



LOCUS OF CONTROL IN DEPRIVED AND NON DEPRIVED

DR.ASHOK.D.HOLKAR

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, GOVT. ARTS COLLEGE, BANGALORE

Abstract

The concept of 'unity in diversity' gives rise to an erroneous understanding of Indian social reality. Contrary to 'unity in diversity' there is a dialectical interrelationship between those social groups who have monopolized the scarce goods of power and privilege and those who lack these resources. Therefore, deprivation plays an important role in unfolding of human behavior in Indian society. The researcher intended to know the locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students, based on the objectives research finding shows that the significance differences in locus of control between male and female PG students except individual control.

Key words: Deprivation ,Personality ,Locus of control and culture

INTRODUCTION

Locus of control in social psychology refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events that affect them. Understanding of the concept was developed by Julian B. Rotter in 1954, and has since become an important aspect of personality studies.

Nannette Richard (2003) Locus of control refers to a person's perception of control or responsibility for his own life and actions. People who view the world as the primary contributor to their life situations and believe forces outside of themselves are responsible for their misfortunes or success subscribe to an exterior locus of control. Those who view their life and destiny as a result of their own doing subscribe to an interior locus of control.

Locus of control is a generalized expectancy, depending on the situation and the value of the reinforcement, someone may express a tendency toward an external locus of control in a given situation (personal love life) but express a tendency toward an internal locus of control in another situation (a given sport or hobby). "What a general measure of locus of control allows us to do is describe each individual's „average“ locus of control attributes over many situations. But we should remember that the wider the range of situations, the less predictive the concept will be. Therefore, (locus of control) may do a good job of predicting people's behavior in general but miss rather badly in any specific situation" (Phares, 1976, 46).

The concept of Internal-External was first proposed by Rotter (1966) and it forms a relatively small part of a more extensive personality theory incorporating many of the principles established in psychology of learning; this theory is known as social learning theory. He proposed that the degree to which people believe their lives to be under their own control is an important dimension of individual variation. People who are relatively internal believe they are responsible for their destiny, whereas people who are relatively external believe that the good and the bad things that happen to them are determined by luck, chance or powerful others.

Burger (1993) says of self-esteem as "the way an individual feels about him and herself for what he/she worth's. by locus of control is therefore, a psychophilosophical orientation about how an individual attribute the course of events that happen to him/her, either of his/her own internal locus of control, or another person's-external locus of control.

Good (1979), Culbreath (1983), Asonibare (1986), Olayonu (1992), Oyekan (1992), Kayode (2000), that studies done on locus of control were patterned on Rotter's (1966) scale of two dimensions, external and internal locus of control. While "external individual perceives having no control on the causes and effect the events of life, the "internal" person feels that the responsibly life events lie within his/her control. With regard to academic Achievement, (i.e. individual's attainment after a course of instruction that is often designated by test scores). Grandy's (1975) study seems to illustrate common findings that: Grandy studied the relationship between locus of control, achievement motivation and opportunity for learner decision making in high school science classes. Two hundred and eighty-eight respondents were involved in the study. Finding revealed that internal orientation was significantly related to science achievement and this group also scored significantly higher in science achievement than the externally oriented students, (in Kayode 2000 P.84). Several scholars have also reported positive relationships between locus of control and academic performance. Thus locus of

control is a strong predictor of academic performance with the internal individuals achieving better than external individual.

Locus of control is not a characteristic to be discovered within individuals. It is a construct, a working tool in social learning theory that allows for an interpretation of remarks made by people in response to questions about causality. Measures such as Rotter's locus of control scale are simply devices created to elicit those expressions of belief" (Lefcourt, 1982, p. 149). Therefore, while it is true that this paper will often refer to people as either internals (those with an internal locus of control) or externals (those with an external locus of control), this is done in order to be concise and does not imply the acceptance of locus of control as a trait.

On the basis of the above, one can conclude, and rightly too, that there are strong and positive inter-relationships to personality, social distance and locus of control with socio-cultural deprivation of students, and these criterion variables are good predictors of socio-cultural deprivation.

Objectives of the study

The following objectives have been set for the present study.

1. Assess the impact of socio-cultural deprivation on locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.
2. To know the significant interaction effect of sex and habitat on locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.

Statement of hypotheses

On the basis of the literature, following hypotheses were formulated with regard to the present investigation on the research topic.

1. There are significant differences in locus of control between deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.
2. There are significant interaction effect of sex and habitat on locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.

Variables

The following major variables have been used as independent and dependent variables.

Independent Variables

1. Sex
2. Habitat

Dependent Variables

1. Locus of Control

Sample

A sample of 400 students was chosen from Gulbarga University, Gulbarga.

Collection of Data

The Prolonged Deprivation Scale was administered randomly a large number of students studying in various P.G. Departments of Gulbarga University, Gulbarga to know the degree of deprivation of the students. The directives of the scale were followed in the process. For controlling the socio-cultural environment and identification of the student, it was thought necessary to collect the bio-data of the students.

Locus of Control Scale

Locus of Control Scale is prepared by Sanjay Vohra 1992. It is a Likert type scale with multiple choice responses presented in a continuum. This scale consists of 24 statements expressing the locus of control of the individuals.

Statistical techniques used in analyzing data

Keeping in the views of objectives and hypotheses of the study, the following statistical techniques were applied and the purpose for which they were used the mean SD and t-test.

Discussion

This research study is designed to find out the Locus of Control of post graduate students. The researcher also intended to find out the significant relationship between in Locus of Control of post graduate students.

Table.1.Shows the Mean, S.D. and t value of Locus of Control of Deprived and Non-Deprived PG students.

Variable and Groups		N	Mean	S.D.	t value	Level of Significance
Powerful	Non Deprived	200	8.04	1.71	2.92	**
	Deprived	200	8.50	1.43		
Chance Control	Non Deprived	200	7.50	1.96	1.11	NS
	Deprived	200	7.70	1.62		
Individual Control	Non Deprived	200	5.10	2.27	4.81	**
	Deprived	200	4.07	2.00		

NS = Not Significant; * Significant at 0.05 level (398 df; 1.97); ** Significant at 0.01 level (398 df; 2.59)

The above table shows the mean and S.D. of powerful of locus of control of non-deprived PG students is 8.04 and 1.71 is higher than the deprived i.e. 8.50 and 1.43 respectively. The calculated t value 2.92 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. The Non-deprived students are having powerful locus of control. There is significant difference between locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.

The mean and S.D. of chance control of locus of control non-deprived PG students is 7.50 and 1.96 is less than the deprived i.e. 7.70 and 1.62 respectively. The calculated t value 1.11 is not significant even at 0.05 level of significance. There would be no significant difference between chance control of locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students. Therefore formulated hypothesis that there would be

significant difference in chance control of locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students. Hence hypothesis is rejected. The reasons are unaware of things what is happening in the society. The fixed beliefs and values does not helps to change the mind set of the deprived students.

The mean and S.D. of individual control of locus of control non-deprived PG students is 5.10 and 2.27 is higher than the deprived i.e. 4.07 and 2.00 respectively. The calculated t value 4.81 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is significant difference between individual locus of control of deprived and non-deprived post graduate students.

Women are looked down upon in this society. Men dominated society has denied the rights of the women. She has been not allowed to live freely. She has been restricted for everything. This discrimination has resulted into lacks of personality development. The socio-cultural rituals and religious beliefs and values made her to develop social distance, and due to lack of knowledge and awareness about the society she has remained unchanged. Therefore, the formulated hypothesis is that there would be significant difference in personality between male and female PG students.

Table:2.shows the Mean, S.D. and t value of Locus of Control of male and female PG students.

Variable and Groups		N	Mean	S.D.	t value	Level of Significance
Powerful	Male	200	8.49	1.41	2.73	**
	Female	200	8.06	1.72		
Chance Control	Male	200	8.08	1.55	5.52	**
	Female	200	7.12	1.91		
Individual Control	Male	200	4.64	2.16	0.55	NS
	Female	200	4.52	2.24		

NS = Not Significant; * Significant at 0.05 level (398 df; 1.97); ** Significant at 0.01 level (398 df; 2.59)

The above table shows the mean and S.D. of powerful locus of control of male PG students is 8.49 and 1.41 is higher than the female students i.e. 8.06 and 1.72 respectively. The calculated t value 2.73 is significant

at 0.01 level of significance. There is significant difference between male and female post graduate students powerful locus of control.

The mean and S.D. of chance control of locus of control of male PG students is 8.08 and 1.55 is higher than the female students i.e. 7.12 and 1.91 respectively. The calculated t value 5.52 is significant at 0.01 level of significance. There is significant difference in chance control between of male and female post graduate students. Hence formulated hypothesis is rejected.

The mean and S.D. of individual control of locus of control of male PG students is 4.64 and 2.16 is higher than the female students i.e. 4.52 and 2.24 respectively. The calculated t value 0.55 is not significant not even at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between male and female post graduate students individual control of locus of control.

Deprivation means the denial of use of natural resources. This condition of deprivation causes the delay in the development and differs in Locus of control. If a person is denied of using natural resources causes lots of Locus of control. Deprivation of food, shelter, nutrition, social-cultural, educational and other natural resources, there are three ways of deprivations. They are prolonged deprivation, absolute deprivation and relative deprivation. These three have different impact on the Locus of control of an individual. The psychological deprivation like suppression of emotions, thoughts, feelings and thinking influence on the Locus of control of the deprived.

Summary and conclusion

There are significant differences in powerful and individual locus of control between deprived and non-deprived post graduate students. There are no significant differences in chance control of locus of control between deprived and non-deprived post graduate students. The reasons are unaware of things what is happening in the society. The fixed beliefs and values does not helps to change the mindset of the deprived students. There are significance differences in locus of control between male and female PG students except individual control.

References

Conchita D'ambrosio and Joachim R. Frick, Income Satisfaction and Relative Deprivation: An Empirical Link, Social Indicators Research (2007) 81: 497–519.

Cox, J., Deck, C., On the nature of reciprocal motives. *Econ. Inquiry* (2005.), 43, 623-635.

Dadu and Pratibha, A Study on the urban and rural male and female college-going students with regard to their personality, values and religions attitudes (1992).

Das, R.C. Standardization of the Gita Inventory of Personality. *Journal of Indian Psychology* (1991), 9, 47-55.

El-Hindi and Amelia E., “Studied on Supporting College Learners; Relations between Metacognition, Reading and Writing Proficiency and Locus of Control” (1995).

Gaiha, Raghav; Imai, Katsushi S.; Kulkarni, Vani S. and Thapa, Ganesh Bahadur. “Disparity, Deprivation and Discrimination in Rural India.” Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper No.13, December 15, 2007.

Hargrove, Rebecca Dausson, “An Investigation of the Relationship between Locus of Control Self Efficiently and Attribution Theory and Duseek”’s Social Cognitive Approach to Academic Achievement Motivation”, *DAI*, (February 1991), Vol.51(8): 2682.

Kaur and Sharanjeet, “Self Concept and Locus of Control as Predictors of Career Maturity on Sex Sub Groups”, *Ph.D., Psy.* (1992).

