10.2	2.92	3.04	N/S	6.4	2.34	7.68	.01
PR INC (n = 84)	9.6	2.93			5.7	1.23		
PR MA (n = 29)	10.9	3.36	10.03	.01	9.4	2.29	87.08	.001
PR IA (n = 55)	9.6	3.64			6.3	2.53		
PR MNA (n = 40)	10.2	3.22	7.27	.01	6.0	2.29	11.67	.001
PR INA (n = 132)	9.5	2.95			5.3	2.11		
PR MCA (n = 23)	11.2	3.52	6.74	.05	9.4	2.31	39.25	.001
PR ICA (n = 31)	9.7	3.68			6.6	2.42		
PR MNCNA (n = 28)	10.2	3.00	3.99	.05	6.6	1.75	26.68	.001
PR INCNA (n = 60)	9.5	2.61			5.1	2.06		
PR MNCA (n = 6)	10.0	2.76	.58	N/S	9.5	2.43	51.91	.001
PR INCA (n = 24)	9.5	3.66			5.9	2.67		

⁺Rotter Scale--Internal = 0-11, External = 12-23; Gurin et al. Scale--Internal = 0-6, External = 7-13.

¹Data from previous study by Ramos-McKay (1976).

*Error MS was the usual within-cell means square and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 10.290.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 181 df. The value was 5.992.

PR = Puerto Rican; M = mainland; I = island; C = college; NC = non-college; A = activist; NA = non-activist.

more adaptively external, than island non-activists.

The next comparisons which were carried out with these two sets of data, for the two scales, combined both education and activism. The following comparisons were made: 1) mainland college activists vs. island college activists, 2) mainland non-college non-activists vs. island non-college non-activists, 3) mainland college non-activists vs. island college non-activists, and 4) mainland non-college activists vs. island non-college activists. The first comparison (mainland vs. island college activists) was significant on the Rotter ($F = 6.74$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .05$) as well as on the Gurin et al. Scales ($F = 39.25$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .001$) indicating that the mainland college activists are, on the Rotter Scale, significantly more external, and, on the Gurin et al. Scale, significantly more adaptively external, than island college activists. The second comparison (mainland vs. island non-college non-activists), however, was non-significant on both scales (Rotter Scale, $F = 2.46$, $df = 1, 181$; Gurin et al. Scale, $F = .36$, $df = 1, 181$). On the third comparison (mainland vs. island college non-activists), the results on both scales were significant (Rotter Scale, $F = 3.99$, $df = 1, 181$, $p < .05$; Gurin et al. Scale, $F = 26.68$, $df = 1, 181$, $p < .001$) pointing out that mainland college non-activists are significantly more external and significantly more adaptively external, than island college non-activists. Finally, on the fourth comparison (mainland vs. island non-college activists), the results on the Rotter Scale were non-significant ($F = .58$; $df = 1, 181$), but significant on the Gurin et al. Scale ($F = 51.91$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .001$) indicating that mainland non-college activists are significantly more adaptively external than their island coun-

terparts.

In summary, it was found that: mainland college Puerto Ricans are significantly more adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale than island college Puerto Ricans; mainland non-college individuals are also significantly more adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale than island non-college individuals; mainland activists are significantly more external on the Rotter Scale and significantly more adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale than island activists; again, on the two scales, respectively, mainland non-activists are significantly more external and adaptively external than island non-activists; and, respectively on both scales, mainland college activists are significantly more external and significantly more adaptively external than island college activists; no differences were found on either scale for the mainland and island non-college non-activists; on the Rotter Scale, mainland college non-activists were significantly more external and, on the Gurin et al. Scale, significantly more adaptively external, than island college non-activists; and, finally, mainland non-college activists were no different from island non-college activists on the Rotter Scale, but significantly more adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale.

Gurin et al. Factors

As stated in the Method section, the questionnaires were scored for the four factors presented in the Gurin et al. study (1968). A description of these factors appears in the Method section. The four factors are: 1) Factor I--Individual-Collective Action, 2) Factor II--Discrimination Modifiability, 3) Factor III--Individual-System Blame, and 4)

Factor IV--Racial Militancy.

A posteriori chi squares were computed to test for significant differences since no hypotheses were generated for these four factors. However, there was an expectation that the results would parallel those of the previous study. This expectation was not borne out completely. The results for the College/Non-College groups appear in Table 7. On Factor I, 40.7% of the College students and 47.6% of the Non-College individuals prefer both collective and individual action equally. On Factor II, 54% of the College students believe that discrimination can be changed while 48% of the Non-College group believe that it cannot be changed. On Factor III, 54.4% and 70.2% respectively of the College and Non-College groups blame themselves for their social and economic failure. Finally, on Factor IV, 48.5% of the College group and 51.2% of the Non-College group prefer non-militant action. None of the chi squares for these factors were significant, which is in contrast to the previous study which yielded significant chi squares on both Factors III and IV.

For the Activist/Non-Activist groups, the results appear in Table 8. Here, on Factor I, 40% and 45.5% of both groups prefer both individual and collective action equally. On Factor II, 50.9% of the Activists believe that discrimination can be changed and 53% of the Non-Activists believe that it cannot be changed. On Factor III, 56.4% and 63.6% respectively of the Activists and Non-Activists blame themselves for social and economic failure. Finally, on Factor IV, 38.2% of the Activists prefer militant action and 59.1% of the Non-Activists prefer non-militant action. The only chi square which was significant ($p < .0001$) was on Factor IV, indicating a significant difference between the two groups.

Table 7
Frequencies, Percentages, Chi Squares and Levels of
Significance for the Four Gurin et al. Factors

Factor I	College		Non-College		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Collective Action Preferred	36	35.0	25	29.8	.929	N/S
Individual Action Preferred	25	24.3	19	22.6		
Both Preferred Equally	42	40.7	40	47.6		
	n = 103		n = 84			

Factor II	College		Non-College		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Believe Discrimination can't be changed	49	47.6	48	57.1	1.335	N/S
Believe Discrimination can be changed	54	52.4	36	42.9		
	n = 103		n = 84			

Factor III	College		Non-College		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
System Blamed	18	17.5	10	11.9	4.939	N/S ¹
Self Blamed	56	54.4	59	70.2		
Both Blamed Equally	29	28.1	15	17.9		
	n = 103		n = 84			

Factor IV	College		Non-College		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Militancy Preferred	26	25.2	13	15.5	2.978	N/S
Non-Militancy Preferred	50	48.5	43	51.2		
Both Preferred Equally	27	26.3	28	33.3		
	n = 103		n = 84			

¹p < .10.

Table 8
Frequencies, Percentages, Chi Squares, and Levels of
Significance for the Four Gurin et al. Factors

Factor I	Activist		Non-Activist		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Collective Action Preferred	19	34.5	42	31.8	.474	N/S
Individual Action Preferred	14	25.5	30	22.7		
Both Preferred Equally	22	40.0	60	45.5		
	n = 55		n = 132			

Factor II	Activist		Non-Activist		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Believe Discrimination can't be changed	27	49.1	70	53.0	.109	N/S
Believe Discrimination can be changed	28	50.9	62	47.0		
	n = 55		n = 132			

Factor III	Activist		Non-Activist		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
System Blamed	11	20.0	17	12.9	1.649	N/S
Self Blamed	31	56.4	84	63.6		
Both Blamed Equally	13	23.6	31	23.5		
	n = 55		n = 132			

Factor IV	Activist		Non-Activist		χ^2	Sig. Level
	f	%	f	%		
Militancy Preferred	21	38.2	18	13.6	19.816	.0001
Non-Militancy Preferred	15	27.3	78	59.1		
Both Preferred Equally	19	34.5	36	27.3		
	n = 55		n = 132			

Again, a difference between the present and previous study is apparent since, in the previous study, the chi-squares for both Factors III and IV were significant.

Sex Role and Attitudes toward Women

The purpose of this part of the study was to generate basic data regarding sex-role self-concepts and attitudes toward women presently existing in the Puerto Rican island population. The first hypothesis generated in this section stated that Puerto Rican island non-college males would be significantly more traditional in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than island college males. In order to test this hypothesis, simple comparisons were again computed with the data generated by the PAQ (sex-role self-concept) and the AWS (attitudes toward women). The results of these comparisons appear in Table 9. The above comparison between college and non-college males yielded on the AWS an F of 2.76 ($df = 1, 181$; $p < .10$), which was not significant, but indicated a trend toward significance. On the PAQ, however, the same comparison was significant ($F = 3.97$; $df = 1, 181$; $p < .05$), indicating that college males have a significantly more liberal sex-role self-concept than non-college males. [See Table 10 for the number of individuals, male and female, falling into each of the four categories.]

The second hypothesis stated that Puerto Rican island college women would be significantly more liberal in sex-role self-concept and attitude toward women than Puerto Rican island college and non-college males. The results on the AWS and PAQ (see Table 9) did not support this hypothesis (AWS-- $F = 3.36$, $df = 1, 181$, $p > .10$; PAQ-- $F = 2.30$, $df = 1, 181$,

Table 9

Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles: Single df Comparisons/Island Puerto Ricans

Comparison	AWS ⁺			PAQ ⁺		
	Mean	S.D.	F*	Mean	S.D.	F**
PR I Coll. Males (n=41)	44.0	12.34	2.76	(n=41)	40.8	6.85
PR I NColl. Males (n=61)	40.6	8.61		(n=65)	37.4	9.31
						3.97
						< .05
PR I Col. Females (n=61)	45.0	10.22	3.36	(n=62)	40.7	7.41
PR I Males (n = 102)	41.9	10.35		(n=106)	38.7	8.56
						2.30
						N/S
PR I Col. Females (n=61)	45.0	10.22	3.56	(n=62)	40.7	7.41
PR I NColl. Females (n=19)	40.3	6.23		(n=19)	39.2	7.92
						.59
						N/S
PR I Col. Females (n=61)	45.0	10.22	.19	(n=62)	40.7	7.41
PR I Col. Males (n=41)	44.0	12.34		(n=41)	40.8	6.85
						.003
						N/S
PR I Col. Females (n=61)	45.0	10.22	6.74	(n=62)	40.7	7.41
PR I NColl. Males (n=61)	40.6	8.61	< .01	(n=65)	37.4	9.31
						4.79
						.05
PR Males (n=102)	41.9	10.35	.24	(n=106)	38.7	8.56
PR Females	42.7				39.9	1.17
						N/S
PR I Col. Females (n=60)	45.0	10.22	42.66		--	--
Spence Females (n=282)	53.2	12.65	< .001		--	--
						--
PR I Col. Males (n=41)	44.0	12.34	7.55		--	--
Spence Males (n=248)	47.2	12.78	< .01		--	--

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 98.222.

**Calculated as for AWS on 181 df. The values was 58.423.

¹p < .10.

+AWS--Traditional = 0-37, Contemporary = 38-75; PAQ--Traditional = 0-38, Contemporary = 39-64.

Table 10
PAQ Categories-Frequencies for Male and Female
College and Non-College

<u>College Males</u>			<u>College Females</u>		
	H.F.	L.F.		H.F.	L.F.
H.M.	16	13	H.M.	25	7
L.M.	6	6	L.M.	17	13

<u>Non-College Males</u>			<u>Non-College Females</u>		
	H.F.	L.F.		H.F.	L.F.
H.M.	22	11	H.M.	7	1
L.M.	9	22	L.M.	6	5

$p < .10$). A trend toward significance, however, must be noted on the AWS.

The final hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences in sex-role self-concept and attitudes toward women between island college and non-college women. The results on the AWS ($F = 3.56$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .10$) and the PAQ ($F = .59$; $df = 1,181$; $p > .10$) supported this hypothesis.

Since no other hypotheses were generated on these two scales, a decision was made to compute a posteriori comparisons in order to clarify the results (see Table 9, comparisons 4 through 9). In comparing island college females and college males, an F of .198 ($df = 1,181$) was obtained on the AWS, and an F of .003 ($df = 1,181$) on the PAQ indicating no significant difference between these two groups on these scales. The comparison between college females and non-college males on both scales, however, was significant (AWS-- $F = 6.74$, $df = 1,181$, $p < .01$; PAQ-- $F = 4.79$, $df = 1,181$, $p < .05$) indicating that the college females were significantly more liberal in attitude and sex-role self-concept than non-college males.

Comparisons between males and females were made on both scales with the AWS yielding a non-significant F of .24 ($df = 1,181$) and the PAQ yielding a non-significant F of 1.17 ($df = 1,181$) indicating no difference between men and women on sex-role self-concept or attitude toward women. In order to give more perspective to the data, as was done in the previous study, two other a posteriori comparisons were made using the data from the Spence et al. study (1975) for the AWS. These results also appear in Table 9. The comparison between the college women of the

present study and the college women ($n = 282$) of the Spence et al. study yielded an F of 42.66 ($df = 1,181$), which was significant at the .001 level indicating that the non-Puerto Rican college females are significantly more liberal in their attitudes toward women than Puerto Rican island college women. In the comparison between the two groups of men, an F of 7.55 ($df = 1,181$) was obtained, significant at the .01 level, which indicates that non-Puerto Rican college ($n = 248$) males are more liberal in their attitudes towards women than Puerto Rican island college males.

In summary, it was found that island college males were significantly more liberal than island non-college males in their sex-role self-concept but not in their attitudes toward women; island college females were not significantly different than the total sample of island males in either attitudes or sex-role self-concept; and island college females were not significantly different than island non-college women on either scale. In a posteriori comparisons, the results indicated that island college females were not significantly different from island college males on either scale; island college females were significantly different from island non-college males on both scales; and island males were not significantly different from island females on either scale. With the data from the Spence et al. study, the following was found: non-Puerto Rican college females were significantly more liberal in their attitudes toward women than island college Puerto Rican females; and non-Puerto Rican college males were significantly more liberal in their attitudes towards women than island Puerto Rican college males.

Comparisons between the Previous Study Results and Present Study Results on the AWS and PAQ Scales

As with the locus of control scales, a decision was made to compute a posteriori comparisons between the data of the previous study and the present study in order to see whether any differences exist between mainland and island Puerto Ricans on the variables of sex-role attitudes and sex-role self-concepts. The results of these comparisons appear in Table 11.

The first two comparisons made were between mainland and island females, and mainland and island males. On the AWS, mainland females were significantly more liberal in attitude than island females ($F = 46.39$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$). On the PAQ, however, no significant difference was found in sex-role self-concept ($F = .27$; $df = 1,181$). For the men, on the AWS, no significant difference was found in attitude ($F = 1.82$; $df = 1,181$), and the same was true for the PAQ ($F = .94$; $df = 1,181$).

For the next four comparisons, the variable of education was introduced. In the first of these comparisons, mainland college males were significantly more liberal in their attitude toward women than island college males ($F = 3.91$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .01$), but this was not the case in their sex-role self-concepts ($F = 1.11$; $df = 1,181$; $p > .05$). However, the following comparison between mainland and island non-college males indicated that island males are significantly more liberal in their attitudes toward women ($F = 20.02$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$), and sex-role self-concepts ($F = 13.63$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$) than mainland non-college males. In the comparisons with females, however, only one comparison was significant; mainland college females were significantly

Table 11

Attitude toward Women and Sex Roles Single df Comparisons/Mainland vs. Island Puerto Ricans

Comparison	AWS		F*	Sig. Level	PAQ		Sig. Level
	Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.	
PR Mainland Females (n=32)	50.2	15.12	46.39	.001	(n=32)	39.48	.27
PR Island Females (n=80)	42.7	9.61			(n=81)	39.92	7.51
PR Mainland Males (n=37)	40.6	10.10	1.82	N/S		37.98	12.26
PR Island Males (n=102)	41.9	10.35				38.70	8.57
PR Mainland College Males (n=17)	47.1	9.26	3.91	<.01		42.1	9.68
PR Island College Males (n=41)	44.0	10.34				40.8	6.85
PR Mainland NCollege Males (n=20)	35.1	7.20	20.02	<.001		33.9	13.18
PR Island NCollege Males (n=61)	40.6	8.61			(n=65)	37.4	9.31
PR Mainland College Females (n=18)	60.4	10.77	149.51	<.001		41.1	6.44
PR Island College Females (n=61)	45.0	10.26			(n=68)	40.7	7.81
PR Mainland NCollege Females (n=14)	37.0	7.89	2.11	N/S		37.9	8.76
PR Island NCollege Females (n=19)	40.3	6.23				39.2	7.92

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 98.222.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 181 df. The value was 58.423.

more liberal in their attitudes toward women than island college females ($F = 149.51$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .001$). There was no difference between these two groups in sex-role self-concepts ($F = .18$; $df = 1,181$). The final comparisons between mainland and island non-college females also resulted in non-significance for both the AWS ($F = 2.11$; $df = 1,181$) and the PAQ ($F = .58$; $df = 1,181$).

In summary, the following was found: mainland females are more liberal in their attitudes towards women than island females, but not in their sex-role self-concepts; mainland males do not differ from island males in attitudes or self-concepts; however, mainland college males are significantly more liberal in their attitudes towards women than island college males, but not different in self-concepts; mainland non-college males are significantly less liberal in attitudes towards women and sex-role self-concepts than island non-college males; mainland college females are significantly more liberal in their attitudes than island college females, but no different in sex-role self-concepts; and no differences exist between mainland and island non-college females in either attitude or sex-role self-concepts.

Other Sources of Variability

As stated in the design section, four additional variables [Color of Skin, Socio-economic Level (SEL), Year in School, and Opportunity to Have Visited or Resided in the United States Mainland (Visit U.S.)] were suspected of being possible sources of variation. The details of these comparisons, including means and F values, may be found in Tables 1-12 in Appendix C (none of the comparisons for Year in School was significant).

ant).

No significant differences were found on either the Rotter Scale or the Gurin et al. Scale for the interaction of Color of Skin X Education. This was also the case on Color of Skin for the comparisons within the two groups--College and Non-College. In the previous study, only one comparison was significant on the Gurin et al. Scale--College Morenos were significantly more adaptively external than Non-College Morenos.

The results of the sex-role scales also appear in Tables 4-12 of Appendix C. In the Color of Skin X Education comparisons only two were significant--College Morenos vs. Non-College Morenos on the AWS ($F = 6.05$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .05$), and the same comparison on the PAQ ($F = 5.58$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .05$) indicating that College Morenos are significantly more liberal in attitude toward women and sex-role self-concept than Non-College Morenos. No comparisons were significant in the within-group, college comparisons; however, one comparison in the within-group, non-college comparisons was significant--on the PAQ, Moreno vs. Black ($F = 4.01$; $df = 1,181$; $p < .05$), which indicates that non-college Blacks were significantly more liberal in their sex-role self-concepts than non-college Morenos. In the previous study, both the comparisons between College Whites and Non-College Whites, and College Morenos vs. Non-College Morenos were significant.

The variable of Socio-economic Level yielded no significant differences on the Rotter and Gurin et al. Scales for either the College or Non-College groups. In the previous study only one comparison--between College Class IV and College Class V--was significant on the Gurin et al. Scale. For the AWS and the PAQ, also, all comparisons for College

and Non-College were non-significant. This was also the case in the previous study.

The final variable was Opportunity to Visit or Reside on the United States Mainland. None of the comparisons on the four scales were significant indicating that having visited or lived on the United States mainland did not influence the results on each of the scales.

Personal Interviews

For the College group ($F = 6$, $F = 5$, Table 12) on question one, one, or 9%, responded that the changes in Puerto Rican life and society are mostly positive; six, or 55%, that they are mostly negative; and four, or 36%, that they are both positive and negative. Some of the changes of which the Ss spoke were: increases in delinquency and crime on the island; increases in economical problems, such as unemployment; a change in community spirit and a movement toward living one's own life and not becoming involved; and too much "Americanization" of Puerto Rican life and customs.

On question two, two, or 18%, classified the government as being "good"; three, or 27%, classified it as "bad"; and six, or 55%, had no definite opinion either way. Those Ss who used the "bad" category referred to: the lack of real change in government even when another party takes over; lack of actual help for the people in terms of jobs and better housing; and corruption in government. Those who used the "good" category spoke about: the bettering of conditions brought about by past and present governments; increases in benefits obtained from the United States government, such as food stamps; and a hopeful outlook now that a

Table 12

Taped Interview Results--College¹

<u>Questions</u>	Changes mostly positive		Changes mostly negative		changes both positive and negative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1) Opinion of Life and Society in Puerto Rico today	1	9	6	55	4	36
	Good		Bad		No def. opin.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
2) Opinion of Puerto Rican govern- ment	2	18	3	27	6	55
	Yes		No		No def. opin.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
3a) Statehood for Puerto Rico	1	9	10	91	-	-
b) Independence for Puerto Rico	2	18	9	82	-	-
c) Status quo for Puerto Rico	8	73	3	27	-	-
4) Is there oppression by the United States in Puerto Rico	3	27	6	55	2	18
	Changing		Not Changing			
	#	%	#	%		
5a) Puerto Rican Family is	10	91	1	9		
	Changes mostly positive		Changes mostly negative		Changes both positive and negative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
b) Changes in family are	3	27	5	46	3	27
	Changing		Not Changing			
	#	%	#	%		
c) Woman's role is	11	100				
	Changes mostly positive		Changes mostly negative		Changes both positive and negative	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
d) Changes in role of women are	3	27	4	36.5	4	36.5

¹F = 6; M = 5

new party was in power. Of the group who used the "no definite opinion" category, some claimed disinterest in, or lack of knowledge of, politics, and the majority chose to withhold their opinions in order to give the new government a chance to do something since they felt it was too early to judge.

On question three a, one, or 9%, voted "yes" for statehood for Puerto Rico and 10, or 91%, voted "no." The one person voting yes felt that statehood would bring more benefits to Puerto Rico. Of those voting no, the reasons given were: a fear that Puerto Rico would lose its culture; and for some, a dislike of the United States. On question three b, two, or 18%, voted "yes" for Puerto Rican independence, and nine, or 82%, voted "no." Those voting yes declared themselves as belonging to the pro-independence party. Those voting no suggested that: Puerto Rico can be independent but only in the future since economically it is not yet ready; and, from one person, a fear of communism were Puerto Rico to become independent. On question three c, eight, or 73%, voted "yes" for maintaining the status quo of a "free associated state," and three, or 27%, voted "no." Of those voting yes, all had previously voted no to independence and felt that the present status was the best way to prepare for independence. Of those voting no, two had voted yes for independence immediately and one, who had voted for statehood, felt that the present status was not good enough because of a lack of "real identity" for Puerto Rico since it is neither "free" nor a "state."

On question four, three, or 27% felt that the United States was oppressing Puerto Rico; six, or 55% felt that it was not; and two, or 18%, had no definite opinion either way. Those who felt that there is oppres-

sion by the United States saw it in economical terms and spoke about the exploitation of the labor force, the lack of taxes for American industries, and misuse of natural resources. Those who did not feel that the United States oppresses Puerto Rico spoke about the many benefits which Puerto Rico is receiving from the United States and the protection which the island needs. Those without a definite opinion claimed to be disinterested in politics.

On question five a, 10, or 91%, see the Puerto Rican family as changing, and one, or 9%, as not changing. On question five b, three, or 27%, see the changes as mostly positive; five, or 46%, as mostly negative; and three, or 27%, as both positive and negative. The changes mentioned by these Ss included: a loss of the extended family system; more economic pressures on the family which force the mother to leave the home and get a job; and the raising of children by strangers since many mothers are forced to work. Those seeing the changes as positive, felt that: the past, closely-knit family system was not good and is now changing; and that it is good for the woman to be able to go out of the home. Those seeing the changes as negative, felt that: the family is disintegrating and moral values are being lost; and a lack of communication between husband and wife, and parents and children is coming about and leading to the break-up of families. Those classifying the changes as both positive and negative saw both sides of the issue and could not commit themselves to either side.

On question five c, 11, or 100%, saw the role of women as changing. On question five d, three, or 27%, see the changes as mostly positive; four, or 36.5%, see them as mostly negative; and four, or 36.5%, see

them as both positive and negative. Among the most frequent changes mentioned by the Ss were: more educational opportunities for women; more economic opportunities for women; and the opportunity for women to do things outside of the home. Those Ss who saw the changes as being mostly positive spoke about: the equalization of roles between male and females; the freedom from household drudgery for women; and the opportunity to help the family financially. Those seeing the changes as negative spoke about: the lack of moral upbringing for children since child-rearing is the mother's responsibility; the increase in divorces due to hostility between husband and wife when the wife becomes financially independent; and an increase in delinquency of children brought up by strangers. Those who saw the changes as both positive and negative saw both sides of the issue but could not commit themselves to saying they were definitely negative or positive for them.

For the Non-College group ($F = 4$, $M = 6$, Table 13), on question one, three, or 30%, saw the changes in Puerto Rican life and society as being mostly positive; four, or 40%, as being mostly negative; and three, or 30%, as being both positive and negative. The positive aspects mentioned by these Ss included: better living conditions, technological advances, and increased job opportunities. The third group saw both the positive and negative aspects and could not commit themselves to saying the changes were mostly positive or negative.

On question two, one, or 10%, classified the Puerto Rican government as "good"; four, or 40%, classified it as "bad"; four, or 40%, as "both good and bad"; and one, or 10%, had "no definite opinion." Here, the reasons for the "good" and "bad" classifications were the same as

Table 13

Taped Interview Results--Non-College¹

		Changes mostly positive	Changes mostly negative	Changes both positive and negative
		# %	# %	# %
1) Opinion of life and society in Puerto Rico Today		3 30	4 40	3 30
	Good		Good&Bad	No def. opin.
	# %	# %	# %	# %
2) Opinion of Puerto Rican government	1 10	4 40	4 40	1 10
		Yes	No	No def. opin.
		# %	# %	# %
3a) Statehood for Puerto Rico		3 30	5 50	2 20
b) Independence for Puerto Rico		2 20	6 60	2 20
c) Status quo for Puerto Rico		2 20	5 50	3 30
4) Is there oppression by the United States in Puerto Rico		4 40	4 40	2 20
		Changing	Not Changing	
		# %	# %	
5a) Puerto Rican family is		7 70	3 30	
		Changes	Changes	Changes
		mostly	mostly	both positive
		positive	negative	and negative
		# %	# %	# %
b) Changes in family are		4 40	4 40	2 20
		Changing	Not Changing	
		# %	# %	
c) Woman's role is		8 80	2 20	
		Changes	Changes	Changes
		mostly	mostly	both positive
		positive	negative	and negative
		# %	# %	# %
d) Changes in role of women are		3 30	5 50	2 20

¹F = 4; M = 6

those given by the College group. The one person who had no definite opinion classified himself as being apolitical.

On question three a, three, or 30%, of the Ss chose statehood for Puerto Rico; five, or 50%, were against it; and two, or 20%, had no definite opinion. Those voting for statehood, again, as in the College group, saw a permanent affiliation with the United States as a positive thing for Puerto Rico. Those voting against it preferred a different status. The two Ss with no definite opinion claimed no interest in, or knowledge of, politics. On question three b, two, or 20%, voted yes for Puerto Rican independence; six, or 60%, voted against it; and two, or 20%, had no definite opinion. Those voting for independence felt that Puerto Rico is economically ready for it. Those voting against it expressed common fears of becoming "like Cuba," much more frequently than in the College group, a fear of being defenseless, and not being financially able to carry it off. The remaining two Ss were the same two as in question three a. Finally, question three c, two, or 20%, chose to maintain Puerto Rico's present status; five, or 50%, wanted to change it; and three, or 30%, had no definite opinion. The two Ss voting for the present status see it as a functioning mechanisms which helps Puerto Rico to reap many benefits while still being somewhat autonomous. The general feeling expressed by these two Ss was that "it has worked well so far." Those voting against the present status indicated that: it is an ambiguous status in which Puerto Rico is neither "free" or a "state"; and that the present status is psychologically detrimental for Puerto Ricans because of the dualities in language, culture, flags, etc. The three having no definite opinion included the two of the same category

as in sections a and b, plus one individual who had voted for statehood, against independence, and who had no strong conviction about the present status.

On question four, four, or 40%, felt that Puerto Rico is being oppressed by the United States; four, or 40%, felt that it is not; and two, or 20%, had no definite opinion. Here, the group who saw no oppression had similar reasons to those responding likewise in the College group. Among those who did see oppression in Puerto Rico, however, feelings against this were much stronger than the feelings of the College group. In this category, the Non-College Ss also spoke of economic exploitation, but many also mentioned military and cultural oppression, the introduction of American racism into Puerto Rican thinking, and a trend, which they see in Puerto Rico, in which mainland Americans are given the better jobs and receive more concessions on the island than Puerto Rican residents.

On question five a, seven, or 70%, saw the Puerto Rican family as changing; and three, or 30%, did not. On question five b, four, or 40%, saw the changes as being mostly positive; four, or 40%, saw them as being mostly negative; and two, or 20%, saw them as being both positive and negative. Here, the Non-College group held the same views as the College group about the changes and the results of those changes.

On question five c, eight, or 80%, saw the role of women as changing; and two, or 20%, did not. On five d, three, or 30%, saw the changes as mostly positive; five, or 50%, as mostly negative; and two, or 20%, as both positive and negative. Of the three individuals seeing the changes as being mostly positive, all spoke about the better oppor-

tunities for women and the economic help they could bring to their families. In the second group, although they, too, saw the opportunities for women as opening up, and the positive aspects of this, they classified the changes as negative based on the negative impact which these changes would have on the family system. Some of the women in this group voiced ambivalent feelings about wanting to work outside of the home, or go to school, but feeling that they are primarily responsible for the upbringing of their children. Although most of the men in this group voiced their objections to changes in the woman's role, these objections were in terms of the increase in freedom to be away from the home and the husband, and not in terms of the men having to help in the home. None of the men in the three groups objected to helping with household chores when the wife works also and did not consider themselves as less of a man for having to wash dishes or cook.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

This study, as the previous study, was an attempt to document attitudinal and behavioral differences between Puerto Rican College and Non-College individuals in the areas of Locus of Control, Social Activism and Sex Roles. The present study, however, focuses on the Puerto Ricans who reside on the island and a comparison was made between them and the Puerto Ricans who reside on the mainland.

Locus of Control

Results on the Rotter IE Scale again, as in the previous study, yielded no significant differences on any of the stated hypotheses. The explanation for this, therefore, is the same as that given before--this scale may not be sensitive enough to the Puerto Rican reality, in this case as it exists on the island, to yield an accurate measure of individual control ideology.

The Gurin et al. Scale, however, did result in some significant differences on the stated hypotheses as well as on the a posteriori comparisons. The first hypothesis stated that island activists and non-activists would not score adaptively external on the Gurin et al. Scale. Since the mean score for the activists was 6.3, and for the non-activists 5.3, both groups fell within the internal range (0-6) of the scale and the hypothesis was accepted. The reason for this result may, as discussed in the hypothesis section, be due to the fact that Puerto Ricans on the island are not a "minority" and, therefore, did not respond

in full to this issue. Since 115 of the Ss participating in the study had visited or resided on the mainland at some time, ignorance of minority problems on the mainland, at least for those Ss, cannot account for the internal response set of the group. An alternative explanation, therefore, may be that these Ss' present reality is not composed of such issues as racism, hatred and lack of equal opportunity which are the primary focus of the Gurin et al. Scale. This hypothesis will be developed further below.

The second hypothesis is stated that no differences were expected on either scale due to sex. Here, however, the hypothesis had to be rejected for the Gurin et al. Scale since the results indicated that males were endorsing significantly more external responses than females. The additional a posteriori comparisons made showed that the difference appears to be due to the more external orientation of the activist males, with participation in social activism, and not the variable of sex, being of greater influence in this result. This, of course, is in keeping with the expectation of greater externality due to activism, as found by Forward and Williams (1973). That the same does not occur with the activist females, however, is not in keeping with the expectation and may be due, in part, to the significantly more internal orientation of the non-college activist females (mean score 3.0). However, the significant differences between activist males and females, college activist males and females, and non-college activist males and females, indicate that the difference is perhaps explained by a different control ideology held by females in spite of their participation in social activism. The variable of sex does not appear to be a main effect in this case since

comparisons between other male-female groups did not yield significant differences.

Since the hypotheses generated on the Rotter Scale did not result in significant differences for any of the groups specified, a decision was made to compute a posteriori comparisons for the Gurin et al. Scale paralleling those of the Rotter Scale. Given the results of the previous study in which education had a significant effect on the results (although not to the same degree as activism), a comparison was made between the college and non-college groups in order to determine whether this would also be the case in the present study. However, the result of the comparison between island college and non-college individuals indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups on the variable of education. The next step, therefore, was to determine whether activism was playing a major role in establishing an externally oriented response set and a comparison was made between activists and non-activists which did indicate that the activists were choosing significantly more external responses than the non-activists. This was not a surprising result since activism proved to be the key factor, in the previous study, in predicting externality on the Gurin et al. Scale.

When the interaction between education and activism was introduced, the result of the next comparison also paralleled the results of the previous study. This comparison was between college activists and college non-activists, which resulted in a significant difference indicating that college activists were responding significantly more externally than college-nonactivists. The next comparison which was made, however, began to cloud the issue. In this comparison between college activists

and non-college activists, the result indicated that a significant difference existed between the two groups with the college activists responding in the external direction significantly more than the non-college activists. The question of a greater influence in the results due to the variable of activism, therefore, seemed no longer feasible and the question of a greater influence due to education was reintroduced. In order to test for this assumed influence by education, the following comparisons were calculated: 1) College Activists vs. Non-college Non-activists; 2) College Non-activists vs. Non-college Non-activists; 3) Non-college Activists vs. College Non-activists; and 4) Non-college Activists vs. Non-college Non-activists. The non-significant results on these comparisons, however, did not support the assumption of a greater influence by education, or the previous one of a greater influence by activism. The explanation, therefore, must be looked for in the suggestion made above that, for Puerto Ricans living on the island, the "minority" question is not relevant. What may be more relevant is the oppression which several writers (Maldonado-Denis, 1972; Silen, 1973) state does exist on the island. Thus, it may be that the Puerto Rican individuals responded to this one aspect tapped by the Gurin et al. Scale, but on an individual basis, without major influence by the level of education or participation in social change activities.

An examination of the analyses of the four Gurin et al. factors lends support to the above explanation. In the Gurin et al. study (1969), externally oriented Ss preferred collective action more frequently; believed discrimination could not be changed; blamed the system more often for their social and economic failures; and preferred mili-

tant action more frequently. In the present study, chi squares were computed on the two groups (College/Non-College, Activist/Non-Activist) for the four factors. On the College/Non-College split (see Table 7); for Factor I (which was not significant), 40.7% of the College and 47.6% of the Non-College group preferred both individual and collective action equally, with the rest of the Ss in both groups distributed almost equally between the two alternatives. Here, therefore, education seemed of no great import on the type of action preferred by the Ss.

For Factor II in the present study, which was also non-significant, the two groups were almost evenly split between the two alternatives with the higher percentage (52.4%) of the College group believing that discrimination can be changed, and the higher percentage (57.1%) of the Non-College group believing that discrimination cannot be changed. The influence by education in this case does not appear to be toward a heightening of awareness about the reasons behind, and the results of, oppression and, thus, the more external feeling that there is very little that can be done about it.¹ Instead, the educational process may have instilled a belief that, through effort, change can be brought about. The Non-College individuals, however, who have not had the benefit of this teaching, and for whom the reality may be closer, tended to

¹ It is of interest to note here that on the personal interviews conducted with 11 college students and 10 non-college individuals (see Appendix D), on question four, which asked if the individual believes that Puerto Rico is oppressed by the United States, three college students said yes and six said no. For the non-college group, however, four answered yes and four answered no. Apparently, higher education, at least for these Ss, does not lead to any more awareness about the existence of oppression.

see discrimination as unchangeable. The result of this on the overall scale results would indicate, as it indeed did, that education did not seem of major importance in predicting external responses.

On Factor III, with a trend toward significance, 54.4% of the College students and 70.2% of the Non-College individuals blamed themselves for their social and economic failure. The reality in Puerto Rico, however, is that there is a duality in systems with the island, ostensibly, ruling itself, but with the United States government having final say. Thus, a confusion with the operation and effects of this dual system may lead to confusion about where to lay the blame, with the end-result being self-blame. Education, in this case, does not appear to clarify the issue and may, instead, instill a "self-advancement through self-effort" ideology in the college students.

Finally, on Factor IV, which was also non-significant, 48.5% of the College group and 51.2% of the Non-College group preferred non-militant action. The explanation for these results could follow from the explanations given above. Militant action has to have a target; if the self is blamed, however, little can come of such action and non-militant action becomes more feasible.

The results of the Activist/Non-Activist split (see Table 8) mirrored those of the College/Non-College split on Factors I, II, and III. Factor IV, however, in this case, was significant at the .0001 level and indicated that, although the Activists were almost evenly distributed between the three alternatives, the Non-Activists preferred non-militant action significantly more often. The analyses of the four factors for Activist/Non-Activist, therefore, suggest as in the analyses for Col-

lege/Non-College, that major influence due to education or activism do not seem to exist, in contrast to the results of the previous study. Instead, the alternative explanation of a difference in the reality of mainland and island oppression appears to have more validity and finds some support in the results on the four factors.

At this point, given the above hypothesis, it is of interest to examine the results on the comparisons between mainland and island Puerto Ricans on the Rotter and Gurin et al. Scales in order to further determine whether a different reality, within the common reality of oppression, does exist between the two groups.

As stated before, the comparison between mainland and island college students on the Rotter Scale was not significant and this was also the case with the comparison between mainland and island non-college individuals. On the Gurin et al. Scale, however, both of these comparisons were significant and indicated that mainland college students are significantly more adaptively external than island college students; and that mainland non-college individuals, although not significantly more external, did endorse significantly more responses than island non-college individuals. A difference in the response sets between these groups, therefore, is immediately evident from these results. On the rest of the comparisons (incorporating activism, and activism with education) computed for both scales, the same pattern emerged, with the mainland groups being either significantly more external, or endorsing significantly more external responses, than the island groups. In addition, of the seven comparisons made for the Rotter Scale, four proved to be significant. Since this scale has, in both the previous and present

studies, failed to produce significant results on any of the stated hypotheses for these same group categories, the most likely assumption is that the difference between the mainland and island groups must be large indeed for it to result in significant differences on this scale.

Since the present study does not include an examination, in any detail, of the many aspects of oppression, it is impossible to present a well-documented explanation for the above results. Knowledge of the history of Puerto Rico, however, and of the present political reality on the island lead to the formulation of one possible hypothesis regarding the difference between the mainland and island Puerto Ricans. This hypothesis is that the oppression which Puerto Ricans encounter on the mainland is primarily in a very personal form, that is, in the form of racial hatred, and lack of equal opportunities in obtaining jobs, housing and education. The results of this type of oppression affect an individual very personally and directly: s/he is called names because of the color of his/her skin, s/he cannot find a job, a home, or get beyond high school. In Puerto Rico, however, the oppression encountered is an impersonal one, that is, in a political form. The Puerto Rican on the island is not called names or discriminated against in jobs, housing, or education. What does occur is that s/he is subject to the laws of the United States but is unable to vote for the president or elect a voting representative to represent island concerns. And, when the United States has gone to war, Puerto Rican men have been subject to the draft. The effects of such oppression are on a less personal level and more on a political level. The result of this difference between mainland and island oppression may be, therefore, that the individual's response re-

flects whichever level s/he finds him/herself in. Unfortunately, the Gurin et al. Scale, although sensitive to the issue of oppression, primarily on a personal level, does not appear to encompass this political level. This hypothesis, of course, needs to be tested through further research.

In summary, the results of the locus of control scales indicated that a difference exists between mainland and island Puerto Ricans regarding their control ideology. This difference became clearer as the responses to the four Gurin et al. factors were examined more closely and comparisons with the results of the scales were made between the two groups. A hypothesis was presented to help in explaining the findings.

Sex Roles and Attitudes toward Women

As discussed in the introduction, some writers (Seda Bonilla, 1973) have presented the concept of "machismo" as a functioning element in the Puerto Rican culture. The second part of this study was an attempt to document this, although in a very basic way, and determine whether any differences exist within the population regarding attitudes toward the role of women and individual sex-role self-concepts. In the first hypothesis, therefore, it was expected that the non-college men would be more traditional on both scales than the college men, with the assumption that education would result in more liberal attitudes and sex-role self-concepts. The results on the AWS did not support this hypothesis. However, the mean scores for both groups were within the liberal range (38-75), indicating that both groups hold a contemporary outlook toward the role of women. On the PAQ the college men had a more liberal sex-role

self-concept than the non-college men. The result on the AWS is not surprising for the college men since it was expected that education would result in a more liberal outlook. The fact that the same was true for the non-college men, however, does not support this assumption. In addition, the same comparisons for the females were also not significant. Since in the area of sex-role self-concepts there were no significant differences, perhaps it can be postulated here, at least for the men, that the non-college men's contemporary responses may be due to exposure, via the media and personal experience, to liberal ideas. When it comes to a change in these individuals' personal characteristics, however, the more traditional ideas persist. For the women, a different explanation is necessary since both the college and non-college group fell within the contemporary range for both scales. The same exposure to liberal ideas must occur with the women but, where the non-college men may be unwilling to change certain personal aspects, for the non-college women a personal change to match their liberal attitudes may not be as difficult since they stand to gain more, or lose less, than the men. The results of the personal interviews lend some support to the above suggestion since 80% of the non-college group saw the role of women as changing and, although some of the women had ambivalent feelings about abandoning their responsibility as primary child-rearers, even these women, along with the others, were in favor of the greater opportunities for women and enjoyed the greater freedom which they have to go out of the home. The men also saw the changes in the role of women but voiced objections to the increased freedom of women. None of these men had any objections to helping with household tasks, but qua-

lified this to say that these chores did not make them feel any less of a man. The traditional sex-role self-concepts, therefore, may be due, not to objections in changing personal activities, but in changing long held views about male and female personal characteristics.

Because of the liberal attitudes and almost contemporary mean sex-role self-concept score (37.4) of the non-college men, when combined with the higher scores of the college men, no differences resulted in the comparison between college women and the men. However, as expected, when college women were compared with only the non-college men, the women emerged as having more liberal attitudes and sex-role self-concepts than the non-college men. These results are not in accord with Ellis and Bentler's work (1973), cited in the introduction, which defined masculinity as being "unlike females" and femininity as being "unlike males." The college men in this study did, in fact, ascribe feminine characteristics to themselves while the women ascribed masculine ones to themselves; and in the case of the non-college group, 22 (see Table 10) of the men did not see themselves as fitting either the female or the male role and fell within the category labelled undifferentiated.

One aspect of considerable interest was the comparisons made between the mainland and island groups on the sex-role scales. On the first two of these, between males and between females, the only significant difference found was with the AWS between mainland and island females. Mainland females were significantly more liberal in their attitudes than island females, but this was not the case on sex-role self-concepts, although the mean scores for both groups fell within the lower end of the contemporary range. For the men, there were no differences

on either scale with both groups of men having liberal views but traditional sex-role self-concepts. In the previous study, the college women also held very liberal attitudes but did not fully practice these in their personal sex-role self-concepts. These results may very possibly mean that Puerto Rican women hear the propaganda and probably agree with much of it but, when it comes to their daily lives, practice only those aspects which, given the views of their men, do not make their lives too difficult. Although it was proposed above that it may not be as difficult for the women, as for the men, to change their personal sex-role self-concepts to match their liberal ideas, the extent to which they actually do appears to be much less than would be expected. The results of the taped interviews which were cited above regarding the ambivalence which some women felt about abandoning traditional roles while, at the same time, enjoying their increased freedom, characterize the difference which seems to exist between liberal ideas and not quite as liberal sex-role self-concepts among the women. Two other comparisons appear to support the explanation given: that between mainland and island college males, and that between mainland and island college females. In both of these, the mainland groups held a significantly more liberal attitude, but all groups were well within the liberal range. On the sex-role self-concepts scale, however, there were no significant differences between the groups. Here, again, all groups were within the contemporary range, but on the lower end of it.

One surprising aspect emerged on the last two comparisons between mainland and island non-college males and females. In the comparison between the men, the island non-college men turned out to be significant-

antly more liberal in both attitude and sex-role self-concepts than the mainland non-college men. This was not the case with the non-college females but the island females did fall within the contemporary range on both scales while the mainland non-college females did not. Attitudes and sex-role self-concepts, therefore, appear to be more liberal on the island, among non-college individuals, than on the mainland and this may be explained by looking at the greater pressures which the mainland non-college group has to face in terms of racism, unequal opportunities, and the need for survival which may make other issues, such as women's rights, less important.

In summary, the concept of "machismo" does appear to be in operation within the Puerto Rican island population but the extent and, particularly, the degree may not be as great as have been suggested, perhaps due to the changes within the society at large. The results in this section of the present study indicated that liberal attitudes are held by island, and mainland, males and females toward the role of women. The men, however, minimally extend these liberal attitudes to their own sex-role self-concepts and the women, although more liberal in both aspects, appear to follow suit by also not liberalizing their sex-role self-concepts too much.

Other Sources of Variability

Since only two of the many comparisons on Color of Skin, SEL, Year in School and Visit U.S. were significant, it can be assumed that these variables had virtually no influence on the results of the principal variables. Few conclusions can be drawn from the significant difference

found between College and Non-College Morenos, on the variable of Color of Skin, for the AWS and the PAQ, except that education appears to have influenced the results since the College Morenos were significantly more liberal in both attitudes and self-concepts. The other significant comparison between Non-College Morenos and Non-College Blacks, with the Blacks being significantly more liberal in self-concept appears to have resulted by chance, which is often the case when a large number of comparisons are made. The fact that a larger number of the same comparisons were significant in the previous study may have been a factor of the increased importance of these variables in the daily lives of Puerto Ricans on the mainland, in particular SEL and Color of Skin.

Conclusions

From the results of the present study, and the comparisons made with the results of the previous study, it appears that, although oppression exists for both mainland and island Puerto Ricans and the Gurin *et al.* Scale tapped this aspect in both groups, the actual reality of this oppression for each group may be very different. It is suggested in the present study, therefore, that the difference may be that, on the mainland oppression takes on a more personal form while on the island it is in a political form. Social change activities on the island also seem to take a different direction and emphasis than on the mainland which is very likely also reflective of a difference in oppression. Further investigation is necessary, however, to determine whether there is, indeed, a difference. Such research might begin by determining whether personal and political oppression are a part of life for Puerto Ri-

cans on the mainland and the island, and the importance to individuals of these types of oppression, again, both on the island and the mainland.

The sex-role research did indicate that Puerto Rican men, although holding liberal attitudes towards the role of women, still maintain many traditional sex-role self-concepts, and that the Puerto Rican women tend to do the same although on a lesser scale. The last stronghold of the "machismo" concept, therefore, seems to be within the personal, individual level which, of course, is more resistant to change. It may be of interest to extend this research in order to further specify the changes taking place in the area of sex-roles and include measures of self-esteem to determine whether the changes are threatening male Puerto Rican's self-esteem, and how.

References

- Abril, M. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Prager Publishers, 1973.
- Alegria, R. E. Historia de nuestros Indios. Coleccion de Estudios Puertorriquenos. San Juan de Puerto Rico, 1969.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Barry, H. A., Bacon, M. R., & Child, I. L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 327-332.
- Betances, R. E. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Prager Publishers, 1973.
- Boyce. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Prager Publishers, 1973.
- Brau, S. La colonizacion de Puerto Rico. San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1956.
- Cabrera, Y. A. A study of American and Mexican-American culture values and their significance in education. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, 309.
- Caplan, N. S. & Paige, J. M. A study of ghetto rioters. Scientific American, August, 1968, 219(2), 15-21.
- Carroll, H. K. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Prager Publishers, 1973.
- Child, I. L. Personality in culture. In E. F. Borgatta & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.

- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Corretjer, J. A. The day Puerto Rico became a nation. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Ellis, L. J. & Bentler, P. M. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25(1), 28-34.
- Epps, E. G. Family and achievement: A study of the relation of family background to achievement orientation and performance among urban Negro high school students. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1969.
- Escoffery, A. S. Personality and behavioral correlations of Negro American belief in "fate control." Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 3261-3262,
- Fernberger, S. W. Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 97-101.
- Fitzpatrick, J. P. Puerto Rican Americans: The meaning of migration to the mainland. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Foraker, J. B. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Forward, J. J. & Williams, J. R. Internal-external control and Black militancy. In R. I. Evans & R. M. Rozelle (Eds.), Social psychology in life. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973.
- Franklin, R. D. Youth's expectancies about internal versus external

- control of reinforcement related to N variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cited in J. Rotter, Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(No. 1), 260-295.
- Garza, R. T. & Ames, R. E. A comparison of Anglo- and Mexican-American college students on locus of control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 919.
- Gore, P. M. & Rotter, J. B. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 58-64.
- Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. Internal-external control of the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 29-53.
- Hartley, R. E. A developmental view of female sex-role definition and identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 3-16.
- Hollingshead, A. B. & Redlich, F. C. Social class and mental illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Irving, W. The life and voyages of Christopher Columbus. New York: United States Book Co., 1828. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- La Democracia. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B. S. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research,

Vol. 6, Academic Press, 1972, 1-39.

Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1976.

Maldonado, Denis, M. Puerto Rico: A socio-historic interpretation. Trans. E. Vialo, New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

Maria de Hostos, E. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Marin, G., de Armengol, Goldstein, and Lombana. Personal correspondence, 1974.

Miles, N. A. From the U.S. War Dept. Military Government of Puerto Rico from October 18, 1898, to April 30, 1900. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1902.

Moore, B. W. & Holtzman, W. N. Tomorrow's parents: A study of youth and their families. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.

Munoz Marin, L. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Morales Carrion, A. Historia del pueblo de Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico: Dept. of Public Education, 1968.

New York Times. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Parsons, O. A. & Schneider, J. M. Locus of control in university students from eastern and western societies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 456-461.

Paige, J. Collective violence and the culture of subordination. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968. Cited

- in Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. Internal-external control of the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 29-53.
- Phares, E. J. Internal-external control as a determinant of amount of social influence exerted. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 642-647.
- Phares, E. J., Ritchie, D. E., & Davis, W. L. Internal-external control and reaction to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 402-405.
- Ramos-McKay, J. M. Locus of control, social activism and sex roles in Puerto Rican college and non-college individuals. Unpublished Masters thesis, 1976.
- Ramos-McKay, J. M. & Alvarez, A. Unpublished Spanish translation of the Attitude toward Women Scale, 1975.
- Ramos-McKay, J. M. & Alvarez, A. Unpublished Spanish translation of the Gurin et al. Scale, 1975.
- Ramos-McKay, J. M. & Alvarez, A. Unpublished Spanish translation of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, 1975.
- Ransford, H. E. Isolation, powerlessness and violence: A study of attitudes and participation in the Watts riot. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 581-591.
- Rosenkrantz, P. S., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, K. I., & Broverman, D. M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external

- control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, whole no. 609).
- Rotter, J. B. Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 46, 278-283.
- Sank, Z. B. & Strickland, B. R. Some attitudinal and behavioral correlates of a belief in militant or moderate social action. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 90, 337-338.
- Seda Bonilla, E. S. Social change and personality in a Puerto Rican agrarian reform community. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Silen, J. A. Hacia una vision positiva del puertorriqueno. Rio Piedras: Editorial Edil, 1973.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS). Bulletin of Psychonomic Society, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. The Personal Attributes Questionnaires: A measurement of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. Journal Supplement Abstract Service Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 43.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.
- Strickland, B. R. Prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 66,

353-358.

Strickland, B. R. Internal versus external control of reinforcement.

In J. Blass (Ed.), Personality variables and social behavior. Englewood, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1977.

Taft. In K. Wagenheim & O. Jimenez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans, a documentary history. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Wagenheim, K. Puerto Rico: A profile. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Name: _____ Date of Birth: _____

Sex: _____ Address: _____

Permanent Address: _____

Religion: _____ If in college, year and semester: _____

Place of birth: _____ Employment: _____

How long have you been living on the U.S. mainland? _____

What is/was your father's occupation (or person who raised you)?: _____

What is/was your mother's occupation (or person who raised you)?: _____

How many children are there in your family? _____ What number are

you?: _____ Education of head of household: _____ Briefly, what life

goals have you set for yourself?: _____

For Interviewer's Use Only

Act.: _____

C.: _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

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 numbered 1 or 2. 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.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on the answer sheet provided. 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.

(Now go on to the next page)

1. 1 Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
2 The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. 1 Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
2 People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. 1 One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
2 There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. 1 In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
2 Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. 1 The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
2 Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. 1 Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
2 Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. 1 No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
2 People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. 1 Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
2 It is one's experience in life which determine what they're like.
9. 1 I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
2 Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

(Go on to next page)

10. 1 In the case of the well-prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
2 Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
11. 1 Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
2 Getting a good job depends on being in the right place at the right time.
12. 1 The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
2 This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. 1 When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
2 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. 1 There are certain people who are just no good.
2 There is some good in everybody.
15. 1 In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
2 Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. 1 Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
2 Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. 1 As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
2 By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. 1 Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings..
2 There really is no such thing as "luck."

(Go on to next page)

19. 1 One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
2 It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. 1 It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
2 How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21. 1 In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
2 Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. 1 With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
2 It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
23. 1 Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
2 There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
24. 1 A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
2 A good leader makes it clearly to everybody what their jobs are.
25. 1 Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
2 It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
26. 1 People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
2 There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
27. 1 There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
2 Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
28. 1 What happens to me is my own doing.
2 Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the directions my life is taking.

(Go on to next page)

29. 1 Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
- 2 In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
30. 1 The best way to handle problems of discrimination is for each individual minority person to make sure s/he gets the best training possible for what s/he wants to do.
- 2 Only if minority individuals pull together in civil rights groups and activities can anything really be done about discrimination.
31. 1 The best way to overcome discrimination is through pressure and social action.
- 2 The best way to overcome discrimination is for each individual minority person to be even better trained and more qualified than the most qualified white person.
32. 1 Racial discrimination is here to stay.
- 2 People may be prejudiced but it's possible for American society to completely rid itself of open discrimination.
33. 1 The so-called "white backlash" shows once again that whites are so opposed to minorities getting their rights that it's practically impossible to end discrimination in America.
- 2 The so-called "white backlash" has been exaggerated. Certainly enough whites support the goals of the minority cause for Americans to see considerable progress in wiping out discrimination.
34. 1 The racial situation in America may be very complex, but with enough money and effort, it is possible to get rid of racial discrimination.
- 2 We'll never completely get rid of discrimination. It's part of human nature.
35. 1 It's lack of skill and abilities that keeps many minority individuals from getting a job. It's not just because they're minority. When a minority person is trained to do something, he is able to get a job.
- 2 Many qualified minority individuals can't get a good job. White people with the same skills wouldn't have any trouble.

(Go on to next page)

36. 1. Many minority individuals who don't do well in life do have good training, but the opportunities just always go to whites.
- 2 Minority individuals may not have the same opportunities as whites, but many minority people haven't prepared themselves enough to make use of the opportunities that come their way.
37. 1 Many minority individuals have only themselves to blame for not doing better in life. If they tried harder, they'd do better.
- 2 When two qualified people, one minority and one white, are considered for the same job, the minority person won't get the job no matter how hard s/he tries.
38. 1 The attempt to "fit in" and do what's proper hasn't paid off for minorities. It doesn't matter how "proper" you are, you'll still see serious discrimination if you're a minority.
- 2 The problem for many minority individuals is that they aren't really acceptable by American standards. Any minority person who is educated and does what is considered proper will be accepted and get ahead.
39. 1 Minorities would be better off and the cause of civil rights advanced if there were fewer demonstrations.
- 2 The only way minorities will gain their civil rights is by constant protest and pressure.
40. 1 Depending on bi-racial committees is just a dodge. Talking and understanding without constant protest and pressure will never solve problems of discrimination.
- 2 Talking and understanding as opposed to protest and pressure is the best way to solve racial discrimination.
41. 1 Organized action is one approach to handling discrimination, but there are probably very few situations that couldn't be better handled by minority leaders talking with white leaders.
- 2 Most discriminatory situations simply can't be handled without organized pressure and group action.

42. 1 Discrimination affects all minority individuals. The only way to handle it is for minorities to organize together and demand rights for all minorities.
- 2 Discrimination may affect all minority individuals but the best way to handle it is for each individual minority person to act like any other American--to work hard, get a good education, and mind his own business.

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (1) agree strongly, (2) agree mildly, (3) disagree mildly, or (4) disagree strongly. Please indicate your opinion by blackening either 1, 2, 3, or 4 on the answer sheet. Begin with number 43 on this answer sheet.

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
4. Telling dirty jokes should be a mostly masculine prerogative.
5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
7. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.

(Go to next page)

9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expenses when they go out together.
12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiances.
18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
19. Women should be concerned with their duties of child-bearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.

(Go to next page)

25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the numbers 1-5 in between. For example:

Not at all artistic 1...2...3...4...5 Very artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics--that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The numbers form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a number which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose 1. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose 4. If you are only medium, you might choose 3, and so forth. ANSWER QUICKLY; YOUR FIRST IMPRESSION IS THE BEST.

Once you have selected the letter that best describes yourself, mark your answer on the printed answer sheet. Do this by blackening the line under the number you choose.

Now go ahead and answer the questions. Be sure to answer every question, even if you're not sure, and use a number 2 pencil. Begin with number 68 on the answer sheet.

1. Not at all aggressive 1...2...3...4...5 Very aggressive
2. Not at all independent 1...2...3...4...5 Very independent
3. Not at all emotional 1...2...3...4...5 Very emotional
4. Very submissive 1...2...3...4...5 Very dominant
5. Not at all excitable
in a major crisis 1...2...3...4...5 Very excitable in
a major crisis
6. Very passive 1...2...3...4...5 Very active
7. Not at all able to de-
vote self completely
to others 1...2...3...4...5 Able to devote
self completely to
others

(Go to next page)

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 8. Very rough | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very gentle |
| 9. Not at all helpful to others | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very helpful to others |
| 10. Not at all competitive | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very competitive |
| 11. Very home-oriented | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very worldly |
| 12. Not at all kind | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very kind |
| 13. Indifferent to other's approval | 1...2...3...4...5 | Highly needful of other's approval |
| 14. Feelings not easily hurt | 1...2...3...4...5 | Feelings easily hurt |
| 15. Not at all aware of feelings of others | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very aware of feelings of others |
| 16. Can make decisions easily | 1...2...3...4...5 | Has difficult making decisions |
| 17. Gives up very easily | 1...2...3...4...5 | Never gives up easily |
| 18. Never cries | 1...2...3...4...5 | Cries very easily |
| 19. Not at all self-confident | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very self-confident |
| 20. Feels very inferior | 1...2...3...4...5 | Feels very superior |
| 21. Not at all understanding of others | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very understanding of others |
| 22. Very cold in relations with others | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very warm in relations with others |
| 23. Very little need for security | 1...2...3...4...5 | Very strong need for security |
| 24. Goes to pieces under pressure | 1...2...3...4...5 | Stands up well under pressure |

(Please stop)

Forma de Información

Nombre: _____ Fecha de Nacimiento: _____

Sexo: _____ Dirección: _____

Religión: _____ Si en Universidad, Año y semestre: _____

Lugar de nacimiento: _____ Empleo: _____

¿Ha viajado a los E.U.?: _____

¿Cuál es/era la ocupación de su padre (o persona que lo/la crió)?: _____

¿Cuál es/era la ocupación de su madre (o persona que lo/la crió)?: _____

La cabeza de mi familia era mi: Padre: _____ Madre: _____

¿Cuántos hermanos y hermanas tiene Ud.?: _____

¿Qué número es Ud. en su familia?: _____

Educación de su Padre: _____ Educación de su Madre: _____

¿Cuál es su educación?: _____

 PARA USO DE LA INVESTIGADORA

Act.: _____

C.: _____

Este es un cuestionario para encontrar la forma en que ciertos eventos de nuestra sociedad afectan a distintas personas. Cada ítem consiste de dos alternativas identificadas con los números 1 y 2. Por favor seleccione aquella alternativa para cada ítem (solo una) que indica lo que usted cree más firmemente concerniente a su caso particular. Por favor escoja aquella que usted en realidad cree más cierta y no la que usted crea que debe escoger o la que usted desearía que fuera cierta. Esta es una medida de creencias personales y por lo tanto no hay respuestas malas o buenas.

Sus respuestas a las preguntas en este cuestionario se deben marcar en la hoja de respuestas adjunta.

Por favor conteste estos ítems cuidadosamente pero no se demore mucho tiempo en cualquiera de ellos. Por favor encuentre siempre una respuesta para cada ítem. En algunos casos usted encontrará que usted cree en ambas alternativas o en ninguna de ellas, en tales casos seleccione aquella que está más relacionada con lo que usted cree. Conteste cada ítem sin fijarse en lo que contestó a ítems previos.

RECUERDE

Seleccione aquella alternativa que usted personalmente cree que es más cierta.

(Siga a la próxima página)

Primera Parte

1. 1 Los niños se meten en problemas porque los padres los castigan demasiado.
- 2 El problema con la mayoría de los niños es que sus padres son demasiado suaves con ellos.
2. 1 Muchas de las cosas desagradables en la vida de una persona se deben en parte a la mala suerte.
- 2 La mala suerte de ciertas personas se debe a los errores que han cometido.
3. 1 Una de las razones más importantes de que tenemos guerras es que la gente no se interesa lo suficiente en la política.
- 2 Siempre habrá guerras, no importa cuanto tratemos de prevenirlas.
4. 1 Al fin y al cabo la gente obtiene el respeto que se merece en la vida.
- 2 Desafortunadamente el valor de un individuo frecuentemente pasa desapercibido, sin importar cuanto se esfuerce.
5. 1 La idea de que los profesores no son justos es absurda.
- 2 La mayoría de los estudiantes no se dan cuenta de la influencia que ciertos hechos accidentales tienen sobre sus calificaciones.
6. 1 Sin ciertas situaciones favorables uno no puede ser un líder eficaz.
- 2 Personas capaces que no se han convertido en líderes es porque no han aprovechado sus oportunidades.
7. 1 No importa cuanto uno se esfuerce, siempre habrá gente a la que uno le disgusta.
- 2 Aquellos que no pueden agradar a otros es porque no saben como llevarse bien con otras personas.
8. 1 La herencia desempeña el papel más importante en determinar la personalidad de un individuo.
- 2 Son las experiencias de una persona las que determinan su manera de ser.

(Siga a la próxima página)

9. 1 Yo he encontrado frecuentemente que lo que va a suceder sucede.
2 El confiar en el destino nunca me ha salido tan bien como el tomar una decisión sobre como debo actuar.
10. 1 El estudiante bien preparado rara vez considera que un examen es injusto.
2 Muchas veces la preguntas en un examen tienen tan poca relacion con lo que se ha hecho en clase que resulta inoficioso el estudiar.
11. 1 El obtener éxito es el efecto del trabajo ya que la suerte tiene muy poco o nada que ver con el éxito de una persona.
2 El obtener un buen trabajo depende principalmente de estar en el sitio correcto en el momento correcto.
12. 1 El ciudadano común y corriente puede tener influencia en las decisiones de goberno.
2 El mundo está gobernado por las pocas personas que ejercen el poder y no es mucho lo que el hombre común y corriente puede hacer.
13. 1 Cuando yo planeo algo, estoy seguro de que los planes funcionaran.
2 No es aconsejable el planear con demasiada anticipación ya que muchas cosas de todos modos dependent de la buena o mala suerte.
14. 1 Ciertas personas son simplemente malas.
2 Hay algo bueno en todas las personas.
15. 1 En mi caso el conseguir lo que yo quiero tiene muy poco que ver con mi suerte.
2 Muchas veces es mejor decidir lo que se va a hacer "echando una moneda al aire."
16. 1 Quien se convierte en jefe depende frecuentemente de quien tuvo la suerte de estar en el sitio correcto primero.
2 El obtener que la gente haga lo que debe hacer depende de la habilidad del jefe; la suerte tiene muy poco que ver en esta situación.

(Siga a la próxima página)

17. 1 En referencia a los asuntos mundiales la mayoría de nosotros somos víctimas de fuerzas que no podemos entender ni controlar.
2 Tomando una parte activa en asuntos políticos y sociales la gente puede controlar los asuntos mundiales.
18. 1 La mayoría de la gente no se da cuenta hasta que grado sus vidas están controladas por hechos meramente accidentales.
2 La suerte en realidad no existe.
19. 1 Uno siempre debe estar dispuesto a admitir sus errores.
2 Generalmente es mejor ocultar los errores que uno comete.
20. 1 Es difícil saber si en realidad uno le agrada a otra persona o no.
2 El número de amigos que uno tiene depende de que tan amable es uno.
21. 1 Al fin y al cabo las malas cosas que le suceden a uno están balanceadas por las buenas.
2 La mayoría de las desgracias que le suceden a uno son el resultado de la ignorancia, la falta de habilidad, la pereza o las tres juntas.
22. 1 Con el suficiente esfuerzo podemos destruir la corrupción política.
2 Es muy difícil para las personas el controlar lo que los políticos hacen una vez que son elegidos.
23. 1 Algunas veces yo no puedo entender como es que los profesores deciden las notas que dan.
2 Existe una relación directa entre cuánto estudio y las notas que obtengo.
24. 1 Un buen líder aspira a que las personas decidan por sí mismas que deben hacer.
2 Un buen líder siempre explica a cada cual lo que debe hacer.
25. 1 Muchas veces yo siento que tengo muy poca influencia sobre las cosas que me suceden.
2 Es imposible para mí el creer que la suerte o la casualidad son importantes en lo que me sucede.

(Siga a la proxima pagina)

26. 1 Ciertas personas se sienten solas porque no tratan de ser amigables.
- 2 No vale la pena esforzarse mucho por complacer a la gente pues si uno les gusta les gusta.
27. 1 Se le está poniendo demasiado énfasis a los deportes en la escuela secundaria.
- 2 Los deportes en equipo son excelentes para crear un buen carácter.
28. 1 Lo que me sucede es producto de mis propios actos.
- 2 A veces siento que no tengo suficiente control sobre el curso de my vida.
29. 1 La mayoría de las veces yo no entiendo por que los políticos se comportan como lo hacen.
- 2 Al fin y al cabo es la gente la que es responsable por un mal gobierno a nivel nacional y local.
30. 1 La mejor manera de tratar los problemas de la discriminación es en que cada persona de grupo minoritario se asegure de recibir el mejor entrenamiento posible para lo que quiere hacer.
- 2 Se podrá hacer algo para combatir la discriminación solo si los grupos minoritarios se unen en grupos y actividades de derechos civiles.
31. 1 La mejor manera de vencer la discriminación es a través de la presión y acción social.
- 2 La mejor manera de vencer la discriminación es en asegurar que cada individuo de grupo minoritario obtenga el mejor entrenamiento y tenga mejores calificaciones que la mayoría de las personas blancas bien calificadas.
32. 1 La discriminación racial estará con nosotros para siempre.
- 2 La gente tendrá prejuicios pero hay una posibilidad para la sociedad norteamericana de deshacerse por completo de la discriminación publica.

(Siga a la próxima página)

33. 1 La así llamada "reacción violenta de los blancos" nos indica una vez más, que los blancos están tan opuestos a que los grupos minoritarios obtengan sus derechos, que es casi imposible terminar la discriminación en los Estados Unidos.
- 2 La así llamada "reacción violenta de los blancos" ha sido exagerada. Hay suficientes personas blancas que respaldan las metas de la causa de grupos minoritarios de modo que los americanos vean progreso considerable en la eliminación de la discriminación.
34. 1 Puede que la situación racial en América sea muy complicada, pero con esfuerzo y suficiente dinero, es posible deshacerse de la discriminación racial.
- 2 Nunca nos deshaceremos de la discriminación. Es parte de la naturaleza humana.
35. 1 Es la falta de destreza y habilidad que impide el empleo de muchas personas de grupos minoritarios. No es solo por que son de grupos minoritarios. Cuando tal persona está bien entrenada puede obtener un trabajo.
- 2 Muchos individuos de minorías que tienen buenas calificaciones no pueden obtener un buen trabajo. Personas blancas con las mismas habilidades no tendrían ningún problema.
36. 1 Aunque muchos individuos de minorías están bien preparados, no tienen éxito en la vida, porque las oportunidades siempre se les dan a los blancos.
- 2 Puede que no se les den las mismas oportunidades a individuos de minorías que se les dan a los blancos, pero muchas personas de minorías no se han preparado lo suficiente para usar las oportunidades que se les presentan.
37. 1 Muchos individuos de minorías se deben echar la culpa a sí mismos por no tener mas éxito en la vida. Si tratasen más duramente, tendrían más éxito.
- 2 Cuando dos personas calificadas, una de minoría y una blanca, son consideradas para el mismo trabajo, la persona minoritaria no será empleada, no importa cuan duramente esa persona trate.

38. 1 El intento de "funcionar apropiadamente" y hacer lo que es correcto no ha resultado en nada para las minorías. No importa lo "correcto" que uno sea, siempre se encontrará con discriminación seria, si uno es persona minoritaria.
- 2 El problema para muchas personas minoritarias es que no son verdaderamente aceptables en términos de la norma americana. Cualquiera persona minoritaria que sea educada y que haga lo que se considere correcto será aceptada y tendrá éxito.
39. 1 Los grupos minoritarios estarían en mejores condiciones y la causa de derechos civiles avanzada si no hubiesen tantas demostraciones y piquetes.
- 2 De la única manera que los grupos minoritarios obtendrán sus derechos civiles es a través de protestas y presión constante.
40. 1 Depender de comités compuestos de dos razas es una pérdida de tiempo. El hablar y la comprensión sin protesta ni presión constante nunca resolverán los problemas de la discriminación.
- 2 El hablar y la comprensión en vez de protestas y presión son las mejores maneras de resolver la discriminación racial.
41. 1 Acción organizada es una manera de tratar con la discriminación, pero probablemente hay más situaciones en las cuales resultaría mejor si los líderes minoritarios hablasen con los líderes blancos.
- 2 La mayoría de las situaciones discriminatorias, simplemente, no pueden ser resueltas sin presión organizada y acción colectiva.
42. 1 La discriminación afecta a todo individuo de grupos minoritarios. La única manera de resolver este problema es en organizar todos los grupos minoritarios y demandar derechos para todas las minorías.
- 2 Puede que la discriminación afecte a todo individuo de grupos minoritarios, pero la mejor manera de resolver este problema es en que cada persona minoritaria actúe como cualquier otro americano --trabajar duro, obtener una buena educación y no meterse en cosas ajenas.

Segunda Parte

CUESTIONARIO DE CARACTERISTICAS PERSONALES

(Siga a la próxima página)

Los ítems abajo son preguntas sobre la clase de persona que usted cree ser. Cada ítem está compuesto de pares de características con los números del 1 al 5 entre cada par. Por ejemplo:

No artístico 1...2...3...4...5 Muy artístico

Cada par describe características contradictorias--en otras palabras, usted no puede ser ambos a la misma vez, tal como muy artístico y no artístico.

Los números forman una escala entre los dos extremos. Usted debe de escoger un número que describe donde usted pertenece en la escala. Por ejemplo, si usted cree que no tiene ninguna habilidad artística, entonces escogería el número 1. Si usted cree que es bastante hábil en arte puede escoger el número 4. Si cree que solo tiene habilidad intermedia puede escoger el número 3. Conteste los ítems rápidamente; SU PRIMERA IMPRESIÓN ES LA MEJOR.

Después que haya escogido el número que mejor describe como es usted, marque su respuesta en la hoja de respuestas adjunta. Con un lápiz, haga una marca al lado del número que prefiere.

Ahora empiece a contestar las preguntas. Asegurese que ha contestado todas las preguntas aunque no esté completamente seguro. Empiece con el número 43 en la hoja de respuestas.

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 43. No agresivo | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy agresivo |
| 44. No independiente | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy independiente |
| 45. No emocional | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy emocional |
| 46. Muy obediente | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy dominante |
| 47. No excitable en una gran crisis | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy excitable en una gran crisis |
| 48. Muy pasivo | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy activo |
| 49. No puedo dedicarme completamente a otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Puedo dedicarme completamente a otros |
| 50. Muy aspero | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy suave |
| 51. No muy servicial con otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy servicial con otros |
| 52. No soy competidor | 1...2...3...4...5 | Soy muy competidor |

(Siga a la próxima página)

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 53. Muy hogareno | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy mundano |
| 54. No soy amble | 1...2...3...4...5 | Muy amable |
| 55. Indiferente al consentimiento de otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Necesito mucho el consentimiento de otros |
| 56. Mis sentimientos no son ofendidos facilmente | 1...2...3...4...5 | Mis sentimientos son ofendidos facilmente |
| 57. No me doy cuenta de los sentimientos de otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Siempre me doy cuenta de los sentimientos de otros |
| 58. Puedo hacer decisiones fácilmente | 1...2...3...4...5 | Tengo dificultad en hacer decisiones |
| 59. Me doy por vencido facilmente | 1...2...3...4...5 | Nunca me doy por vencido facilmente |
| 60. Nunca lloro | 1...2...3...4...5 | Lloro facilmente |
| 61. No tengo confianza en mi mismo | 1...2...3...4...5 | Tengo mucha confianza en mi mismo |
| 62. Me siento muy inferior | 1...2...3...4...5 | Me siento muy superior |
| 63. No tengo buena comprensión de otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Tengo mucha comprensión de otros |
| 64. Soy muy indiferente en relaciones con otros | 1...2...3...4...5 | Soy muy cariñoso en relaciones con otros |
| 65. Tengo poca necesidad de la seguridad | 1...2...3...4...5 | Tengo gran necesidad de la seguridad |
| 66. Me desborono por completo bajo presión | | Resisto bien cuando estoy bajo presión |

Tercera Parte

Las siguientes oraciones indican las actitudes que varias personas tienen hacia el papel de la mujer en la sociedad. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas, solo opiniones. Pedimos que usted exprese sus sentimientos sobre cada oración indicando si usted (1) está completamente de acuerdo, (2) está un poco de acuerdo, (3) está un poco en contra, o (4) está completamente en contra. Por favor indique su opinión marcando los números 1, 2, 3, o 4 en la hoja de respuestas. Empiece con el número 67 en esta hoja.

(Siga a la próxima página)

67. Blasfemias y malas palabras son más repulsivas cuando dichas por una mujer que por un hombre.
68. Las mujeres deben de tomar más y más responsabilidad en el liderato para resolver los problemas intelectuales y sociales de hoy día.
69. Tanto un esposo como una esposa deben de ser permitidos las mismas razones para obtener un divorcio.
70. El contar chistes indecentes debería de ser un privilegio masculino.
71. La intoxicación en la mujer es peor que la intoxicación en el hombre.
72. Bajo condiciones actuales de la economía, con las mujeres siendo muy activas fuera del hogar, los hombres deben de compartir tales quehaceres de la casa como lavar platos y lavar ropa.
73. Es un insulto para las mujeres mantener la palabra "obedecer" en la ceremonia matrimonial.
74. Debería de haber un sistema de mérito estricto en nombramientos y promociones en empleos sin referencia al sexo de la persona.
75. La mujer debería tener la misma libertad de proponer matrimonio que el hombre.
76. Las mujeres deberían de apurarse menos por sus derechos y más por ser buenas esposas y madres.
77. La mujer que gana lo mismo que su novio debería de compartir en los gastos cuando salen juntos.
78. Las mujeres deben asumir su lugar apropiado en los negocios y en todas las profesiones junto con los hombres.
79. Una mujer no debe esperar el poder ir a los mismos sitios o tener la misma libertad que un hombre.
80. Los hijos en una familia deben de recibir más ayuda para que vayan a la universidad que las hijas.
81. Es ridículo cuando una mujer maneja un tren y un hombre zurce medias.
82. En general, el padre debe tener más autoridad que la madre en la crianza de los hijos.

(Siga a la próxima página)

83. Las mujeres deben de ser aconsejadas a que no tengan intimidad sexual con ninguna persona antes de ser casadas, aun con sus compañeros prometidos.
84. El esposo no debe de ser favorecido más que la esposa por la ley en cuestiones de la disposición de propiedad or ingresos.
85. Las mujeres deberían estar más interesadas en sus deberes, tales como maternidad y el cuidado del hogar, en vez de sus deseos por carreras profesionales.
86. El liderato intelectual de una comunidad debería estar mayormente en las manos de los hombres.
87. La libertad económica y social vale más para una mujer que aceptar el modelo de la femeneidad ideal que ha sido establecida por los hombres.
88. Por lo general las mujeres deben de ser juzgadas como menos capaces de contribuir a la producción económica que los hombres.
89. Hay muchos trabajos en los cuales los hombres deben de recibir preferencia en cuestiones de empleo y promoción que las mujeres no deben de recibir.
90. Las mujeres deberían ser dadas la misma oportunidad que los hombres para participar en aprendizajes profesionales.
91. La muchacha moderna tiene el mismo derecho de estar libre de reglas y controles como el muchacho moderno.

(Pare aquí)

APPENDIX B

Interview Format

Ss are to be informed that their individual answers to the interview will be kept in the strictest confidence.

Ss are asked to answer the following questions:

- 1) What kinds of hobbies do you have?
- 2) Do you participate in any sports?
- 3a) (for college students) What do you think of the university system as it exists today in this society?
- 3b) (for non-college individuals) What do you think of the current employment situation?

After these questions, the E will ask the individual whether s/he has ever been, or is now, involved in any social action movements or organizations which actively carry out demonstrations or protests concerning issues in today's society.

If the S answers yes to the above question, a free style interview including the following questions is to be conducted:

- 1) What kinds of activities have you been involved in?
- 2) What was your role in these activities?
- 3) What led you to participate in social change activities?
- 4) Do you plan to participate in such activities in the future?

APPENDIX C

Table 1
Locus of Control Single df Comparisons--
Skin Color-College/Non-College

Comparison	Rotter Scale ⁺			Gurin et al. Scale ⁺		
	Mean	S.D.	F*	Mean	S.D.	F**
College White (n = 32)	9.31	3.29	.146	5.45	3.01	.023
Non-College White (n = 16)	8.94	3.04		5.31	2.63	
College Moreno (n = 53)	9.68	3.26	.818	5.85	2.08	.187
Non-College Moreno (n = 54)	9.56	2.89		5.34	2.01	
College Black (n = 17)	10.12	3.16	.853	6.69	3.26	.488
Non-College Black (n = 14)	10.28	2.97		5.93	2.43	

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 10.3003.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale with 181 df. The value was 8.2933.

Table 2

Locus of Control Single df Comparisons Skin Color-College

Comparison	Rotter Scale ⁺			Gurin et al. Scale ⁺		
	Mean	S.D.	F*	Mean	S.D.	F**
White (n = 33)	9.03	3.62	.757	4.79	3.34	2.34
Moreno (n = 53)	9.68	3.26		5.76	2.21	
White (n = 33)	9.03	3.62	1.170	4.79	3.34	.461
Black (n = 17)	10.12	3.16		6.29	3.55	
Moreno (n = 53)	9.68	3.26	.218	5.76	2.21	3.13
Black (n = 17)	10.12	3.16		6.29	3.55	

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 100 df. The value was 11.3228.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 100 df. The value was 8.1266.

Table 3

Locus of Control Single df Comparisons Skin Color/Non-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Rotter Scale⁺</u>			<u>Gurin et al Scale⁺</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>
White (n = 16)	8.94	3.04	.548	5.31	2.63	.012
Moreno (n = 54)	9.56	2.89		5.24	2.12	
White (n = 16)	8.94	3.04	1.58	5.31	2.63	.549
Black (n = 14)	10.29	2.97		5.93	2.43	
Moreno (n = 54)	9.56	2.89	.689	5.24	2.12	1.018
Black (n = 14)	10.29	2.97		5.93	2.43	

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 81 df. The value was 8.6065.

**Calculated as for Rotter Scale on 81 df. The value was 5.1634.

Table 4

Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles

Single df Comparisons-Skin Color-College/Non-College

<u>Compar.</u>	AWS				PAQ			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Sig. Level</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>	<u>Sig. Level</u>
CW (n=32)	46.00	12.06	2.04	N/S	(n=33)	39.67	8.01	.433
NCW (n=16)	41.00	9.96			(n=16)	38.25	4.44	N/S
CM (n=53)	44.76	11.12	6.05	.05	(n=53)	40.53	6.96	5.58
NCM (n=51)	40.12	7.74			(n=54)	36.59	9.98	.05
CB (n=17)	41.47	8.71	.001	N/S	(n=17)	43.29	5.61	.312
NCB (n=13)	41.38	7.30			(n=14)	41.93	7.98	N/S

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 181 df. The value was 130.4348.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 181 df. The value was 49.9646.

C = college; NC = non-college; W = whites; M = Morenos; B = Blacks.

Table 5
 Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles
 Single df Comparisons-Skin Color-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>AWS⁺</u>		<u>F*</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>PAQ⁺</u>		<u>F**</u>
		<u>S.D.</u>					<u>S.D.</u>		
White (n = 32)	46.00	12.06	.252	(n=33)	39.67	8.01	.297		
Moreno (n = 53)	44.76	11.12				6.96			
White (n = 33)	46.00	12.06	1.855	(n=33)	39.67	8.01	2.91		
Black (n = 17)	41.47	8.71				5.61			
Moreno (n = 53)	44.76	11.12	1.130	(n=53)	40.53	6.96	1.94		
Black (n = 17)	41.47	8.71				5.61			

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell mean square and is distributed on 100 df. The value was 122.7682.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 100 df. The value was 50.7607.

Table 6

Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles
Single df Comparisons-Skin Color-Non-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>AWS⁺</u>			<u>PAQ</u>			<u>Sig. Level</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>	
White (n=16)	41.00	9.96	.0159	(n=16) 38.25	4.44	.429	N/S
Moreno (n=51)	40.12	7.74		(n=54) 36.59	9.98		
White (n=16)	41.00	9.96	.1429	(n=16) 38.25	4.44	1.279	N/S
Black (n=13)	41.38	7.30		(n=14) 41.93	7.99		
Moreno (n=51)	40.12	7.74	.2500	(n=54) 36.59	9.98	4.01	<.05
Black (n=13)	41.38	7.30		(n=14) 41.93	7.99		

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 77 df. The value was 66.4984.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 81 df. The value was 78.9749.

Table 7
Locus of Control Single df Comparisons-
Socio-Economic Level-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Rotter Scale⁺</u>			<u>Gurin et al Sci⁺</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>
Class I (n = 3)	8.00	1.73	1.34	6.33	1.53	.43
Class II (n = 11)	10.55	3.33		5.09	2.47	
Class I (n = 11)	8.00	1.73	.93	6.33	1.53	.02
Class III (n = 31)	9.97	3.74		6.10	3.49	
Class I (n = 11)	8.00	1.73	.40	6.33	1.53	.24
Class IV (n = 36)	9.28	3.35		5.47	2.78	
Class I (n = 11)	8.00	1.73	.28	6.33	1.53	.60
Class V (n = 22)	9.10	2.97		4.96	2.40	
Class II (n = 11)	10.55	3.33	.24	5.09	2.47	.98
Class III (n = 31)	9.97	3.74		6.10	3.49	
Class II (n = 11)	10.55	3.33	1.19	5.09	2.47	.15
Class IV (n = 36)	9.28	3.35		5.47	2.78	
Class II (n = 11)	10.55	3.33	1.36	5.09	2.47	.02
Class V (n = 22)	9.10	2.97		4.96	2.40	
Class III (n = 31)	9.97	3.74	.70	6.10	3.49	.77
Class IV (n = 36)	9.28	3.35		5.47	2.78	
Class III (n = 31)	9.97	3.74	.87	6.10	3.49	2.00
Class V (n = 22)	9.10	2.97		4.96	2.40	
Class IV (n = 36)	9.28	3.35	.04	5.47	2.78	.44
Class V (n = 22)	9.10	2.97		4.96	2.40	

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 98 df. The value was 11.3953.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 98 df. The value was 8.3899.

Table 8
Locus of Control Single df Comparisons-
Socio-Economic Level¹ Non-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Rotter Scale⁺</u>			<u>Gurin et al. Scale⁺</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>
Class III (n = 13)	9.30	2.87	.10	4.77	2.32	.59
Class IV (n = 39)	9.62	3.15		5.33	2.43	
Class III (n = 13)	9.30	2.87	.08	4.77	2.82	1.38
Class V (n = 32)	9.59	2.74		5.66	2.03	
Class IV (n = 39)	9.62	3.15	.0009	5.33	2.43	.35
Class V (n = 32)	9.59	2.74		5.66	2.03	

¹No cases in Classes I and II.

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 79 df. The value was 8.9838.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 79 df. The value was 5.2683.

Table 9
Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles
Single df Comparisons-Social-Economic Level/College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>AWS</u> <u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Class I (n = 3)	46.67	11.93	.13	42.67
Class II (n = 11)	44.00	9.19		41.73
Class I (n = 3)	46.67	11.93	.04	42.67
Class III (n = 31)	45.32	12.39		41.61
Class I (n = 3)	46.67	11.93	.08	42.67
Class IV (n = 36)	44.80	9.40		40.19
Class I (n = 3)	46.67	11.93	.24	42.67
Class V (n = 22)	43.27	13.05		39.50
Class II (n = 11)	44.00	9.19	.11	41.73
Class III (n = 31)	45.32	12.39		41.61
Class II (n = 11)	44.00	9.19	.04	41.73
Class IV (n = 36)	44.80	9.40		40.19
Class II (n = 11)	44.00	9.19	.03	41.73
Class V (n = 22)	43.27	13.05		39.50
Class III (n = 31)	45.32	12.39	.04	41.61
Class IV (n = 36)	44.80	9.40		40.19
Class III (n = 31)	45.32	12.39	.43	41.61
Class V (n = 22)	43.27	13.05		39.50
Class IV (n = 36)	44.80	9.40	.25	40.19
Class V (n = 22)	43.27	13.05		39.50

[†]All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed with 98 df. The value was 126.9257.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 98 df. The value was 1.14.

Table 10

Attitudes toward Women and Sex Roles Single df Comparisons-
Socio-Economic Level¹ Non-College

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>AWS⁺</u>	<u>F*</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>PAQ⁺</u>	<u>F**</u>
		<u>S.D.</u>				<u>S.D.</u>	
Class III (n = 12)	37.33	6.07	1.45	(n=13)	39.08	7.17	.02
Class IV (n = 38)	40.58	7.85		(n=39)	38.67	7.41	
Class III (n = 12)	37.33	6.07	2.42	(n=13)	39.08	7.17	.91
Class V (n = 30)	41.67	8.90		(n=36)	36.22	11.19	
Class IV (n = 38)	40.58	7.85	.30	(n=39)	38.67	7.41	1.26
Class V (n = 30)	41.67	8.90		(n=32)	36.22	11.19	

¹No cases in Classes I and II.

⁺All comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 75 df. The value was 66.4080.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 79 df. The value was 83.3805.

Table 11

Locus of Control

Single df Comparisons--Visit U.S.

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Rotter Scale⁺</u>			<u>Gurin et al. Scale⁺</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F*</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>F**</u>
Visit U.S.--Yes (n = 115)	9.47	3.42	.196	5.30	2.85	1.06
Visit U.S.--No (n = 72)	9.68	2.72		5.71	2.18	

⁺Comparisons were non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 186 df. The value was 10.0340.

**Calculated as for the Rotter Scale on 186 df. The value was 6.8174.

Table 12
 Attitude toward Women and Sex Roles
 Single df Comparisons--Visit U.S.

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>AWS⁺</u>		<u>F*</u>		<u>PAQ⁺</u>		<u>F**</u>
		<u>S.D.</u>				<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	
Visit U.S.--Yes (n = 113)	43.67	10.92	2.28	(n=113)	39.64	7.17	.264	
Visit U.S.--No (n=69)	41.36	8.32		(n=72)	39.01	9.54		

⁺Comparisons are non-significant.

*Error MS was the usual within-cell MS and is distributed on 186 df. The value was 100.2824.

**Calculated as for the AWS on 186 df. The value was 66.5912.

APPENDIX D

Personal Interview Questions

The following questions were asked of each S:

- 1) What is your opinion of life and society in Puerto Rico today?
- 2) What is your opinion of the Puerto Rican government and what it has, or has not, accomplished?
- 3a) What is your opinion of statehood for Puerto Rico?
- 3b) Independence for Puerto Rico?
- 3c) The continuation of the present status as a "free associated state?"
- 4) Do you believe that Puerto Rico is oppressed in any way by the United States?
- 5a) Do you believe that the Puerto Rican family is changing?
- 5b) Are these changes positive or negative in your opinion and what are some of them?
- 5c) Do you believe that the role of the Puerto Rican woman is changing?
- 5d) Are these changes positive or negative in your opinion and what are some of them?

