UC Riverside
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Dimensions of Locus of Control: Exploring Their Influence on ESL Students' Interlanguage Development

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1z19952x

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 3(1)

ISSN
1050-4273

Author
Clachar, Arlene

Publication Date
1992-06-30

DOI
10.5070/L431005152

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Dimensions of Locus of Control: Exploring Their Influence on ESL Students' Interlanguage Development

Arlene Clachar
Inter-American University of Puerto Rico

This paper reports the findings of a study which sought to determine whether adult ESL students with internal orientations on two dimensions of locus of control also have positive expectancies about their life situations in the United States and therefore show a higher degree of proficiency in their English interlanguage than their counterparts with external orientations on these same two dimensions. Broadly speaking, internal orientations of locus of control refer to people's belief that rewards in life are contingent on their own actions. External orientations refer to people's belief that rewards occur independently of their actions and that life situations are determined more by fate and luck (Rotter, 1966, 1975; Lefcourt, 1982). The study acknowledged that locus of control is a complex and multidimensional construct; that is, a person not only does not necessarily have similar internal or external orientations across a broad range of situations, his or her other orientations may differ with respect to the particular dimension of locus of control being measured (Wilhite, 1986). In the present study, internal-external orientations on two different dimensions of locus of control (locus of responsibility and locus of personal control) were investigated in order to observe their effect on interlanguage development. The findings show that locus of personal control correlates significantly with interlanguage development. Rationalizations for and implications of the findings are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Locus of control, a construct from social learning theory, is thought to determine where people place control of their lives, that is, who or what they perceive to be controlling the rewards and failures they experience (Rotter, 1966, 1975). Measures of this construct are reported in terms of people having an internal or external orientation. People with an internal locus of control place

Issues in Applied Linguistics ISSN 1050-4273
© Regents of the University of California
Vol. 3 No. 1 1992 7-41

the responsibility for their lives within themselves. They believe that they determine the successes and failures they encounter in their lives and that they can control their own destinies. Those with an external orientation place control of their lives outside themselves, as being the result of the influence of fate, chance, luck, powerful others, etc. They do not feel responsible for their lives because they perceive that their behavior does not affect the reinforcements they receive (Wilhite, 1986; Rotter, 1966, 1975). Locus of control is highly correlated with an individual's cultural upbringing and life experiences and shapes the way an individual thinks, makes decisions, and defines events (James, 1990; Sue, 1981). For minorities in the United States, a strong determinant of locus of control is very much related to the subordinate position assigned to them in society. It is also important to understand that locus of control is a very complex and multidimensional construct; a person not only does not necessarily have similar internal or external orientations across a broad range of situations, his or her orientations may differ with respect to the particular dimension of locus of control being measured (Wilhite, 1986; Sue, 1981).

This paper reports the findings of a study which sought to determine whether adult ESL students with internal orientations on two dimensions of locus of control have positive expectancies about their life situations in the United States and therefore show a higher level of proficiency in their English interlanguage than their counterparts with external orientations on these two dimensions. The hypothesized relationship between orientations of locus of control and interlanguage development that was investigated emerged from the observation that non-English-speaking immigrants of lower socioeconomic status (a representative population in most ESL/adult basic education classes in large U.S. cities) find themselves in a situation in which the acquisition of English begins the process of gaining control in their lives: getting a job, having access to needed services, and attaining upward social mobility. In this context, interlanguage development was believed to be influenced by the degree to which an adult ESL student feels control over certain forces in his or her life situations, or, in other words, by the student's orientation of locus of control (LOC).

Locus of Control: Its Meaning in the Context of Acquiring English as a Second Language in the U. S.

In describing the students in classes designed for teaching English to adult immigrants, Wallerstein (1983) states:

> the majority of ESL students come from a low socioeconomic background. Most have little formal education. They experience many situations in the U.S. which make them feel vulnerable and inadequate. Even if they possess technical skills, ESL students have limited access to jobs. They are often humiliated for their "accent" and blame themselves for not succeeding in America. These problems (with life in the United States) affect students' self images which often create difficulties in learning English. (p. 4)

In the face of the social and psychological turbulence experienced by non-English-speaking immigrants, exacerbated by the need to acquire English for job eligibility, access to needed services, and ultimately by a desire for upward social mobility, I was led to the hypothesis that internally oriented immigrants, who believe in their ability to overcome the adversities of a new sociocultural environment in order to secure rewards, would exhibit a higher level of proficiency in English than the externally oriented ones, who succumb to an overwhelming sense of unpredictable fate. The assumption made was that a non-English-speaking immigrant's interlanguage development is in part a function of LOC.

In discussing LOC, it is important to note that it is a *construct* and not a trait. Lefcourt (1982) warns against misuse of this construct:

> An individual's LOC is often inferred from momentary expressions of his sense of causality which, if solicited at different points in time, may be relatively consistent. However, it must be kept in mind that events such as expressions of causal expectations are but referents of the LOC construct and not the construct itself. LOC 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. The remarks, expressions, and behaviors indicative of beliefs about causality are the events that psychologists observe and test for reliability, and measures such as Rotter's LOC scale are

> simply devices created to elicit those expressions of belief. (pp. 148-9)

Lefcourt also explains that LOC scales may elicit quite different responses when different situations are invoked, and he therefore recommends that each research case be analyzed and interpreted in the context of the situation being studied. A *situation*, as described in the social learning context, consists of cues that lead to expectations for a variety of behavior-reinforcement sequences (Lefcourt, 1982). For example, it can be argued that immigrants of lower socioeconomic status and Afro-Americans are not given as equal an opportunity as certain other groups to obtain material rewards in the United States. Because of this discrimination, they may perceive a discrepancy between their own ability and what they can achieve. As a result, a situation may exist in which non-English-speaking immigrants of lower socioeconomic status and Afro-Americans hold the expectancy that their behavior cannot determine the outcomes or reinforcements they seek, a phenomenon which is likely to shape their LOC. Lefcourt maintains that the notion of *situation* needs to be clearly stated in any theory that using the construct of LOC.

In the present study, the notion of *situation* assumed a heightened significance because non-English-speaking immigrants of lower socioeconomic status were the target population for the research, and because, in the U.S., these immigrants generally find themselves in situations where they have had a history of failure--failure tied to real external obstacles, such as cultural discrimination, racism on the job, layoffs, etc. (Wallerstein, 1983). Their external orientation, therefore, may be a function of their opinions about the prevailing social institutions in which they have to operate.

However, Gurin & Gurin (1976) have concluded, that while high external people are less effectively motivated, perform poorly in achievement tasks, and evidence greater psychological problems, this profile does not necessarily hold for all minorities and low-income persons. These authors emphasize that focusing on external forces may be motivationally healthy if it results from assessing one's chances for success against systematic and real external obstacles rather than against an unpredictable fate. Gurin & Gurin therefore ventured the assumption that in spite of the economic deprivation and social denigration faced by immigrant minorities, there seems to be a distinction between those who are able to come to terms with socioeconomic and racial barriers,

viewing themselves as active controllers of their fate, and those who perpetuate a fatalistic outlook.

Pursuing this line of reasoning, I was led to hypothesize that immigrants of low socioeconomic status who are internally controlled, believing themselves to be agents of change rather than passive recipients of history and fate, would be able to generate the motivation necessary to achieve a high degree of proficiency in English--an important step in the movement toward socioeconomic success. Concomitantly, when immigrants hold an external orientation, succumbing to the fatalistic attitude that they cannot effect positive change in their lives, their motivation to achieve proficiency in English (for socioeconomic success) would be low.

Locus of Control: A Multidimensional Construct

Apart from the notion of *situation* discussed above, another concern that must be underscored when using LOC as a measure of people's control orientations is that this construct is *multidimensional*; that is, people do not necessarily have similar internal or external orientations across a broad range of situations, and control orientations differ as a function of the particular dimension of LOC being measured (Wilhite, 1986; Sue, 1981). To illustrate this point, it is worth considering the findings of Gurin & Gurin (1976) who identified three dimensions of LOC. However, only two of these dimensions are relevant to the present study. The first, control ideology, is a measure of general belief about the role of external forces in determining success and failure in the larger society. It represents a cultural belief in the Protestant ethic: that success is the result of hard work, effort, skill, and ability. The second dimension, locus of personal control, reflects a person's belief about his or her own sense of personal efficacy or competence. While the former dimension represents an ideological belief, the latter is more related to actual control. Gurin & Gurin's data indicated that Afro-Americans were equally as internal as whites on the control ideology dimension, but when a personal reference (locus of personal control) was used, they were much more external. The authors concluded that Afro-Americans may have adopted the general cultural beliefs about internal control but find they cannot always be applied to their own life situations because of racism and discrimination.

It was these two dimensions of locus of control--locus of personal control and locus of responsibility--which were measured for use in the present study, using the Spanish version of

Wolfgang & Weiss's (1980) Interpersonal Locus of Control (WWILOC).[1] It is important to note that the original WWILOC Scale (see Appendix) was developed to measure only interpersonal locus of control. The two subscales (i.e., locus of personal control and locus of responsibility) were derived for the present study from an item analysis of the WWILOC Scale. It will be shown in this paper that although the data elicited by these two subscales can only be interpreted as exploratory because of the relatively small number of items on each, the study nevertheless represents a pioneering attempt to understand the role of locus of control in second language acquisition and therefore provides a theoretical basis on which to build future research.

Locus of Personal Control and Locus of Responsibility

A brief description of the two dimensions measured for this study and their hypothesized relevance to certain social and psychological aspects of second language acquisition (SLA) now deserve some attention. As has been noted, the first dimension, locus of personal control, reflects the extent to which an individual believes in his or her sense of personal efficacy or competence (Gurin & Gurin, 1976). Sue (1981) describes locus of personal control as a composite factor of (a) self-esteem (attitudes and feelings which reflect beliefs and perceptions of what one can do or achieve), (b) role-expectation (acceptance of aspirations and demands that one thinks others or significant others expect of one), (c) self-adequacy (the security with which a person views his or her present and future possibilities of success). An internal orientation on locus of personal control represents a strong belief in personal efficacy, whereas an external orientation refers to the belief that one's choices, decisions, and reasonings are inextricably bound up with external forces such as fate, chance, or luck. This belief in external forces as determinants of outcomes in one's life engenders low self-esteem and mediocre aspirations (Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Lefcourt, 1982).

The study of the role of locus of personal control in SLA seems particularly appealing since, as Beebe (1988) states, speaking a second language involves stripping oneself of the protective devices normally provided by the native language and reverting to a less mature level of expression, both factors which are likely to make second language speakers feel vulnerable and ridiculous. The degree to which these factors become devastating for a language learner, so much so as to retard SLA, may depend

on that individual's locus of personal control, that is, on such attributes as self-esteem, sense of self-adequacy, and role expectation. In the face of these and other psychological adversities accompanying the SLA process, I hypothesized that an internal orientation on locus of personal control is likely to contribute to a favorable affective disposition for successful SLA.

The second dimension in the WWILOC Scale is locus of responsibility. In essence, as was discussed earlier, this dimension measures the degree of responsibility or blame placed either on the individual or on the system (Sue, 1981). For example, Sue (1981) points out that in the case of Hispanic immigrants or Afro-Americans of lower socioeconomic status, their lower standard of living may be attributed to their personal inadequacies or shortcomings (such as low proficiency in Standard English and thus an inability to mobilize themselves in the job market), or the responsibility for their plight may be attributed to discrimination and lack of opportunity to participate in society on an equal footing with less disadvantaged groups. The former orientation blames the individual, the latter blames the system.

Theoretically, then, locus of responsibility reflects both the internal orientation that because success or failure is attributed to one's own skills or personal inadequacies, a strong relationship exists between one's ability, effort, hard work, and success in society *and* the external orientation that social, economic, and political forces (rather than personal attributes) are powerful and shape an individual's destiny in the socio-political establishment. I thus hypothesized that an immigrant's orientation on the locus of responsibility dimension may influence how s/he defines the SLA process: if the immigrant believes that there is a strong relationship between skill, effort, ability, hard work, and socioeconomic success (internal orientation), the acquisition of English may be perceived as an achievement-oriented task, controllable by the learner and constitutive of a strategy for the procurement of socioeconomic benefits. Maximum linguistic development (achieved through skill, effort, and ability) may then be representative of having begun to pave the way to socioeconomic success. On the other hand, if an immigrant believes that social, political, and economic forces are more powerful than anything s/he can do and thus shapes his or her destiny in society (external orientation), then the acquisition of English may not be viewed as an achievement-oriented task to procure social rewards. Instead, the immigrant perceives the socioeconomic benefits of acquiring English to be so remote that English proficiency is felt to be more a

function of luck or chance than of achievement. Proficiency in English, thus interpreted by the immigrant, is an arbitrary and non-significant factor in determining future socioeconomic success.

Research Questions

The study thus addressed the following questions:

1. Do adult ESL students with a more internal orientation on the locus of personal control subscale evidence higher levels of proficiency in their English interlanguage?

2. Is an internal orientation on the locus of responsibility subscale significantly correlated with English interlanguage development?

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects who participated in the study were Hispanic immigrants of low socioeconomic status (27 females and 13 males) who were enrolled in an adult basic education (ABE) program sponsored by the New York City Board of Education. The socioeconomic status of the subjects was established on the basis of the social stratum with which the subjects affiliated themselves, according to several factors: (a) socioeconomic status of the family in which the subjects were reared (37 subjects stated that their parents were of lower socioeconomic status and 3 classified their parents as members of the working class); (b) number of years of high school education which subjects had in their native country (23 subjects completed 2 years of high school, 15 completed 3 years, and 2 completed 4 years but had not attempted to go beyond post-secondary education); (c) educational level of subjects' parents (29 subjects said their parents did not have a high school education, 9 stated that their parents completed 2 years of high school, and 2 stated that their parents completed only 1 year of high school); (d) subjects' occupations in their native country (all subjects reported non-professional, blue-collar jobs); (e) subjects' weekly salaries (7 subjects reported that they were making below the minimum wage, 28 said they earned minimum wage, and 5 said they were earning a

little more than the minimum wage); and (f) number of wage earners in subjects' households (the subjects stated that all adults in their households were employed).

Controlled Variables

age: The subjects were adults between the ages of 21 and 30. Levinson et al. (1976) have identified this age range as a clearly defined period within the life span during which an individual's focus is on the exploration of and personal commitment to adult roles and responsibilities. Issues of risk-taking preferences and occupation choices are crucial at this period and are often affected by one's LOC (Gurin et al., 1969).

length of time working in the U.S.: The subjects had all been working in the U.S. for three to six years. This control was necessary to establish a reasonable time-frame in which the subjects would have had sufficient opportunity to interact in English.

informal contact with English: Obviously, not all immigrant Hispanics of low socioeconomic status have jobs which bring them into contact with speakers of Standard English, and thus not all immigrants have the same opportunities to develop their proficiency in English. To control for this variability, only those subjects who stated (on the demographic survey questionnaire) that they speak English "sometimes" were selected for the study.[2] Moreover, many Hispanics of lower socioeconomic status work in environments where some of their linguistic input is likely to come from the non-standard English dialects spoken by Afro-Americans and West Indians. Since it was assumed that such input is likely to influence the interlanguage of Hispanics, another requirement for participation in the study was that subjects had to be receiving formal ESL instruction which, presumably, provided a basis of corrective reinforcement upon which to improve their language proficiency.

formal contact with English: The selection of subjects who were exposed to formal English instruction was particularly important because Krashen & Scarcella (1978) have observed that formal instruction is a better prediction of proficiency among adults than are years of natural exposure to the target language. Schumann (1975) agrees that formal instruction in English may facilitate SLA in a number of ways: by supplying more input

through dialogues, practice sentences, and exercises; by helping the adult learner to isolate grammatical and lexical elements, thus making them more perceptually salient and identifiable in informal interaction; and by assisting the learner to construct a conscious grammar which can be used to monitor his or her speech in informal interaction.

All subjects were chosen from two ESL/ABE sites in New York City. Based on information derived from the demographic survey questionnaire, homogeneity among the 40 subjects was controlled with regard to (a) their knowledge of English at the beginning of study and their prior exposure to English when they enrolled in the ESL program; (b) the content of the syllabus--only those linguistic structures already taught in the ESL classes were used in the study to measure the subjects' degree of interlanguage development; and (c) the number of hours of ESL instruction per week.

reading level in Spanish: The demographic survey questionnaire and the WWILOC Scale were administered in Spanish because a lack of reading proficiency in English could have led the subjects to misinterpret many of the items. Therefore, in order to ensure that subjects had acquired at least an eighth-grade reading level in Spanish, I administered a Spanish reading achievement test (Calfee, Calfee, & Peña, 1979) at the start of the study.

Collection of Speech Data

English language performance (or the degree of interlanguage development in each subject's speech sample) was defined by the extent to which a subject showed linguistic development in the use of (a) negation forms, (b) interrogative forms, (c) morphophonemic rules for past forms, and (d) morphosyntactic rules for the possessive. These four linguistic indices were chosen because they had been taught in the ESL classes and because research in SLA has shown them to be sensitive indicators of language development (Hatch & Wagner-Gough, 1983; Ravem, 1975; Milon, 1974; Butterworth, 1972).

Two techniques were used to elicit speech samples: a story retelling task and a photograph description task. The story retelling task required each subject to retell stories heard on a tape-recorder in his or own words. The original stories, taken from Myers (1987), had to be modified in order to introduce the four types of

syntactic and morphosyntactic structures which were used as linguistic indices of interlanguage development. The modification of the texts was done by changing the original sentences (which were in the simple present and present progressive tenses) to the simple past, past progressive and past perfect tenses. Also, several negative sentences and sentences with the possessive "s" morpheme were introduced into the stories. In the photograph description task, subjects first listened to a tape-recorded situation depicted in the photographs and were then given directives (such as "Pretend that you are . . . and ask . . . where . . . ?") so as to elicit interrogative forms. The recording session for each subject lasted approximately one hour. Interrater reliability was established by having two monolingual English speakers evaluate transcripts of the data produced by the subjects.

Following Schumann's (1975) pidginization model for analyzing interlanguage development, subjects were classified into three proficiency groups: those who evidenced the lowest degree of linguistic development (Schumann's basilang ESL students); those who showed a higher degree of linguistic development (Schumann's mesolang ESL students); and those with the highest level of interlanguage development (Schumann's acrolang ESL students). The *basilang* stage is characterized by many pidginized forms, i.e., ESL students show very little linguistic development in the direction of Standard English. The *mesolang* stage (what O'Malley, Chamot, & Walker (1987) call the associative stage) is a point at which pidginized forms are gradually corrected as ESL learners become more proficient in detecting discrepancies between their language production and the models they encounter. As has been postulated in the literature, the *mesolang* stage appears to represent a temporary interlanguage system that is constantly restructured as the ESL learner evaluates attempted hypotheses about the target language and adds, drops, or modifies rules as a result. Further, rules that are productive at the *basilang* stage begin to disappear in the *mesolang* stage. Because the *mesolang* stage operates as a rubric for varying degrees of proficiency in detecting mismatches between pidginized forms and standard forms, it seemed justifiable to refine this stage into *lower*, *mid-* and *upper mesolang* stages corresponding to a decreasing occurrence of pidginized forms respectively. At the *acrolang* stage, ESL students exhibit very few pidginized forms and approach standard English norms of morphosyntax. For details of the forms prevalent at each stage of the *basilang-mesolang-acrolang* continuum with specific reference to the negation and interrogation systems, the

morphophonemic rules for past forms, and the morphosyntactic rules for the possessive, see Schumann (1975) and Stauble (1978, 1984).

Negation Development

How well each subject had acquired the English negation system was analyzed in terms of the well known developmental stages of negation acquisition, which begin with a preverbal negation rule and end with the Standard English postverbal negation rule. The degree to which each subject in the study had progressed along the basilang-mesolang-acrolang continuum was assessed using Schumann's (1975) technique, namely, by calculating the ratio of the standard negating devices used (e.g., analyzed do-aux forms, postverbal negation rule applied to the copula and modals, etc.) in relation to the total number of negative forms produced by each subject. Ratios were then converted to percentages. The criterion for acquisition (i.e., the acrolang stage) was set at 80%. Scores of 50-59%, 60-69%, and 70-79% characterized the lower mesolang, mid-mesolang, and upper mesolang ESL students respectively. Basilang ESL students were those subjects whose scores fell below 50%.

Interrogative Development

In order to classify subjects along the basilang-mesolang-acrolang continuum with respect to their use of English interrogative rules, the subjects' speech data was examined for a progression from no inversion of the subject noun phrase and auxiliary/copula/modal (e.g., "Where you are going?") to inversion of the subject noun phrase and auxiliary/copula/modal (e.g., "Where are you going?"). This progression in ESL learners' interlanguages has been categorized into three stages by Schumann (1975) based on cross-linguistic studies. The criteria used for distinguishing these three stages for the development of interrogative forms are as follows:

> ***basilang***: Subject does not distinguish between simple and embedded wh-questions, e.g., "What is he doing?" (simple wh-question--inversion) compared with "Did he tell you *what he is doing*?" (embedded wh-question--no inversion). For basilang subjects simple and embedded wh-

questions do not carry *inversion.* Yes/No questions are also *uninverted.*

mesolang: Simple wh-questions are sometimes inverted and sometimes not. In addition, there is increasing inversion in simple wh-questions, with inversion extended to embedded wh-questions, e.g., *"Does he know *where are you going*?"

acrolang: Subject distinguishes between simple and embedded wh-questions; yes/no questions are inverted.

The extent to which each subject had acquired the interrogative inversion rule for simple wh-questions and yes/no questions was determined by computing ratios to indicate the frequency of inversion of the subject noun phrase and the auxiliary/copula/modal supplied in obligatory contexts in relation to the total number of obligatory contexts for inversion. This computation yielded a supplied in obligatory contexts (SOC) ratio which was then converted to a percentage. The degree of mastery for embedded wh-questions was determined by calculating an SOC ratio representing the frequency of no inversion of auxiliary/copula/modal and the subject noun phrase of the embedded clause in relation to the total number of possibilities for embedded wh-questions. The resultant SOC ratio was converted to a percentage. For each subject, the mean percentage for the two types of interrogative transformation rules was calculated in order to yield a single score for this linguistic structure. The criterion for acquisition of the interrogative, i.e., the acrolang stage, was set at 80% (in accordance with Schumann, 1975). Scores of 50-59%, 60-69%, and 70-79% characterized the lower mesolang, the mid-mesolang, and the upper mesolang ESL students, respectively. Basilang ESL students were those subjects whose scores fell below 50%.

Development of Possessive "s" Morpheme

The degree to which subjects had acquired the possessive "s" morpheme (and, thus, their designation as basilang, mesolang, or acrolang speakers) was assessed by computing SOC ratios representing the frequency of the possessive morpheme supplied in obligatory contexts in relation to the total number of obligatory

contexts for the possessive morpheme. These SOC ratios were then computed as percentages.

However, a more in-depth look at the data revealed that one could not accurately assess the acquisition of the possessive morpheme in the speech of some subjects *only* on the basis of an SOC analysis; a measurement of the extent to which the possessive morpheme was used inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts was also necessary. Since the problem is that an SOC score does not reflect when a morpheme is used correctly in other than obligatory contexts, another type of analysis, similar to that used by Hakuta (1976) and Stauble (1984), was employed. I refer to this procedure as a target-like use (TLU) analysis. Such an analysis captures instances in which subjects use the possessive morpheme inappropriately in contexts other than obligatory contexts, and thus the total number of inappropriate uses outside of obligatory contexts was added to the denominator of the SOC ratio to compute the TLU ratio. For example, when a subject used the possessive morpheme five times out of ten (i.e., 5/10 or 50 %) correctly but also used that morpheme on four different occasions inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts, the number 4 was added to the 10 of the denominator to calculate the TLU ratio: 5/10 + 4 = 5/14 or 36%. The TLU ratio is thus always lower than the corresponding SOC ratio when a particular morpheme is used inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts. The rationale for the TLU analysis is supported by the following examples taken from the speech data:

appropriate use in obligatory context

"I saw the man's hat through the window."

non-use in obligatory context

"He decided no take the place that have the lady"
(possible meaning: 'the lady's place')

inappropriate use outside of obligatory context

". . . because she didn't see that the man's it belong."
(intended meaning: 'She didn't see that it belonged to the man.')

Because several subjects used the possessive morpheme both appropriately in obligatory contexts and inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts, the TLU analysis appeared to give a more precise representation of the extent to which their interlanguages had developed in the direction of Standard English. The criterion for the acquisition of the possessive morpheme (i.e., the acrolang stage) was set at 80%. Scores of 50-59%, 60-69%, and 70-79% characterized lower mesolang, mid-mesolang, and upper mesolang ESL students, respectively. Those subjects whose scores fell below 50% were considered basilang ESL students.

Development of Past Forms

The degree to which each subject had acquired the morphemes to mark past time was determined by examining two levels of the use of verb morphology: the lexical level and the auxiliary level. At the lexical level, the focus was on the appropriate morphophonemic changes for the past tense of regular and irregular verbs. At the auxiliary level, the focus was on the appropriate past forms for the progressive aspect (*be-aux + V-ing*) and the perfective aspect (*have-aux + V-ed*). The analysis of past forms was limited to affirmative sentences. The acquisition of the past forms in each subject's speech was based on: (a) the ratio of correct usage of the past tense supplied in obligatory contexts in relation to the total number of obligatory contexts for the past tense (this SOC ratio was converted into a percentage); (b) the ratio of correct usage for the past progressive aspect in obligatory contexts in relation to the total number of obligatory contexts for the past progressive aspect, with the resulting SOC ratio converted into a percentage; and (c) the ratio of correct usage for the past perfective aspect in obligatory contexts in relation to the total number of obligatory contexts for the past perfective aspect. Again, this SOC ratio was computed as a percentage.

As was the case in assessing the degree of acquisition of the possessive morpheme, a TLU analysis was also necessary to evaluate the development of the past progressive and perfective aspects. It was discovered that some subjects supplied the past progressive and perfective aspects inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts--a finding which was not captured by the SOC scores alone. A few examples from the speech data exemplify this point:

inappropriate use of past progressive outside of obligatory context

> "In my country, the people *was eating* rice everyday"
> (intended meaning: 'In my country, people *eat* rice everyday.')
>
> "The people *was cleaning* the machines on Tuesdays because the manager check them"
> (intended meaning: 'The people *had to clean* the machines on Tuesdays because the manager would check them.')

inappropriate use of past perfective outside of obligatory context

> "The receptionist who *had make up* the forms for the people who speak Spanish doesn't work there again."
> (intended meaning: 'The receptionist who used to/would make up [complete] the forms for the people who speak Spanish doesn't work there anymore.')
>
> ". . . he always *had spoken* to the factory workers in English on the job but outside he speak in Spanish."
> (intended meaning: '. . . he always speaks to the factory workers in English but . . . .')

Thus, for each subject whose speech included such errors, I computed a TLU ratio and converted it into a percentage. An overall score for each subject was obtained by adding together the SOC scores for the three past forms, or, for those subjects who supplied some past forms inappropriately outside of obligatory contexts, by adding together the SOC and TLU scores. The criterion for acquisition of the past forms, that is, the acrolang stage, was set at 80%. Scores of 50-59%, 60-69%, 70-79% characterized lower mesolang, mid-mesolang, and upper mesolang ESL students, respectively. Scores which fell below 50% represented basilang ESL students.

RESULTS

After examining each subject's development in each of the four linguistic indices a mean score for each subject was computed. This resulting mean score theoretically represented the degree to which each subject's speech had progressed in the direction of Standard English or, concomitantly, had pidginized, according to the basilang-mesolang-acrolang continuum. Table 1 displays the mean scores and classification of the subjects along the basilang-mesolang-acrolang continuum:

Table 1. Classification of Subjects According to Overall Scores*

Subjects N = 40	Negative Forms (%)	Interrog. Forms (%)	Past Forms (%)	Poss. "s" Morpheme (%)	Overall Score (%)
Basilang					
Cecilia	21	39	52	31	**36**
Topacia	7	43	55	45	**38**
Luz	21	41	53	34	**37**
Mirta	24	39	59	31	**38**
Luis	18	48	53	45	**41**
Tony	19	58	53	36	**42**
Ana	20	46	57	39	**41**
Fernando	16	51	59	43	**42**
Soraya	33	53	52	34	**43**
Carmen	49	39	52	51	**48**
Isabel	38	46	57	58	**49**
Lower Mesolang					
Pedro	44	55	63	37	**50**
Rosemary	40	51	64	53	**52**
Bernaldo	50	43	64	55	**53**
Sonia	56	58	65	39	**55**
Miguel	37	56	68	56	**54**
Cristóbal	51	53	68	55	**58**
Jesús	60	59	63	55	**59**
Lora	61	61	57	50	**57**

Mid-Mesolang					
Gloria	60	65	65	55	**61**
Rosa	61	67	68	58	**64**
Fanny	65	62	60	71	**65**
Yani	78	62	65	65	**68**
Betsaida	63	65	65	77	**68**
Carlos	68	69	67	63	**67**
Upper Mesolang					
Alicia	79	62	86	63	**73**
Claribel	67	66	64	91	**72**
José	69	75	83	67	**74**
Hortensia	76	71	80	67	**74**
Quisqueya	75	71	81	68	**74**
Linda	77	69	80	61	**72**
Ricardo	74	75	85	61	**73**
Mimi	79	78	87	66	**78**
Betty	79	76	81	68	**76**
Acrolang					
Josefina	81	89	81	80	**83**
Mona	84	83	82	82	**83**
Javier	87	87	91	74	**85**
Terry	89	87	84	82	**86**
Efrén	91	90	83	85	**87**
Narisa	91	87	85	85	**87**

*Classification of subjects was determined only on the basis of overall scores, not on individual scores for negation, interrogation, past forms, and the possessive "s" morpheme.

With the subjects classified as to interlanguage development, it was now possible to address the central research questions of this study, which can be stated operationally as: Do basilang and lower mesolang ESL students show more of an external orientation on the locus of personal control dimension and on the locus of responsibility dimension of LOC than their upper mesolang and acrolang counterparts? Are upper mesolang and acrolang ESL students more internal on these two dimensions than basilang and lower mesolang speakers? In order to answer these questions, the control orientation of each subject on each of these two dimensions of LOC had to be established by administering the WWILOC Scale.

The WWILOC Scale

As mentioned earlier in this paper, the WWILOC Scale was used to gather data on the subjects' control orientations. The scale (see Appendix) consists of 31 forced-choice items, each one presenting an internal and external perception of interpersonal relationships in the English-speaking world. Of the 31 items, 22 pair internal and external control expectancy statements--a respondent is required to select the statement that seems most true for him/her. For example, in the following item,

> a. In the long run, I get the respect that I deserve regardless of the language I am speaking.
> b. Unfortunately, Americans often do not recognize my worth as a person, in spite of my effort to speak English.

the participant who selects "a" has selected an internal response. The remaining nine items present statements to which the participant is asked to respond "Yes" or "No." A "Yes" answer indicates that the individual mostly agrees with the statement, while "No" indicates a general disagreement. For example, in the item,

> Whenever you have to speak in English, do you frequently feel that Americans are manipulating your behavior?
> YES NO

the respondent who answers "Yes" has selected an external response. The WWILOC Scale embodies two dimensions of LOC: locus of personal control and locus of responsibility, both of which represent subscales. Twelve of the items measure control orientations on locus of personal control, and nineteen measure control orientations on locus of responsibility.

The WWILOC Scale is scored in the direction of externality. One point is given for an externally oriented response; no points are given to internal responses. Therefore, the highest internal score on locus of person control and locus of responsibility would be zero, and the highest external score would be 12 and 19 on the locus of personal control and locus of responsibility subscales, respectively. The WWILOC Scale was chosen because it represents an excellent example of the advancements made in the area of LOC measurement. The scale was designed for a specific population, namely, recent immigrants to a highly industrialized country. It also specified what dimensions were being measured--

powerlessness or perceived control in interactions with people in general and with significant others in one's environment in particular.

Moreover, the WWILOC Scale was especially appropriate for this study because the items tapped the degree to which the use of English symbolized an immigrant's sense of power and powerlessness in his or her daily communicative interaction in the United States. Table 2 shows the scores for the two dimensions of LOC, and Table 3 displays the means, standard deviations, and ranges:

Table 2. Scores for the Two Dimensions of LOC*

Subjects N = 40	Locus of Personal Control	Locus of Responsibility
Basilang		
Cecilia	7	12
Topacia	6	12
Luz	0	4
Mirta	10	15
Luis	8	14
Tony	12	12
Ana	9	15
Fernando	5	9
Soraya	5	11
Carmen	4	3
Isabel	1	5
Lower Mesolang		
Pedro	0	5
Rosemary	5	13
Bernaldo	8	10
Sonia	7	12
Miguel	1	6
Crisóbal	4	12
Jesús	5	12
Lora	10	9

Mid-Mesolang		
Gloria	4	10
Rosa	9	16
Fanny	11	14
Yani	3	15
Betsaida	2	5
Carlos	12	14
Upper Mesolang		
Alicia	0	7
Claribel	4	10
José	7	12
Hortensia	5	10
Quisqueya	1	4
Linda	5	11
Ricardo	1	5
Mimi	1	6
Betty	3	16
Acrolang		
Josefina	1	6
Mona	7	11
Javier	0	5
Terry	1	3
Efrén	5	9
Narisa	4	11

*For each locus of control dimension, a score of zero was accorded an internal response and one point for an external response. Thus the lower the score, the more internally oriented a subject is expected to be.

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for WWILOC Scales

WWILOC Scales	Mean	SD	Range
Locus of Personal Control	4.8	3.52	0-12
Locus of Responsibility	9.8	3.88	3-16

Analysis of the Relationship between Interlanguage Development and LOC Dimensions

In order to determine the relationship between locus of personal control, locus of responsibility, and interlanguage development, the two research questions were tested through coefficients of correlations and analyses of regression using SPSS-X. Because significant correlations were found, the regression analyses were undertaken to determine which LOC dimensions were explaining a significant portion of the variance in language performance when possible confounding demographic variables were controlled. Table 4 reports the correlations among the LOC scores and language performance:

Table 4. Correlations among LOC Scores and Language Performance

Variables	Language Performance	Locus of Personal	Locus of Responsibility Control
Language Performance	--	-.34	.22
Locus of Personal Control	-.34*	--	.73*
Locus of Responsibility	-.22	.73*	--

*$p < .05$

As can be seen in Table 4, locus of personal control was significantly negatively correlated with language performance ($r = -.34$, $p < .05$).[3] Further inspection of Table 4, however, revealed that locus of personal control and locus of responsibility were highly correlated with each other, supporting the validity of these scales as measures of the construct LOC, but indicating that the scores for the two dimensions of LOC should not be entered into the regression equations at the same time.

Although a great deal of effort was made in this study to control for demographic variables (such as age, highest grade completed, length of time worked in the U.S., English instruction in native country, and English instruction in the U.S. before registration in the ABE program), the subjects nevertheless differed with respect to these characteristics. It was therefore interesting to

determine whether these demographic variables correlated with the two LOC dimensions and with language performance. Table 5 reports the correlations among the demographic variables, the two LOC dimensions, and language performance:

Table 5. Correlations among Demographic Variables, LOC Dimensions, and Language Performance

Demographic Variable	Language Performance	Locus of Personal Control	Locus of Responsibility
Age	-.19	.11	-.02
Highest grade completed	-.08	.33*	.16
Length of time working in the U.S.	.27*	.10	.07
English instruction in native country	-.16	.24	.25*
English instruction in U.S. prior to registration in ABE program	-.12	-.17	-.15

*$p < .05$

Table 5 reveals that age and English instruction in the U.S. prior to registration in the ABE program were not significantly correlated with the LOC dimensions or with language performance. However, length of time working in the U.S. was significantly correlated with language performance ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). In addition, highest grade completed correlated positively with locus of personal control ($r = -.33$, $p < .05$), and length of English instruction in native country correlated positively with locus of responsibility ($r = .25$, $p < .05$).

The five demographic variables were then used as predictors of language performance in two separate hierarchical stepwise regression analyses. In both analyses, the demographic

variables entered the equation before the LOC scores in order to determine the amount of incremental variance accounted for by the LOC dimensions. Results are shown in Table 6:

Table 6. Regression Analysis of Language Performance on Demographic Variables and LOC Subscale Scores

Predictors	R	R^2	$F(R^2)$ change	R^2 change	$F(R^2)$	Beta	r
Time employed in U.S.	.2688	.0723	2.959	.0723	2.959	-.2634	-.2688
English instruction in native country	.3385	.1146	2.394	.0423	1.769	-.1408	-.1582
Highest grade completed	.3448	.1189	1.619	.0043	0.177	-.0309	-.0804
Locus of personal control	.4304	.1853	1.990	.0664	2.851	-.3466	-.3356
Locus of responsibility	.4342	.1885	1.580	.0032	0.136	.0845	.2177

As can be seen in Table 6, length of time working in the U.S., English instruction in the native country, and highest grade completed accounted for 11.9% of the variance; locus of personal control and locus of responsibility accounted for an additional 7%. However, it should be pointed out that at no time was the total or incremental variance accounted for significantly different from zero at the .05 level.

The implication of the results of the two regression analyses is that if one uses the demographic variables in addition to the two LOC scores as predictors, then language performance is, in essence, unpredictable. However, an alternative way of analyzing the data was available and was undertaken: correlating the two LOC scores with language performance scores, partialling out the

demographic variables. The results of this procedure indicated that locus of responsibility was not significantly correlated with language performance ($r = -.15$), but locus of personal control was ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$). It should be noted that although locus of personal control correlated significantly with language performance, it only accounted for 8% of the variance. This result may have been due to the relatively small number of items (12) in the locus of personal control subscale.

DISCUSSION

The salient finding in this study is that an individual's interlanguage development may be predicted by his or her locus of personal control. Essentially this means that acrolang and upper mesolang ESL students are likely to evidence a more internal orientation on locus of personal control than their basilang or lower mesolang counterparts.

One problem in a study such as this, however, is that there is no previous work which directly studies the relationship between proficiency in SLA and LOC, and thus it is not possible to compare the present findings with research in this area so as to bolster the findings or to identify moderator variables which may have led to discrepancies. Due to the dearth of information concerning language performance and LOC, I was obliged first to probe the current literature dealing with the psycho-affective characteristics of learners and their influence on SLA, then to seek a plausible behavioral link to an internal orientation on locus of personal control.

Beebe (1983), for example, in a ground-breaking article on risk-taking in second language acquisition, discusses the odds stacked against a person learning to communicate in a second language: fear of appearing ridiculous in the face of incomprehension, fear of frustration coming from a listener's blank look showing that the second language learner has not succeeded in communicating, fear of alienation stemming from not being able to communicate and therefore not being able to develop relationships with others, and, worst of all, the formidable fear of loss of one's cultural identity. Given these psychological barriers, Beebe submits that communicating in a second language involves both taking the risk of being wrong and being able to overcome possible failure.

Bem (1971) sees risk-taking as a choice, in which an individual decides among alternatives of different degrees of desirability; the result of the decision is not only uncertain, there is a possibility of loss or failure. His argument recognizes that it is only by taking the risk to communicate in a second language that a learner's hypotheses about the second language (encouraged by input from interlocutors) can be formed, tested, and confirmed or rejected. In Beebe's (1983) words, "risk-taking in learning to speak a second or foreign language must involve the learner trying out new structures he or she is unsure of" (p. 46). It seems feasible, therefore, to assume that a high level of proficiency in an ESL student's interlanguage could partly be explained by a willingness to take risks.

The observed relationship between higher levels of interlanguage development and internal orientation on locus of personal control may thus be explained by the risk-taking induced by personal control, a factor which seems to play a role in higher levels of English proficiency. I am inclined to speculate that it is the more proficient ESL students who, by their evidence of higher internality on locus of personal control, may have a greater propensity for risk-taking. The literature to date, although but briefly, does allude to a relationship between risk-taking and factors representative of internal locus of personal control.

It was mentioned earlier in this paper that an internal orientation on locus of personal control is defined as a composite construct of three personality factors: high self-esteem, favorable role-expectation, and a sense of self-adequacy. These factors have also been shown to stimulate risk-taking. Bem (1971), for example, connects high self-esteem to motivation and motivation to risk-taking. Atkinson & Feather (1966) review literature which advocates that persons with high self-esteem are, contrary to popular belief, moderate, not high risk-takers; i.e., they do not take wild, frivolous risks, like to be in control, and prefer to depend on skill. I would also argue that high self-esteem, because of its relationship to motivation, probably engenders a strong determination to overcome barriers and therefore leads an individual to take moderate risks (not extremely high or low risks), since the determination to succeed would encourage him or her to ponder the prospect of loss or failure in especially high or low risk-taking situations.

Of particular relevance to the findings in this study is Bem's (1971) argument which seems to support the explanatory power of risk-taking as a moderator variable in the observed relationship

between interlanguage development and internal orientation on locus of personal control. Bem claims that speaking best reflects self-esteem (an inherent characteristic of locus of personal control), "since speaking is an active skill which requires risking evaluation by others of the speaker's grammar, pronunciation, language facility" (p. 228).

The second personality factor comprising an internal orientation on locus of personal control, favorable role-expectation, implies an inner sense of security on the part of an individual to accept the aspirations and demands which are placed on him by others (Sue, 1981). I would also maintain that it is this sense of security that induces moderate risk-taking. Since risk-taking involves an outcome of a choice that could leave an individual in a worse position, an inner sense of security is necessary to rationalize and therefore cushion the possibility of failure (in the acquisitional context, failure to communicate effectively in the target language and the resilience to deal with possible negative evaluation by interlocutors).

Führer (1974) posits that individuals with a sense of self-adequacy (the third personality factor of an internal orientation on locus of personal control) are consistent, successful risk-takers. It would appear, then, that such individuals get satisfaction from targeting risky goals with a 50% approximate chance of success rather than goals fraught with wild, frivolous risks. It also seems reasonable to assume that a sense of self-adequacy would foster a propensity towards moderate risk-taking because individuals with this attribute believe that skill, not chance, leads to success.

Thus far I have attempted to offer a plausible explanation for the observed relationship between interlanguage development and internality on locus of personal control. The phenomenon of risk-taking was used to explain this relationship, and it appears to be a moderator variable induced by an internal orientation on the locus of personal control dimension, which is a characteristic of the more successful ESL students in this study. The speculation was also offered that such individuals, probably because of their willingness to take risks in communicating in a second language, thereby allowing input to become intake (to use Krashen's terms), may evidence a higher level of English proficiency than their counterparts with lower propensities for risk-taking.

This study showed that locus of responsibility did not correlate significantly with interlanguage development. Since locus of responsibility, in essence, measures the degree of responsibility or blame that an individual places either on self or on the system for

success/failure, this construct is dependent not only on an individual's sense of his or her place in the social structure but also on a sense of how much control s/he is able to negotiate with social and political circumstances in the system.

It is obviously the amount of negotiation that an individual is able to marshall within the social structure that enables her or him to decide whether success or failure is attributable to self or to the social system. Williams & Capizzi Snipper (1990) suggest that given the social, political, and cultural barriers inveighing against socioeconomic success for non-English-speaking minority immigrants--compounded by the incongruence of Euro-American cultural beliefs which place a high premium on uniqueness, independence, self-reliance, rugged individualism, and status achieved through one's own efforts--minority immigrants are likely to be confused as to whether the source of success and failure is attributable to themselves or to the social system. Thus, locus of responsibility, when applied to adult ESL students of low socioeconomic status, presents a picture that is contradictory and obfuscating and probably cannot be used to predict success or failure in language performance. Internal orientation on locus of responsibility as registered by some of the subjects in the study, may have been the result of internalized Western cultural beliefs about internal control rather than a social-psychological construct developed from concrete personal experiences.

CONCLUSION

At the core of the research findings in this study is the realization that an internal locus of personal control is equated not only with successful SLA but also with self-esteem, confidence, self-definition, and the propensity for risk-taking. The need to develop and foster an internal locus of personal control among adult ESL students of lower socioeconomic status is thus a priority because their experiences so often orient them in the opposite direction. Advocacy for a pedagogical model which empowers ESL students in ABE classes is therefore highly recommended. Such a model should provide for genuine dialogue between student and teacher in both oral and written modalities, negotiation, facilitation (rather than control) of student learning by teacher, and the encouragement of student/student talk in a collaborative learning context. Trueba (1989) calls for an emphasis on language which

builds on issues relevant to students' lives, which encourages active dialogue in the classroom, and which helps students develop a critical view of their lives, as well as calling for tasks to be presented to students in ways that generate intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation.

Consistent with these tenets is the imperative to move from ESL materials that teach only the language of survival, of expressing an opinion or purpose, of following orders, of apologizing, of talking about the weather, and of asking for food items in a supermarket to ESL materials that teach the language of tenants' rights, of complaining, of filing grievances, of organizing a union, and of getting an association to defend one's rights. Auerbach (1991) proposes that teachers discuss with their ABE ESL students how to reshape the current curriculum so as to include a critical analysis of immigrant roles in the U.S. economy and the labor market and of the reasons for these students' linguistic and cultural exclusion from the establishment, thus making the debate about the ESL curriculum part of the ESL curriculum itself. She also argues that the philosophy of empowerment for ABE ESL students entails a move from a pedagogy of assimilative ESL to a pedagogy of critical ESL. English in ABE ESL classes can thus be a tool to establish active dialogue and encourage students to develop a critical view of their lives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professors Alice Deakins and Isaura Santiago Santiago for their thorough reading and insightful comments during the development of this research.

NOTES

1 I am grateful to A. Wolfgang and D. Weiss for allowing me to use their unpublished scale for this study. Requests for copies of the WWILOC Scale (in Spanish and/or English) should be sent to Arlene Clachar, Department of Languages and Literature, Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, Call Box 5100, San Germán, Puerto Rico 00683.

2 Words such as "always" and "sometimes" were used on the questionnaire since it is difficult for respondents to quantify precisely the amount of English they use on the job.

[3] Note that a lower score on the WWILOC Scales representing a more internal control orientation was hypothesized to correlate with a higher score on language performance. Thus, negative correlations were found for the LOC dimensions and language performance.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. W. & Feather, N. T. (1966). *A theory of achievement motivation.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Auerbach, E. (1991). Politics, pedagogy, and professionalism: Challenging marginalization in ESL. *College ESL, 1*, 1-9.

Beebe, L. M. (1983). Risk-taking and the language learner. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 39-66). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Beebe, L. M. (Ed.). (1988). *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives*. New York: Newbury House.

Bem, D. J. (1971). The concept of risk in the study of human behavior. In R. S. Carney (Ed.), *Risk-taking behavior* (pp. 13-27). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Press.

Booth-Butterfield, M. (1989). Perception of harassing communication as a function of locus of control, work force participation and gender. *Communication Quarterly, 37*, 262-75.

Butterworth, G. (1972). *A Spanish-speaking adolescent's acquisition of English syntax*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Calfee, R. C., Calfee, K. H., & Peña, S. C. (1979). *Interactive reading assessment system--Spanish edition.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Führer, C. R. (1974). *Skill-oriented risk-taking in disadvantaged preschoolers: A link in a behavioral pattern.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. (1969). Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. *Journal of Social Issues, 25*, 29-54.

Gurin, G. & Gurin, P. (1976). Personal efficacy and the ideology of individual responsibility. In B. Strumpel (Ed.), *Economic means for human needs* (pp. 56-71). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Hakuta, K. (1976). A case study of a Japanese child learning English as second language. *Language Learning, 26*, 321-51.

Hatch, E. & Wagner-Gough, J. (1983). Explaining sequence and variation in second language acquisition. In B. W. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects* (pp. 334-53). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

James, M. R. (1990). Adolescent values clarification: A positive influence on perceived locus of control. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 35*, 75-80.

Krashen, S. D. & Scarcella, R. (1978). On routines and patterns in language acquisition and performance. *Language Learning, 28*, 283-300.

Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). *Locus of control, current trends in theory and research.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1976). The psychosocial development of men in early adulthood and the mid-life transition. In D. F. Ricks, A. Thomas, & M. Roff (Eds.), *Life history research in psychopathology* (pp. 87-105). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Milon, J. (1974). The development of negation in English by a second language learner. *TESOL Quarterly, 8*, 137-43.

Myers, L. (1987). *Short stories from Latin America: An ESL/EFL reader.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. M., & Walker, C. (1987). Some applications of cognitive theory to second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9*, 287-306.

Ravem, R. (1975). The development of Wh- questions in first and second language learners. In J. H. Schumann & N. Stenson (Eds.), *New frontiers in second language learning* (pp. 157-75). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychyological Monographs, 80*, 1-28.

Rotter, J. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 56-67.

Schumann, J. H. (1975). *Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Stauble, A. M. (1978). Decreolization as a model for second language development. *Language Learning, 28*, 29-54.

Stauble, A. M. (1984). A comparison of a Spanish-English and a Japanese-English second language continuum: Negation and verb morphology. In R. W. Andersen (Ed.), *Second languages: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 323-54). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sue, D. W. (1981). Dimensions of world views. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (pp. 73-97). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Trueba, H. T. (1989) *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century.* New York: Newbury House.

Wallerstein, N. (1983). *Language and culture in conflict: Problem-posing in the ESL classroom.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wilhite, S. C. (1986). The relationship of headings, questions, and locus of control to multiple-choice test performance. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 18*, 23-40.

Williams, J. & Capizzi Snipper, G. (1990). *Literacy and bilingualism.* New York: Longman.

Wolfgang, A. & Weiss, D. (1980). The development of an internal locus of control scale and its relationship to social distance in a therapeutic setting. Unpublished manuscript.

Arlene Clachar is Assistant Professor of TESL and Applied Linguistics at the Inter-American University of Puerto Rico. Her research interests include social psychological factors in second language acquisition, classroom-oriented research, and the cognitive aspects of second language learning.

APPENDIX

Wolfgang & Weiss Interpersonal Locus of Control (WWILOC) Scale

INSTRUCTIONS

These statements reflect the way people feel or react in social situations which are considered important in their lives. Try to respond to each statement carefully and honestly. Circle the response "a" or "b" which you think applies to you. Do not go back to the statements you have already responded to and do not spend too much time on each statement.

1. a. However much I try, people are usually not satisfied with my work.
   b. If people are not satisfied with my work, it is because I do not know how to better my relationships with people.

2. a. To get on well with people you need to be pleasant.
   b. It is difficult to know whether people really like you or not.

3. a. Many times I feel that to a great extent, successful relationships with people do not depend on me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that luck or chance has anything to do with my successful relationships with people.

4. a. What happens in my dealings with others depends entirely on me.
   b. Generally, I feel that I do not have sufficient control over the way things turn out between myself and others.

5. a. In the long run, I get the respect that I deserve regardless of the language I am speaking.
   b. Unfortunately, Americans often do not recognize my worth as a person, in spite of my effort to speak English.

6. a. When I plan ahead how I am going to improve my relationships with people, I am almost certain that everything will go well.
   b. It is not always intelligent to plan ahead how to improve your relationships with people, because in many cases, things happen as a result of good or bad luck.

7. Most times when you have difficulty understanding something that an American said to you, it is:
   a. because you did not pay enough attention.
   b. because the person did not explain clearly.

8. Suppose Americans think that you are not very intelligent or alert:
   a. If you make an effort, you can make them change their opinion of you.
   b. Whatever happens, they will always think that you are not intelligent.

9. If someone tells you that "your work is good," it is:
   a. because you did a good job.
   b. something you are usually told in order to encourage you.

10. Suppose you answered a question that you were not sure of, but it happened that your answer was correct. This probably happened:
    a. because you gave the best answer that you thought of.
    b. because the person who asked the question was not as clear as usual.

11. If someone tells you that you are acting immature and stupid and that you are not reasoning clearly, it is probably:
    a. because of something you did, or
    b. because people just like to complain.

12. Generally when you do not get on well with someone, it is:
    a. because of something you did, or
    b. because the person likes to argue.

13. When someone does not understand you, it is:
    a. because you are not explaining yourself clearly.
    b. because the person is not very intelligent.

14. a. Even though I am under no obligation, I sometimes find myself doing things that I really do not want to do.
    b. Generally, I do just what I want to do.

15. a. There are very few things in the English-speaking world that influence what I do; generally I do what I decide to do.
    b. Americans do have a great deal of influence on me.

16. a. I have noticed that sometimes when I am in the presence of some people, I do things without thinking, things I am sure I would not normally do.
    b. I think that I am able to control my behavior regardless of whom I am with.

17. a. Sometimes when I deal with Americans, my behavior can be very different from the usual.
    b. It would be very difficult for me to change my usual behavior when I am dealing with Americans.

18. a. What happens to a person when dealing with others is always due to his/her own actions.
    b. Very often, it is believed that what happens to a person in his/her dealings with others has nothing to do with what that person does. It is destiny.

19. a. Generally speaking, no one influences my behavior, regardless of whether the person speaks in English or not.
    b. Whenever I have to speak in English, I frequently feel that Americans are controlling my behavior.

20. a. I often realize that regardless of how hard I tried, destiny had planned some of the things that happened to me in my relationships with other people.
    b. The success and failures that I have had in my relationships with other people have been due to my own actions.

21. If I feel uncomfortable with Americans, it is:
    a. because Americans are not very kind to me.
    b. because I have not tried to be pleasant with them.

INSTRUCTIONS

These questions have no right or wrong answers. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with each question. If you agree, circle "YES"; if you disagree, circle "NO."

Answer the questions and give only one answer to each question. Do not go back to the questions that you have already answered.

22. Do you believe that your behavior has any effect on Americans?
    YES NO

23. Do you think it is almost impossible to make Americans change their opinions of something?
    YES NO

24. Do you believe that when Americans are not nice to you they usually have good reasons for being so?
YES NO

25. Do you think that when you do not get along well with Americans, there is very little you can do to change the situation?
YES NO

26. Do you often feel confused about the way Americans behave towards you?
YES NO

27. Do you think that you exercise a great deal of influence over what happens to you when you are with Americans?
YES NO

28. Do you think that when you are successful in your relationships with people, it is because they have tried to be nice to you, and not because you have made a special effort to be nice to them?
YES NO

29. Whenever you have to speak in English, do you frequently feel that Americans are manipulating your behavior?
YES NO

30. Do you think it is your responsibility to pay attention to the effects that your behavior may have on Americans when you speak in English?
YES NO

31. Some people believe:
a. that Americans try to manipulate their behavior.

Other people believe:
b. that they themselves are able to control their own lives as they wish, independently of the language they speak.

What is your opinion?
Circle "a" or "b."