An investigation of personality characteristics of Negroes attending a predominantly white university and Negroes attending a black college

Nina W. Brown

College of William & Mary - School of Education

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation


https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-jqew-y019
INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeib Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
BROWN, Nina Woody, 1936-
AN INVESTIGATION OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF NEGROES ATTENDING A PREDOMINATELY WHITE UNIVERSITY AND NEGROES ATTENDING A BLACK COLLEGE.

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, Ed.D., 1973
Education, psychology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973
NINA WOODY BROWN
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
AN INVESTIGATION OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF
NEGROES ATTENDING A PREDOMINATELY WHITE
UNIVERSITY AND NEGROES ATTENDING A
BLACK COLLEGE

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Faculty of the School of Education
College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Nina W. Brown
July, 1973
APPROVAL SHEET

We the undersigned do certify that we have read this dissertation and that in our individual opinions it is acceptable in both scope and quality as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Accepted by

Fred L. Adair, Ph.D.

Kevin E. Geoffroy, Ed.D.

Curtis O'Shell, Ed.D.
Acknowledgment

Sincere thanks are extended to Terry Davis and Robert Dawson who helped with the statistics and computer; Dr. Kevin Geoffroy and Dr. Curtis O'Shell as members of the committee for their guidance and constructive criticism, and most of all to Dr. Fred Adair who as advisor and friend provided the support, guidance and knowledge necessary for a project of this magnitude. Gratitude is also extended to the friends, colleagues and above all to my family for the encouragement and support given.
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Orientation.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of Study</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of Dissertation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Factors and Educational Choice</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro College Students' Personality</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Black and White College Students</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Success and Personality Characteristics</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Instruments</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Psychological Inventory</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective Checklist</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of Colleges</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the Population</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Assessment and Description of Measuring Instruments</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of Data</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Analysis</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Description for Factor Analysis</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results on the CPI</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Analysis CPI</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation and Labeling of Factors</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 - &quot;Dominance - adjustment by control of External Reality&quot;</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 - Cognitive-Affective Independence</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 - The Larger Culture Attitude or Response Set</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 - General Adjustment</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 - Uninterpretable</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results on the ACL</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Analysis - ACL</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 - Dominance by control of External Reality</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 - Social Desirability</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 - Helpful Attitude Toward Life</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 - Flexibility</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Study</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Results</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing of Hypothesis</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions for Further Research</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS ON THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS FOR ODU BLACK STUDENTS BY SEX ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BLACK STUDENTS AT NSC BY SEX ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS FOR WHITE STUDENTS AT ODU BY SEX ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS RESULTS FOR FEMALES ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT T-TEST RESULTS FOR MALES ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS OF RACE, SEX AND EDUCATIONAL CHOICE TO SCALES ON THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FACTORS, EIGENVALUES AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE FOR BLACK STUDENTS - CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX BLACK STUDENTS - CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DIFFERENCES IN SCALE LOADINGS ON THE FIVE FACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS BETWEEN GROUPS ON THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS FOR FEMALES ON THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FACTORS, EIGENVALUES AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE-ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGE OF SCORES FOR ALL GROUPS ON THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGE OF SCORES FOR ALL GROUPS ON THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS ON THE ACL FOR ODU BLACK STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS FOR NSC - BLACK STUDENTS ON THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS FOR ODU - WHITE STUDENTS ON THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS FOR MALES ON THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP OF RACE, SEX AND EDUCATIONAL CHOICE TO SCALES ON THE ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INTERCORRELATIONS FOR THE CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>INTERCORRELATIONS FOR THE ACL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

Introduction

The decision making process is a very complicated one to analyze. There are numerous variables to be taken into consideration in determining of what the decision is composed and the weight or significance of the factors which compose the decision. The variables are external, internal, implicit and explicit and the underlying dynamics of the personality of the individual determine how the variables are perceived and acted upon.

There are "crisis" or sensitive phases throughout life and two such phases have been identified as the beginning of puberty and the first adult-adjustment period, ages 18-20. (Kvaraceus, 1966) In addition to the many and varied internal changes made in the individual, there are a number of pressing external changes also. Although the post secondary school educational choice is made usually in the first adult adjustment period, the preparation and basis for the decision occur during the onset of puberty, generally in the junior high school years.

Ideally, decisions should be made on the basis of facts, however, individuals for the most part either do not have the necessary facts for wise decisions or the facts possessed may be distorted because of misinformation, inaccurate perceptions or omission of
pertinent details. Thus, in many instances, the educational choice is not made wisely because the facts are not available. In order to make the wisest choice, the individual should know himself, the college environment and be able to project how his personality will grow and interact with the environment. The information for making such an ideal decision as to educational choice is just not available to one at this time.

The decision as to type and kind of educational choice may be especially difficult for the negro student. Not only does he have the usual variables influencing the decision but also the added problem of selecting between a predominately white or a predominately black college.

Purpose of the Study

The aims of the study are to:

1. identify those personality characteristics of the negro population in predominately white and predominately negro colleges.

2. to determine the personality profiles of successful negro students as identified on the California Psychological Inventory and the Adjective Check List.

3. to ascertain if a cluster of personality traits exists and is the discriminating personality variable that distinguishes between negroes enrolled in predominately white institutions and those enrolled in predominately black institutions.
**Statement of the Problem**

Questions to be investigated are: What is the relationship between personality variables and the selection of a college or university for negro students? Are the personality profiles different for the two groups? and Does a cluster of personality traits exist and if so, is it the discriminating personality variable that distinguishes between negroes enrolled in predominantly white institutions and those enrolled in predominately black institutions?

**Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between negro students attending Old Dominion University and a random sample of negro students attending Norfolk State College.

2. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between negro students and a random sample of white students attending Old Dominion University.

3. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between white students attending Norfolk State College and a sample of white students attending Old Dominion University.

4. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between white students and the sample of negro students attending Norfolk State College.
Theoretical Orientation

The approach chosen in the study of personality influences not only the interpretation of results but also the mode of investigation. For example, the psychoanalytic approach relies on projective techniques and analysis of life history to uncover underlying dynamics of personality. Rogers' client centered approach utilizes the here-and-now-state and feelings of the individual with little in the way of objective personality assessment used in the framework of the theory.

The instruments used in this study have their theoretical orientation in trait and factor theories with an overlap into Murray's Personology. Murray's system of needs has been incorporated into one of the tests and individuals are described accordingly. The combination assumes that certain traits and needs are present in everyone, however, the amounts vary within and among individuals. For example, the trait, or need achievement is said to be present in everyone but there is variance among individuals and even within the individual depending upon the press of the environment.

Basically, for the purpose of this study, the approach to the study and description of personality takes into account that within each individual are the impulses, wishes, hopes, aspirations, anxieties and fears that play a part in organizing behavior, developing special response apparatuses, giving a persistently distinctive character to each person and providing as basis for intraindividual coherence. At each stage in his development, the
individual faces certain tasks and must meet certain requirements set by society, the specific person with whom he associates and be his own developing desires and needs. Often individuals encounter difficulties in meeting those inner requirements such as conflicting motives, anxieties, distortion of perception and many unrecognized and uncontrolled reactions.

This view of personality is dynamic in that it emphasizes that successive experiences have the effect not only of accumulating information and other instrumental behavior potentials, but also of modifying and reorganizing the emotional life and the motivational demands of the individual. In addition, within an individual we expect to find systems of motives which are relevant to a wide range of his behavior, along with other systems, either independent of the more comprehensive view or loosely related to theory which is relevant only to a narrow segment of his behavior.

The theory utilized for the study has its foundations in Holland's theory of vocational choice, in that, although the choices being studied are educational the basic assumptions underlying vocational choices could be said to be valid when applied to educational choices. Indeed, the primary assumption made by Holland (1966) is that the choice of a vocation is an expression of personality as is other choices. Since vocational choices are interrelated with educational opportunities and personality orientation of the individual, it seems logical to propose that the
kind and amount of education chosen is also related to the personality of the individual.

Other assumptions made are that interests can be measured by personality tests and although there are individual differences, the members of a vocation have similar personalities and similar histories of personality development. Because of these similarities, they will respond similarly to many situations and problems, and will create a characteristic interpersonal environment. Just as vocational satisfaction, stability and achievement depend on congruence between one's personality and the environment in which one works, so does educational satisfaction, stability and achievement. Reasoning so, it could be concluded that the satisfaction a student has with college and his achievement in college depend not only on his personality but also on the congruence of his personality with the personality and environment of the college.

**Significance of the Study**

Once a student makes the decision to attend college the question then becomes "What college to attend"? There exists a vast array of institutions of higher education to select from. The student may select from: liberal arts colleges, state colleges, state universities, private universities, or junior colleges. Each type of college may be: urban or rural, public or private, large or small, secular or non-secular, close to home or far away, coeducational or limited to one sex.
The student body in the various institutions may vary widely as to family backgrounds, socioeconomic status, type and quality of educational background and cultural antecedents. They differ vastly in attitudes, motivation, values, past achievement and in ability.

With all the possible combinations of colleges and students, the choice becomes very difficult especially since most studies on success in college have not been able to clearly delineate the difference between the successful student and the unsuccessful student. The most fruitful area of research on differences has been in the area of personality variables. However, this type of information is not available to the student when the decision on what type of college to attend has to be made.

Schuger (1970) points out the problems in attempting to match students and colleges;

"...the problem of matching applicants with colleges might be put in its clearest form if one were able to test each applicant and derive a pattern of personality scores, compare these scores with a pattern of "best" scores established for a number of colleges, (all colleges at the optimum), compute a pattern similarity coefficient or similar index of fit between the student's pattern and those of the colleges, and advise him to apply to the three colleges at which the index was highest. The best scores for each college might be derived empirically, by testing all students at the institution and averaging their scores to get the college's profile, or by measuring aspects of the college's environment, or by conscious manipulation of the profile by college officials, who might for example, want to change the character of the student body by including more extroverts in a given year. The first method of setting an optimum profile assumes that the current students are somehow a reflection..."
of the best criterion for fitting the incoming students to the institution. The second method would at least be independent of local biases in determining the ultimate criterion of matching but would have to face the problem at some other level. Despite the problems, it would be useful to be able to compare the "personalities" of students and colleges by a quantitative index, but for the most part, the information is just not available."

James Coleman (1970) notes that the institution can marshal considerably more resources in selection procedures than can the individual student. The college has at its disposal admission officers, college recruiters, placement officers and perhaps, most important, they have the organization of the College Board Examinations to provide them with systematic objective information on individuals that makes it possible to compare students.

Although information is available to the individual concerning the college via catalogues, counselors, students and college officials; the individual seldom has the kind of information necessary to decide if the institution is of the sort he will "fit in" and be satisfied. The kind of information needed for a decision of this kind is more in the realm of personality attributes than ability attributes.

The problem may be more acute for the negro high school student. He has the added variable of whether to attend a predominately white or predominately black college. How much more prevalent this problem is today is reflected in the United States Census Bureau report which states that there were 496,000 negroes enrolled in colleges and universities in 1970 representing 6.6 percent of
the nation's 7.4 million college students, and is 50 percent
greater than the 1965 percentage. (Centura, 1970) Much of the
growth in negro enrollment has occurred in predominately white
colleges and universities. The College Board Survey of 1970
found that enrollment of negroes had increased 65 percent on white
campuses since 1967. (Egerton, 1970)

Thus, with more black students attending college, the type
of college to select is occurring more often. Where can these
students turn for help in making this important decision?

Studies on sources of information for students involved in
the college selection process found that parents were the first
source and school counselors, second. (Rossi and Coleman, 1964;
Kerr, 1962; Roemmich and Schmidt, 1962) This information coupled
with the facts that the majority of negro college students are the
first in their family to attend college, many parents are indifferent
to or fearful of academic achievement, and most negro families are
not in a financial position that would facilitate the sending of a
child to college, points out that the primary source of information
concerning college selection is generally not present for these
students. Many black students do not choose to attend an interracial
college for numerous reasons. Many do not have the academic records
that make entrance to college easy. Many counselors who attended all
black colleges enjoyed their experience and are inclined to encourage
their black cunees to do the same.
Vontress (1971) writes that some of the reasons why many negroes do not choose to attend an interracial college include: teachers and counselors express concern the student would not be happy or achieve academically, and financial considerations. He further makes the statement that "the only adequate generalization one can make about negro colleges is that they are uniformly worse than their white counterparts". In support of this statement, he cites studies by Karon (1958), Frazier (1960) and Wright, (1960). The major findings of these studies are: while, in general, southern education for both negroes and whites is inferior to its northern counterpart, it is far worse for blacks than for whites; the cumulative effect of inferior elementary and secondary education has been reflected in the type of student who enters and graduates from the negro college, and in verbal skills on national examinations the negro generally scores low when compared to white collegians. The inference is that attendance at an interracial college would enable the student to overcome some of the handicaps of his earlier inferior education.

**Limitations of the Study**

Since the population is to be drawn from two institutions of approximately the same size, with similar course offerings, differing mainly in the predominant race of the student body; the results may not be applicable to other colleges and universities.

Colleges and universities vary widely in their environments,
therefore, as the colleges in this study are of the same type, i.e. large, urban institutions, the results may hold true for colleges that fall in the same category and not be true for colleges that differ from them in environment.

Because of the small number of negroes attending Old Dominion University and whites attending Norfolk State College, the results may lack generalization to other similar populations.

There is increasing evidence that separate norms are necessary for negroes. The argument proposes that since there are different norms based on sex, there should be separate norms for race also. This proposal has come about as a result of many studies showing the typical negro performance to differ significantly from the typical white performance. Therefore, the results may be interpreted differently if based on black norms. However, there are no black norms thus, the results will have to be interpreted as they relate to the normative sample.

**Definition of Terms**

For this study the following definitions will be used:

Factor - a construct that is assumed to underlie test performance.

Factor analysis - a method for determining the number and nature of the underlying variables among large numbers of measures.

Negro - refers to an American of African descent. Although
some people choose to be called black because it is indicative of racial pride, a survey by Brieland (1969) found that the majority prefer to be called negroes. In this study, as in many others, the two terms will be used interchangeably since some literature reviewed uses the term "negro" and some use "black".

Profile - a set of different measures of an individual or group, each of which is expressed in the same unit of measure. (Kerlinger, 1964)

Personality scale - a collection of items or statements such that each item or statement is believed to be relevant to some trait of interest. (Edwards, 1970)

Personality inventory - a collection of items that can be scored for more than one trait.

Successful student - a student that has academically completed more than one year at college.

**Design of Study**

A random selection of negro students at Norfolk State College and a random selection of white students at Old Dominion University will comprise Groups II and III. All full-time negro students at the sophomore level and above attending Old Dominion University will form group I. All full time white students meeting the same criteria attending Norfolk State College will be Group IV.

The four groups will be administered the CPI and the ACL. Means and standard deviations for each scale for each group will
be computed. The t-test will be utilized to ascertain if significant differences exist between groups. This will be a total of forty-two scale comparisons with a grand total of 168 comparisons of scales between the four groups. The standard scores of each group will be factor analyzed with the principal components method with factors rotated to meet Kaiser's criteria. Multiple correlations will be computed to determine the effects of sex and race on educational choice.

**Format of Dissertation**

Chapter II will contain the review of related literature. As there are no studies on this kind of population utilizing the CPI or ACL, the review will focus on objective personality assessment of negro college students, factors influencing educational choice, black and white college students and personality characteristics and success in college.

Chapter III gives the research design and methodology, description of the colleges, the measuring instruments, data gathering techniques, statistical analysis and factor analysis.

Chapter IV will provide analysis of results, both statistical and factor. A profile analysis and description of personality characteristics of each group will also be in Chapter IV.

Chapter V will summarize, discuss and interpret the results. Alternatives for further research will be suggested.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature is divided into five sections; literature pertaining to personality variables and educational choice, negro college student personality, college success and personality characteristics, comparisons of black and white college students, and literature on the objective personality assessment instruments to be used in the study.

An extensive search of the literature did not reveal studies on negro college students' personality traits on objective personality scales and educational choices. The search includes a computer search of ERIC as well as extensive library research. The studies found have focused on personality variables such as intelligence, motivation, attitudes and level of aspiration.

Pettigrew (1964) noted that little had been done in the area of studying negro personality and Hilliard (1972) writes that "historically, most of the psychological research has focused on the measurement of the comparative intellectual performance of blacks and whites" and "there have been few well controlled experimental studies on personality attributes". Further, Hilliard
remarks that of all of the studies done on the black protest movement he found not a single quantitative study that compared black activists and nonactivists on a series of personality dimensions. It could very well be that the need for controlled, quantitative personality studies is so obvious that it has been overlooked for that very reason.

**Personality Factors and Educational Choice**

Hartnett (1970) investigated two groups of black collegians - those who attended negro colleges and those who attended integrated colleges to ascertain if relevant educational differences existed. From the data gathered on the College Student Questionnaire (Part I) and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Verbal) he concluded that negroes entering integrated institutions had higher SAT-V scores, were more independent, liberal, concerned with social injustice and aspired to more years of formal education. He also concluded that integrated institutions are attracting the negro student with higher ability (as measured on the SAT-V) and these students also have a quite different set of attitudes, background characteristics and orientation toward college. Hartnett notes that the focusing on students with higher SAT scores is also bringing out a re-distribution of behavior styles and personality characteristics.

Community colleges in five major cities took part in a study of negroes in their communities to ascertain college attendance
plans. (Knoell, 1970) Access to higher education was compared for black and white, male and female high school graduates of similar educational and family backgrounds. It was found that the high school attended appeared to be nearly as important as race as a determinant of likelihood of attending college. The location of the school relative to the community college campus and the social class status of the families of the students are factors relating to college attendance rate for the high schools as well as the racial composition of the school.

Seron (1967) investigated the factors determining college choice among urban, rural, and suburban high school students — no mention was made of race of students. The students responded to a questionnaire designed to measure four variables of the college choice process; information, need, concern, and involvement.

Analyses of the data indicated rejection of the hypotheses of no difference between schools or within schools. Four major conclusions drawn were: students planning to attend college are better informed about college, are more involved in college planning and express a greater recognition of the need for college than students not planning to attend college; female students are better informed about college than male students, rural and suburban high school students are better informed concerning college than are urban high school students; and senior
high school students are more informed and more involved in college planning than students on lower levels.

Probably the most comprehensive study of the relationship of personality variables and type of college selected was done in Minnesota in 1968, however, the study makes no mention of race of the students.

The University of Minnesota made a study of the background of personality characteristics of students who attended various kinds of colleges in Minnesota. Questionnaire and test data were collected on 97 per cent of the students who graduated from public and private high schools in 1967. Of the 46,000 seniors graduating, approximately 15,000 attended college in Minnesota. Each of the student's questionnaire and test data was sought and the information was found for 12,405 students.

All regionally accredited four-year colleges and all public junior colleges in Minnesota cooperated in the study. Included were the eight private liberal arts colleges, the three catholic men's colleges, the five public state colleges, the four catholic women's colleges, the ten public junior colleges, and the one private junior college and the seven colleges of the University of Minnesota.

The students were compared by sex and type of institution attended on the variables of; academic achievement, socioeconomic factors and college choice, father's occupation, parental education,
family economic position, books in home, plans for graduate or professional training, plans for marriage, social relations, degree of conformity, risk taking, and personality characteristics and academic achievement.

Analyses of the results revealed the following:

1. Academic Achievement - the GPA of a student is greatly affected by the overall distribution of grades in that college and there is little relationship between the ability of students in a particular college and the mean grade point average received at that college.

2. Socioeconomic factors and college choice - as far as family socioeconomic status is concerned, both expensive private colleges and junior colleges have heterogenous populations. Although there are differences they are not as great as would be expected. In the liberal arts colleges, state and private, approximately 20 per cent of the students come from homes where the father had no more than an eighth grade education and approximately one-third of the students had fathers who had been to college. In the state and junior colleges approximately one-third of the students had fathers with eighth grade education or less and approximately one-fifth of the fathers had completed college.

The differences among students in different colleges in the level of the mother's education were smaller than the differences in father's education. As a group the total population of college
fresher did not come from "bookish" homes with 2 per cent reporting fewer than 10 books in their homes, 10 per cent reporting 10-24 books, 22 per cent reporting 25-49 books and 29 per cent reporting 50-99 books. Students who planned graduate work were proportionally twice as numerous in private liberal arts colleges as in state or junior colleges or in the University's College of Agriculture. For each type of college, prediction of academic achievement was not enhanced by the addition of consideration of socioeconomic factors to high school ranks and scholastic aptitude scores.

3. Social relations - males in the university's College of Agriculture reported significantly poorer social relations than other students in the university or other colleges. Men in the smaller liberal arts colleges and in the university's liberal arts college made similar scores on social adjustment while females attending the smaller liberal arts colleges, catholic colleges and the university's liberal arts college had similar scores on social adjustment.

4. Conformity - males in the university's Institute of Technology and College of Agriculture as well as the private liberal arts colleges were the most responsible and least rebellious.

5. Risk-taking - willingness to take risks appeared to be related to the type of college the student chose to attend. Students of both sexes who attended the large heterogeneous state university appeared to be the most willing to take risks.
6. Personality characteristics and achievement - in the university's Institute of Technology and College of Agriculture the more introverted student tended to get better grades. A significant negative relationship was found between scores on the conformity scale and academic achievement for students of both sexes in most of the types of colleges. (Hood, 1968)

From the comprehensive study comes the conclusion that not only do institutions have different personalities, but also persons choosing the various institutions are very similar in personality to other selecting the same type of institution.

**Negro College Students' Personality**

Pandey (1972) investigated the performance on the MMPI of 350 black and white freshmen attending Lincoln University in Missouri. The students were divided into three groups: good dropout and probationary. Analyses of variance revealed significant differences between groups on the hypochondrasis (HS), Hypomania (MA), Masculinity-Femininity (MC), Lie (L), Frequency (F) and Social Introversion (Si) scales. However, the mean T scores fell well within the author's cutoff points of 90 and 70 indicating no serious pattern of abnormality for any group. Thus, the author concluded that college dropouts may not have more personality disturbances than those who succeed in school.

Levy, Murphy, and Carlson (1972) utilized the conceptual framework of Jungian topology in their investigation of personality
types among Negro college students. They administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to 758 undergraduate students attending Howard University. The students' scores were compared with previously reported scores of Amherst males, Liberal Arts White Males from Brown, Dartmouth, Stanford and Wesleyan Colleges, and Pembroke College white female students. The results indicated significant ethnic differences in the distribution of personality types.

Brazziel (1964) compared the need structure of white and negro college students as measured by the EPPS. The negro student samples were from a lower-south college and an upper-south college. The white sample was the normative group for the EPPS and as such was drawn from colleges across the United States. In the lower-south group, females scored significantly higher on needs achievement, endurance and intraception; and lower on needs deference, autonomy and heterosexuality. However, in the upper-south sample, females score significantly higher only on needs dominance and heterosexuality. Sex differences were present in 12 of 15 variables in the general college norms but are relatively absent in comparison of the norm group and negroes. The author concludes that there are not only significant ethnic differences but also significant differences within the negro student groups.

In a study on motivation and aspiration of negro students
in negro colleges, there are also descriptions of the students and the variations in colleges (Gurin and Katz, 1966). The student population was found to be heterogeneous with three basic similarities between students; most had homes in which both parents were present, the colleges and students were mainly southern in origin and what the students were looking for from their colleges were similar. There was a wide variation in the socio-economic background of the students in the various colleges, the parents' educational attainments and the parents' occupational status.

The schools studied varied as to: type of sponsorship, academic status, social status of the student body, cosmopolitanism of the students' backgrounds, curriculum emphasis of the schools, sex ratio in the student body, academic values of the student body, amount of faculty-student interaction, and diversity of extra-curricular activities. The various institutional patternings were found to exert significant effects on motivation and level of aspiration.

**Comparison of Black and White College Students**

Frenkel (1966) explored whether reported differences between personalities of negro and white students on personality measures result from inadequate control of variables or if differences really exist. Eight hundred and twenty-five white students at Oklahoma State University and three hundred and twenty-five
negro students at Oakwood College in Alabama were administered the: Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, Lie Scale from the MMPI, Anxiety test from Cattell's Objective-Analytic Test, Advanced Vocabulary V-5 from tests of cognitive factors, the Social Acquiescence Scale and Mf scales on the MMPI, Barron Ego Strength and the Aggression Scale from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Statistical analyses included intercorrelations between measures, factorial analysis of variance for each variable and t-test comparisons, group comparison and individuals matched on the variables of age, sex, intelligence, socioeconomic background and urban-rural designations. The results showed the white students tend to score significantly higher on measures of anxiety while the negro students tended to score significantly higher on the Acquiescence scale. Higher ego-strength and aggression scores were found for the white students when the groups were unmatched, however, the differences virtually disappeared when the groups were matched. It was concluded that the findings on the anxiety scales, ego strength, masculinity-femininity and aggression scales were inconsistent with most earlier studies reported.

Centra (1970) compared the background characteristics, activities, goals and perceptions of black students at predominately white colleges with their white counterparts utilizing the Questionnaire on Student and College Characteristic. The sample consisted of 249 black students at 83 traditionally white institutions, matched with a group of white students. The
results indicate many similarities and differences. Both
groups were involved equally in over half of college extracurricular activities; they similarly rated eight possible
goals in attending college and both groups perceived the general
features of the college environment the same way.

However, black students were involved minimally in dating;
viewed the racial environment differently, i.e. the black students
appeared to be acutely aware of their minority status on campus;
came from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and proportionally,
more black students expected to attend graduate school.

College Success and Personality Characteristics

Stein (1963) reviewed the literature published between
1950-1960 on the relationship between antecedent and personality
factors and some criterion of college success. He divided the
studies into four categories; the pilot experience, the social
or demographic approach, the psychological approach and the
transactional approach. In the pilot approach the predictions
of college success are based on achievements in high school;
the social approach concentrates on life history; the psychological
approach utilizes the characteristics as measured by tests and
the transactional approach assumes that the prediction is a function
of the relationship between the student and the college environment.

An example of the pilot experience is the study by Holland
(1960) where he used 148 boys and 140 girls from the finalists in
the National Merit Scholarship program to ascertain the personality factors of achievers of upper rank high school rankings. The predictors included the SAT, the 16PF, the NMSS the Holland Vocational Preference Inventory and teachers' ratings of maturity. Analysis revealed that males could be characterized as feminine, serious, conservative, aspiring, responsible, persistent and intelligent. Females were submissive, high on self-control, intelligent, passive, and self-sufficient. Both males and females were rated high by teachers.

Holland (1960b) used a sample of 641 males and 311 females from 7,500 finalists in the National Merit Scholarship program to correlate their freshmen grades in college with all the variables in the previous study and found the same predictors. This finding was similar to that found by Holland (1959) utilizing the CPI. In that study, the best predictors of college success were: socialization, social presence and self-control.

The psychological approach uses the individual personality characteristics and their relationship to college success. The criterion of college success is generally not specified nor does this approach attempt to investigate directly, facets of the college environment that hinder or promote success.

Stone and Ganung (1956) used the MMPI to study female students and found no difference in the number of quarters completed between the two groups of "normals" and "maladjusted students". Yeomans and Lundin (1957) administered the MMPI to the top and
bottom quarter of freshman and senior classes at Hamilton College. Academically poorer students were more maladjusted in both classes and freshmen as a whole showed poorer adjustment than seniors.

Bendig (1958) found the need achievement score on the EPPS to be a better predictor of self reported GPA than either a vocabulary test or the honor point ratio scale of the CPI. The n-ach also correlated higher with GPA than did an achievement score on six of McCelland's TAT-llie pictures.

It was concluded from the studies reviewed that when personality tests are used as predictors of college success they provide more effective understanding of the characteristics of students who succeed in college than is the case when other approaches to prediction are used. The information on the relationship between anxiety, maladjustment, need, etc., there exists a greater understanding of the psychological and personality variables that determine success or failure in college.

Measuring Instruments

The California Psychological Inventory by Harrison Gough described as the "sane man's MMPI", was developed in the hope of attaining two goals of personality assessment. The first goal, largely theoretical in nature, has been to use and to develop descriptive concepts which possess broad personal and social relevance. Many of the standard personality tests and assessment
devices available were designed for use in special settings, such as the psychiatric clinic, or were constructed to deal with a particular problem, such as vocational choice.

The CPI has been concerned with characteristics of personality which have a wide and pervasive applicability to human behavior, and which in addition are related to the favorable and positive aspects of personality rather than to the morbid and pathological (Gough, 1957). The second goal was "...the practical one of devising brief, accurate and dependable subscales for the identification and measurement of the variables chosen for inclusion in the inventory" (Gough, 1967).

In a 1967 article in *The Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, Gough writes that in test construction a researcher should have in mind two basic testing assumptions. First, the purpose of the test is to assess and/or fore-cast non-test behavior. Second, the test is ultimately for the interpretation and analysis of the individual case (Gough, 1965). The second of these points seems well established in regard to the CPI but what of the point of predictability as represented in the first assumption?

One of Gough's earlier attempts to establish creditability for the purpose of forecasting non-test behavior was an attempt to predict scholastic achievement (Gough, 1953b). He selected items for this personality scale on three criteria: previous findings, theories of academic motivation and intuitive hunches.
Groups were selected by teachers to be of high or low probability for success in a beginning psychology course. After item analysis, significant discriminating items were retained and the scale was found to yield a .38 correlation (Gough, 1953b).

Gough showed the versatility of the CPI as a predictor of performance in medical school. The reason for this study was that grades on medical college admission tests had not yielded satisfactory results. He developed his equation for performance from an original sample of 34 subjects. When scores from the CPI regression equation were correlated with clinical practice correlations of .68 and .73 were yielded the 68 subjects in cross validated samples. These correlations surpassed other measures such as Grade Point Average and Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT) by significant degrees. In fact, none of the MCAT scores would reach the .05 level of confidence while 11 of the CPI scores do (Gough & Hall, 1964).

Still another use of the CPI as a predicting instrument is illustrated by Magargee in the prediction of leadership. In his study subjects scoring high and subjects scoring low on the Dominance scale (DO) of the CPI were chosen for study. Pairings of subjects were made including a high DO with a low DO and told to complete a simple task. In this situation, where only the task was emphasized there was no significant difference between groups regarding which person took the position of leader. Later,
when they were instructed to appoint a leader those subjects high on the DO scale filled the leadership positions in 90% of the cases. Magargee concludes by making the important observation that dominance manifests itself only under certain conditions in which leadership is salient. The CPI does appear to predict leadership on the DO scale but the conditions of and situations in which leadership are exhibited must be accounted for, (Magargee, 1966).

In 1966, Gough expounded upon a trait of personality which he called Social Maturity. Social Maturity is indicated by the Socialization (So) scale but differs from it (Gough, 1966), in that the So scale measures the conventional means by which a person functions in society and is a measure of his harmony with society. As "the goal of the socialization process is to produce individuals who are in harmony with the mandates of the Culture, but at the same time free enough or detached enough to set them aside when they become destructive or illegitimate," we seek not people who are super-socialized but those who are able to conform but are receptive to change and experiment. In Gough's terminology, we seek those who are socially mature.

As a means of measuring social maturity Gough developed a regression equation from the dominance, responsibility, socialization, good impression, communality and flexibility scales that yielded a measure of social maturity.
An equation composed of these variables validly differentiated delinquent from nondelinquent males in the United States and in Italy. Among nondelinquents it distinguished between cheaters and non-cheaters on course examinations, and between more- and less-responsible high school students. Adjectival analyses revealed high-scorers on the equation to be dependable, foresighted and capable (Gough, 1966).

A follow-up study using this formula was done in 1971 (Gough, 1971). In this study a group of 45 undergraduates were asked to scale 14 occupational groups by comparison with prison inmates using the constant sum method. By this process a rank order was established with industrial research scientists first and inmates last. Counselors were ranked fourth by these students. When correlated with scores derived from the CPI regression equation a correlation of .83 was obtained and counselors yielded the highest scores from the equation (Gough, 1971).

Adjective Checklist - The aim of an adjective checklist is to present a library of simple descriptive terms covering the widest possible range of behavior, self-conceptions and personal values. The subject must be able to fill it in himself or by an observer who records his reactions to a S. It is not as analytically and statistically precise as some other methods but this is more than offset by the S being able to report his reactions as he would in an interview.

Gough wanted an instrument which would meet his three criteria for describing personality; (a) it must be meaningful, (b) it must
be sufficiently complex in scope to cover the ordinary range of behavior observed and (c) it should be susceptible of systematic analysis.

One of the first attempts to use the ACL technique in a systematic manner was made by Hartshorne and May 1930. They devised a checklist of 160 words consisting of 80 pairs of antonyms. The words were related to four kinds of conduct; honesty, service, persistence and inhibition. Teachers were asked to rate students using the list and a reputation score was obtained.

Allport and Odbert (1936) made a survey of the English language for all trait names, and/or words referring to personal behavior and derived 17,953 terms. Cattell (1943, 1946) consolidated this list into an initial trait list of 160 terms. Eleven more terms were added to meet a number of special considerations and then trait ratings of a sample of S's were obtained.

Factorial analyses of the intercorrelations of the 171 words as the starting point for his ACL. Words were added to reflect the different theoretical viewpoints for describing personality. These totaled 297 words. Others were added later and the present 300 word ACL is "an emergent--list from the language itself, past study, intuitive and subjective appraisal, empirical testing and a three year overall evaluation."

Alfred Hsilbrun developed 15 need scales based on Henry Murray's description of needs. These "needs" were also incorporated into
the EPPS where they were found to be highly correlated (p > .05). Heilbrun used 99 students in an undergraduate course in psychology, 56 females and 43 males as subjects in his validation study. The scales were rationally derived by having 20 advanced graduate students judge which adjective, if checked, would indicate a high level of: achievement, deference order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nuturance, changes, endurance, heterosexuality and aggression. Agreement of 9 out the 20 was the criteria for selection of an adjective. The number of adjectives on each scale ranged from 19 on succorance through 33 for aggression. Later revision of the scales had 19 advanced graduate students judge which checked adjectives would contraindicate a high level of a given need. Nine out 19 was needed for inclusion.

Heilbrun then administered the ACL to the undergraduate psychology class. Approximately three months later factual information was obtained by questionnaires from the S's and from university records to validate the achievement, exhibition, affiliation, nurturance, and abasement scales.

The criterion for achievement need was college GPA with estimated intelligence derived from vocabulary percentile ranks. The criterion for the exhibition need scale was the number of group activities, social academic, athletic, church, etc. of which the S had been a voluntary member since he entered high school. The
criterion for the affiliation need was the number of friends a S had. S's were asked to list the names of people they had met in the previous five years whom they would consider "good friends." Validation of the Nurturance scale was attempted by relating it to the number of charitable, medical research, rehabilitation, church, or educational activities to which S had contributed time, money or personal effects within the previous two years. The predicted course grade (made by the S) was compared with his current GPA in order to validate the abasement scale. There was consistent finding of significance relationships between the five need scales and the selected criteria. (Heilbrun 1958)

Heilbrun (1962) in validating the need Affiliation scale of the ACL compared results of an empirical and a rational derivation for the need. Utilizing 493 subjects he found a slight superiority of the empirical approach, however, a correlation of .75 pointed out the similarity of the two approaches.

The criteria of convergent and discriminant validations proposed by Campbell and Fiske were applied to a multitrait-multimethod matrix constructed from the intercorrelations of 15 need scales from the ACL, the EPPS and a normative modification of the EPPS. Based upon a population of 131 male and female college freshmen, the evidence supported the convergent and discriminant validity of the 15 needs when the two forms of the EPPS were compared. When both of these instruments were
compared with the ACL, the criteria were also met, however, to a minimal degree (Poe, 1969). This finding was further confirmed by Whol and Palmer (1970) in a study of three groups of university students. A considerable number of significant correlations of low absolute value were found leading to the conclusion that the two measures appear to have very little common meaning empirically in measuring needs.

Parker and Veldman (1969) administered the ACL to 5000 college freshmen to determine the item factor structure of the ACL. Interitem correlations were factor analyzed and a varimax rotation of the first 10-2- factors was made. After eliminating all traits with loadings smaller than .40, the first seven factors were: social desirability, interpersonal abrasiveness, ego orientation, introversion-extroversion, internal discomfort, intraception and social attractiveness. The factorial structure of the checklist was also found to be invariant across sex. The authors in subsequent research presented the factors with 5 point scales to 713 females in teacher training. Factor analysis of the emergent items replicated the original structure and simple scale sums showed satisfactory internal consistency and test re-test stability (Veldman and Parker, 1970).

Heilbrun (1965) hypothesized that high social desirability responders would provide more valid and reliable test records. To test the hypothesis, he administered the ACL to 44 college
males followed by negative information relevant to the subjects' age group. When the ACL was readministered it was found the prediction of a more negative ACL self descriptions for high abasing subjects was supported for the high social desirability responders only, whereas the reverse relationship was found for low social desirability responders.

Parker (1969) attempted to derive a masculinity-femininity scale from the ACL. The ACL was administered to 5017 entering university students. Ninety-four feminine and 39 masculine items were identified. The derived measure correlates between .20 and .50 with other measures of masculinity and femininity.

The usual response procedure with the ACL is for S's to make only positive responses. Warr and Knapper (1967) studied the advantages of also eliciting negative responses. Half the S's made positive responses only and half made both positive and negative responses. The latter procedure was acceptable to S's yielded considerably more useful information.

Gough and Rina (1967) found support for using the ACL to predict academic success and its adaptability to cross-cultural conditions. ACL scores were correlated with the grades of 105 French high school subjects, and found a correlation of .45. When the first three scales of the ACL was correlated with scores on an intelligence test, a correlation of .47 was obtained.

Use of the ACL in prediction of academic success is also
supported by Heilbrun's study of college dropouts (1962). He found that of the middle 80 percent of the freshmen dropouts, the scores were higher on heterosexuality, change and lower on achievement, order and endurance.

The ACL has also been found to be of value in predicting defection from psychotherapy. Heilbrun (1966) followed 33 patients in a VA mental hygiene clinic for one year. He found the correlation between scores on the counseling readiness scale and number of therapeutic interviews to be .34 supporting the validity of the scales in predicting longevity of psychotherapy with non-college adults.

Grigg and Thorpe (1960) administered a list of common and uncommon adjectives from the ACL to college freshmen. Those freshmen who became treatment cases had greater deviant response scores than those students in a control group.

Domino (1970) used the ACL to develop a creativity scale. ACL teacher ratings for 59 creative undergraduates who had been nominated by their teachers and observed over a three year period were compared with a control group individually matched on age, intelligence, adjustment ratings and academic major. A creativity (Cr) scale of 59 items more frequently ascribed to creative people was developed and cross-validated on 400 adolescents creative in art, literature or science and 400 appropriate controls. The Cr scale significantly differentiated creative from controls in every
field, but was not influenced by sex or type of creativity. The Cr scale appears to have both empirical and rational validity, is applicable to both sexes and is not influenced by specificity of creative achievement. (Brown, 1972)
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In the study on the relationship of personality variables and educational choice of negro college students, the research design and methodology includes; description of the population, selection of the population, the measuring instruments, data gathering procedures and descriptions of the statistical and factor analyses.

Description of Colleges

In Norfolk, Virginia there are two institutions of higher education with many characteristics in common. Tuition is approximately the same for Virginia residents; $230 per semester at Norfolk State College (NSC) and $235 per semester at Old Dominion University (ODU). There is no significant difference in the number of full time students, both are located centrally in Norfolk, most students commute to college and except for engineering, the undergraduate course offerings are similar. The major difference between the two institutions is that 98 percent of the undergraduate population at ODU is white and 98 percent of the undergraduate population at NSC is negro. Thus, it would appear that a fruitful area of exploration of educational choice for the negro student lies in the area of personality.
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Description of the Population

All fulltime negro students at the sophomore level and above, with the exception of engineering and oceanography students, attending ODU will comprise Group 1. The administration at ODU estimated that there were 40 fulltime negro students at the sophomore level and above enrolled in September 1972. Three of these were engineering majors and could not be included in the study, five refused to participate three graduated mid-year and one could not be located. Thus, the final sample to be 27 in number.

A random sample of negro students at the sophomore level and above attending NSC formed Group 2. Although no effort was made to have equal sample size for each group, an attempt was made to have approximately the same number in each sample wherever possible. Therefore, even though many more students were available at NSC, the sample size was restricted to 34. The same procedure was used to secure the white sample at ODU resulting in a sample of 32.

The administration at NSC estimated that there were only 10 fulltime white students at the sophomore level and above attending college. However, only five could be located the second semester and these students made up Group 4.

Sophomore, junior and senior students were selected because success and gratification with the institution may be inferred. Engineering and oceanography students are omitted from the sample because
Personality Assessment and Description of Measuring Instruments

Personality assessment deals with descriptions of individuals. The two major avenues of securing descriptions are; ask the individual and observations of others. Both these modes of personality assessment may present problems. There may be omissions, modesty may color the descriptions, faulty memory, limited observations and the degree of cultural internalization of society's values may influence the assessment obtained. The determination of a baseline of personality is necessary before comparing and contrasting personalities. Before the nature and extent of individual differences can be determined, there must be a common basis for the personality description.

While it is possible to quantify the degree of differences in individuals with respect to height and weight, degrees of differences in such constructs of personality as intelligence, dominance and self-concept are difficult to effectively quantify at this time. That is, an individual who makes a standard score of 80 on a personality scale cannot be said to have twice as much of a particular characteristic as an individual who makes a score of 40. However, it is generally accepted that individuals have different personalities and that these differences are qualitative rather than quantitative. (Edwards, 1970) Thus, individuals are perceived as having basic characteristics in common and these characteristics vary in amounts or degree according to
the individual.

In addition to the previously mentioned difficulties in assessing personality, Hall and Lindzey (1970) caution that,

"personality is defined by the particular empirical concepts which are a part of the theory of personality employed by the observer. Personality consists concretely of a set of values or descriptive terms which are used to describe the individual being studies according to the variables or dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory utilized."

With this qualification in mind, the scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Adjective Checklist (ACL) for the purposes of this study are utilized as the author of the scales intended as descriptive of personality characteristics. That is, no attempt was made by Gough or Heilbrun to judge the relative value of a characteristic or trait. All interpretations of individual personalities are presented as descriptive and not judgemental as to "goodness" or "badness".

Many authorities agree that the selection of items for structured inventories is done by one of two methods, rational or empirical. Since both methods were utilized in the derivation of scales for both the CPI and ACL, a brief description of both methods is given.

In the rational method, the test author decides what items should be involved. The decision may be in accord with a formal psychological theory or an intuitive understanding of the trait to be measured. Also, there may be one person selecting the items or a group
of persons as was used by Heilbrun in selecting the need scale items of the ACL. The items selected are then administered to subjects and the results analyzed statistically.

With the empirical approach the item selection is determined solely by the empirically determined relationship between the test item and a particular criterion measure. The item pool is selected, usually on a rational basis, administered to criterion groups who differ on the dimension to be assessed. Supposedly, the groups are the same except for this dimension or characteristic. The frequency of selected responses for each group is determined for each item and the statistical significance of differences are computed. Those items that discriminate significantly between the two groups are collected into a preliminary scale, rescored for the criterion groups and if results hold true, the scale is then cross-validated on new groups.

Although there are basically two approaches to deriving personality scales, the factor analytic technique is unique and should be discussed separately. With this approach, the researcher identifies a factor that appears to be a basic personality dimension, constructs a small pool of items closely related to the hypothesized factor, administers the items to a group of subjects along with other measures already identified as being closely related to the factor, intercorrelates the items, factor analyzes and rotates the factor. The term factor, when used in the factor analytic approach, refers to a constellation of traits or characteristics which, when combined describe a personality dimension. With the other two methods, the dimension is
described after deriving the measurement of the trait or characteristic. When the correlation of each item with the factor is determined, those items with the highest loadings are selected for inclusion in the final scale.

There exists disagreement as to which is the best method of test construction. Few comparative studies have been conducted. Goldberg (1971) found initially no significant differences in methods however, a later report revealed that the rational approach has a slight edge over the other approaches. Whereas, the factor analytic method produces a more homogeneous and factorially pure instrument, the rational approach is most likely to have high content validity, a consistent approach and can result in a scale closely related to a formal psychological theory. (Megargee, 1972)

Thirteen of the 18 CPI scales were derived empirically; Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Sense of Well-being, Responsibility, Socialization, Tolerance, Good Impression, Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, Femininity and Psychological Mindedness. Four scales were derived rationally; Social Presence, Self-acceptance, Self-control, and Flexibility. For a complete description of the scales, see Appendix A.

The ACL has its origins in the grammar of the language especially those words used as descriptors and specifiers. The first list of adjectives as derived in 1949 consisted of the 171 words from a study by Cattell and relevant adjectives from the major psychological
theorists, making a total of 279 words. Further testing at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research revealed the need for further words. In 1951 the list increased to 284 words and in 1952 the 300 word adjective checklist was adopted. Thus the current checklist emerged from the language and evolved to its present form through objective and subjective appraisal, past study, empirical testing and a three year over-all evaluation. (Gough and Heilbrun, 1965)

There are 24 scales for use with the ACL. The first eight scales; number checked, Defensiveness, Favorable adjectives checked, Unfavorable adjectives checked, Self-confidence, self-control, Lability and Personal Adjustment were developed by Gough and were derived empirically.

Heilbrun, utilizing Murray's system of "needs", developed 15 scales. The three considerations that determined the selection of these need scales were; each could be defined in terms of observable behavior, each appeared to be relevant to personality organization and functioning, within a normal population and there were descriptions of the "needs" available for selection of items. All of the need scales were derived rationally by 19 psychology graduate students. At least 9 of the 19 had to agree on an adjective before it could be included in a scale.

The fifteen need scales are; Achievement, Dom’nance, Endurance, Order, Intraception, Nurturance, Affiliation, Heterosexuality, Exhibition, Autonomy, Aggression, Change, Succorance, Abasement and Deference. For a comprehensive description of the scales, see appendix A.
Collection of Data

The collection of data was hampered at Old Dominion University because the black students were not listed by race, most of the students were commuters so that the dormitories could not be utilized in identification of the minority students, the president of the black students' organization estimated that only one-fifth of the black students belonged to the club, and there was no way acceptable to the administration of obtaining a list of black students from the faculty. In addition to approaching students in the Student Union building, the Deans of the Schools of Business, Education, Arts and Letters, individual students and faculty members aided the study by requesting negro students in the various classes to contact the researcher.

At Norfolk State College it was agreeable to all concerned that a random sample of students could be requested to participate in the study if they were not required to give their names or background data. Thus, the sample was drawn by assigning a number to each student at the sophomore level and higher whose name appeared in the student directory and selecting the numbers for inclusion in the study from a table of random numbers. The same procedure was followed in obtaining the sample of white students from ODU.

Procedure

Groups I-IV were administered the California Psychological Inventory and the Adjective Checklist. The results were subjected to statistical and factor analyses.
Each group was compared with all other groups on each scale of the CPI and ACL, making a total of 168 scale comparisons. The first comparisons were on the basis of type of educational choice and the second comparison included sex and type of educational choice. Thus, the groups compared first were:

Group I - negro students, ODU
Group II - negro students, NSC
Group III - white students, ODU
Group IV - white students, NSC

After sex is added to type of educational choice, the groups became:

Group I_a - negro, ODU, female
Group I_b - negro, ODU, male
Group II_a - negro, NSC, female
Group II_b - negro, NSC, male
Group III_a - white, ODU, female
Group III_b - white, ODU, male
Group IV_a - white, NSC, female
Group IV_b - white, NSC, male

Statistical Analysis

The data was subjected to the following statistical analyses:

Mean for each group on each scale of the CPI and ACL

\[ \bar{X} = \bar{A}.M + \frac{FD}{N} \times c.i. \]
Standard deviation of each group on each scale

\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\text{fd}^2}{N} \right) - \left( \frac{\text{fd}}{N} \right)^2 \times \text{c.i.}} \]

t-test for significant differences between scores of each group on each scale

\[ t = \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\sqrt{\frac{x_1^2 + y^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \times \frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2}}} \]

The .05 level of confidence will be accepted. Because of unequal cell size the analysis of variance will not be used, however, since \( \sqrt{F} = t \), t can be used.

In order to determine the relationship of the nominal data variables of sex, race and educational choice to interval data variables of standard scores made on the CPI and ACL, the eta coefficient

\[ n_{xy}^2 = \frac{(Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_j)^2}{(Y_{ij} - \bar{Y})^2} \]

and the test of significance for the correlations

\[ F = \frac{(n^2 - r^2) / (k - 2)}{(1 - n^2) / (N - k)} \]

**Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis will enable the large number of variables or scales to be limited by locating and identifying the unities or fundamental properties underlying the tests. This type of analysis will be an objective method of determining the number of factors, the
clustering of the factors of the magnitudes of the saturations of the factors for the population studied.

Megargee (1972) reports 20 factor analytic studies done with the CPI. Seven used the principal component method, as will be used in this study, and 10 used the varimax rotation. Despite the variety of methods used in factor analysis of the CPI, there is relative uniformity in the number of factors extracted, ranging from 3 to 5. The dearth of factor analytic studies which dealt with the measurement of personality utilizing different racial groups caused Megargee to note that the "primary need in the area of test development is for normative studies on representative samples of minority group Americans".

The data will be factor analyzed using the principal component method and comparison made between factors extracted for these groups and those in previous studies.

The procedure to be followed is:

1. Use the principal components factor analysis rotated to meet Kaiser's Varimax Criteria which will maximize variance, R-technique.

2. Rotate orthogonal factor structure.

3. Isolate, identify, label and analyze factors with loadings of .50 and above.

Computer Facilities

The university possesses a Univac 70/40 computer. Its core is 131,072 bytes and has a cycle time of 1440 nano seconds. There is an attached card punch which handles 80 column cards at a rate
of 100 cards per minute. The card reader has a speed of 1435 cards per minute and has a capability of reading 80 columns in a binary format. The printer has a high speed of 1250 lines per second with 132 print positions. The computer has two tape drives, seven or nine track magnetic tape rate of 60,000 bytes per second. The online storage capability is 87.3 million bytes. There is access time of: minimum, 25 milliseconds, average 60 milliseconds and maximum 135 milliseconds. The transfer rate is 312,000 bytes per second. The computer also has an 1130 terminal connected to an IBM 360 with 5/2 k bytes of mean storage.

Program Description for Factor Analysis

A principal component solution and the varimax rotation of the factor matrix are performed. Principal component analysis is used to determine the minimum number of independent dimensions needed to account for most of the variance in the original set of variables. The varimax rotation is used to simplify columns (factors) rather than rows (variables) of the factor matrix.

The sample problem for factor analysis consists of 23 observations with nine variables. In order to keep the number of independent dimensions as small as possible, only those eigenvalues of correlation coefficients, greater than or equal to 1.0 are retained in the analysis. The factor analysis sample program consists of a main routine, FACTO, and six subroutines:
of 100 cards per minute. The card reader has a speed of 1435 cards per minute and has a capability of reading 80 columns in a binary format. The printer has a high speed of 1250 lines per second with 132 print positions. The computer has two tape drives, seven or nine track magnetic tape rate of 60,000 bytes per second. The on-line storage capability is 87.3 million bytes. There is access time of: minimum, 25 milliseconds, average 60 milliseconds and maximum 135 milliseconds. The transfer rate is 312,000 bytes per second. The computer also has an 1130 terminal connected to an IBM 360 with 5/2 k bytes of mean storage.

Program Description for Factor Analysis

A principal component solution and the varimax rotation of the factor matrix are performed. Principal component analysis is used to determine the minimum number of independent dimensions needed to account for most of the variance in the original set of variables. The varimax rotation is used to simplify columns (factors) rather than rows (variables) of the factor matrix.

The sample problem for factor analysis consists of 23 observations with nine variables. In order to keep the number of independent dimensions as small as possible, only those eigenvalues of correlation coefficients, greater than or equal to 1.0 are retained in the analysis. The factor analysis sample program consists of a main routine, FACTO, and six subroutines:
CORRE
EIGEN
TRANCE Are from the Scientific
LOAD Subroutine Package
VARMX
DATA is a special input subroutine
Chapter IV is divided into presentation and analysis of results on the CPI and presentation and analysis of results on the ACL. Both presentations and analyses will follow the same format. Descriptive statistics for each group will be first followed by descriptive statistics for sub-groups based on sex. Scale comparisons for each group will be made with subsequent analyses by group and sex. The results of the factor analysis for Groups 1 and 2 - black students at ODU and NSC will be presented and discussed for each test and finally, the relationship of race, sex and school attended to scores made on the various scales will be presented. Since the number of subjects in Group 4 was only 5, no attempt was made to analyze their scores.

RESULTS ON THE CPI

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations and range of standard scores on each scale for each group are presented in Table A. Using the criteria of above 70 and below 30 as indicative of extreme scores, all of the groups' means are within the "normal" range. If the criteria of scores between 40 and 60 indicating
"average" is applied, the means of Group 2 - black students attending NSC - on the scales measuring capacity for status well-being, tolerance, and intellectual efficiency are below average. The mean standard scores for group 4 white students attending NSC - were below average on the scales measuring responsibility, socialization and tolerance. The students in groups 1 and 3 had mean scores approximately one standard deviation above the mean of 50 on the scale measuring self-acceptance. Group 3 - white students attending ODU evidenced more variability on each scale than was found generally for the other groups. However, the smallness of the sample size (n=5) for Group 4 and the standard deviations would indicate a very heterogeneous collection of students.

Table 1 presents the results of t-tests for scores made on each scale between Groups 1 and 2, 1 and 3 and 2 and 3. Significant differences were found between the black students attending ODU and black students attending NSC on 13 of the 18 scales. Seven of the 13 differences were beyond the .001 level, 2 beyond the .01 level and 3 beyond the .02 level with one scale difference found to be significant beyond the .05 level. All the Class I scales measuring poise, ascendancy self-assurance and interpersonal adequacy showed significant differences; two of the Class II scales measuring socialization, maturity, responsibility and intrapersonal structuring of values showed significant differences;
### TABLE 1

**RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS ON THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU, NSC-Black (N=61)</th>
<th>ODU Black-White (N=59)</th>
<th>NSC Black-ODU White (N=66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>3.43 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>3.48 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.28 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>5.11 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>4.36 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.56 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3.22 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2.68 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2.65 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>2.53 **</td>
<td>2.44 **</td>
<td>5.60 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>3.59 ****</td>
<td>2.16 *</td>
<td>5.15 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>4.09 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.63 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>6.03 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.79 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>2.22 *</td>
<td>2.24 *</td>
<td>4.71 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>2.46 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .02, ***p > .01, ****p > .001
all but one of the Class III scales measuring achievement potential and intellectual Efficiency; and all of Class IV scales measuring intellectual and interest modes revealed significant differences between the two black sample of college students. There were no significant differences between the two black groups on the Responsibility, Socialization, Good Impression, Communality, and Achievement scales. Group 1 students' mean scores on the scales evidencing significant differences were higher than Group 2 students' for all scales except Femininity.

Groups 1 and 3 - black and white students attending ODU - showed significant differences in mean scores on the scales measuring Tolerance, Achievement via Independence and Flexibility. Fifteen other scales did not show any significant difference in mean scores. On all three scales the white students scored higher than did the black students.

The same pattern of significant differences between the two black groups was exhibited between Groups 2 and 3 - black students at NSC and white students at ODU - with the exception of the scale measuring Femininity where no significant difference was found for Groups 2 and 3.

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations and results of t-tests on the CPI between the black males and females attending ODU. The only scale showing significant difference by sex was Capacity for Status. The males mean scores deviated from
TABLE 2

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS FOR ODU BLACK STUDENTS BY SEX ON THE CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=17</th>
<th>Male N=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
the "average" range of 60 and 40 on three scales; Social Presence, Self-Acceptance were above 60 and Self-Confidence was below 40. However, all mean scores for males and females fell within the "normal" range of 70 - 30. There was considerable variability on every scale for both sexes with the exception of Well-Being for the males as evidenced by the relatively large standard deviations. This would seem to indicate that there are fairly extreme individual differences in the sample of black students attending ODU.

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the black students attending NSC broken down by sex. There are no significant differences between the scores made by the males and those of the females. Four of the mean scores on the scales Capacity for Status, Well-Being, Tolerance, and Intellectual Efficiency for the females, fell below the "average" cut-off point of 40. There were no mean scores above the upper limit of the average range - 60. Only the mean scores for Self-Acceptance fell at the mean of 50 and Femininity scores fell somewhat above the mean for the females attending NSC. The males had mean scores below 40 on the scales Well-Being, Responsibility, Tolerance, and Intellectual Efficiency. The scales measuring Self-Acceptance and Femininity fell the mean of 50 but below the upper limits of the average range. All scales for males and females evidenced much variability indicating extreme individual differences.
TABLE 3
MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR BLACK STUDENTS AT NSC BY SEX ON THE CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=22</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male N=12</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means, standard deviations and results of t-tests for white students are given in Table 4 by sex. The means of the females fell below 40 on the scales Well-Being and Good Impression. No scale means were above 60, however, unlike their black counterparts attending ODU, nine mean scale scores fell above the mean of 50. The males had mean scales scores above 60 on Dominance, Social Presence, Self Acceptance and Flexibility with no mean scores below 40 and all of the mean scale scores above 50. Significant sex differences were found on 10 of the 18 scales: Dominance, Capacity for Status, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Well-Being, Tolerance, Good Impression, Achievement, Intellectual Efficiency and Psychological Mindedness. Thus, it would appear that the white males, on the average, scored higher on all Class I scales except Socialibility. The males also scored significantly higher, on the average, on two of the Class II scales, 2 Class III scales and one of the Class IV scales. As was the case with the black students at both ODU and NSC, considerable variability was evidenced on most scales.

Table 5 shows the results of the t-tests between the females in each group for each scale. No significant differences between the black and white female students attending ODU were found except on the scale Good Impression. Eleven of the 18 scales were found to differ significantly between the black females attending ODU and black females attending NSC. Those scales differing
TABLE 4

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS FOR WHITE STUDENTS AT ODU

BY SEX ON THE CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N=22 Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>N=13 Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.096*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .01, ***p > .001
## Table 5

**Significant T-Test Results for Females on the CPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N=61 ODU Black-NSC Black</th>
<th>N=59 ODU Black-White</th>
<th>N=66 NSC Black-ODU White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>2.34 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2.77 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.08 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.73 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>2.657 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>2.52 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>2.16 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.204 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2.96 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>3.86 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>4.65 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>2.219 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>*p &gt; .05, **p &gt; .02, ***p &gt; .01, ****p &gt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .02, ***p > .01, ****p > .001
significantly were: Dominance, Capacity for Status, Socialbility, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Well-Being — all Class I scales, Tolerance from the Class II scales, Achievement via Independence and Intellectual Efficiency from the Class III scales and Psychological Mindedness and Flexibility from the Class IV scales. The black female students at NSC and white female students at ODU also differed on 11 out of 18 scales. The pattern was almost the same for the black and white students as it was for the two groups of black students except for two scales Dominance and Self-Confidence. No significant difference was found in mean scores on the Dominance scales between black females at NSC and white females at ODU. There were significant differences between the two female groups on the scale, Self-Confidence. This, it would appear that the black female students at ODU are more like the white female students at ODU than they are like the black female students at NSC.

Table 6 presents the significant results of the t-tests between the male students on the CPI. The black males attending ODU differed significantly from the black males attending NSC on 9 of the 18 scales; Dominance, Capacity for Status, Socialbility, Social Presence, Tolerance, Good Impression, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, and Psychological Mindedness. The black males at ODU differed significantly from the white males at ODU on two scales; Tolerance and Femininity with the white
**TABLE 6**

**SIGNIFICANT T-TEST RESULTS FOR MALES ON THE CPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N=61 ODU Black-NSC Black</th>
<th>N=59 ODU Black-White</th>
<th>N=66 NSC Black-ODU White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>2.486 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>3.09 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2.08 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>3.75 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.34 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.45 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.604 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2.29 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>2.57 **</td>
<td>2.12 *</td>
<td>4.78 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2.26 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>2.16 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>4.14 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.51 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05,  **p > .02,  ***p > .01,  ****p > .001
males scoring higher, on the average, on both of the scales showing significant differences. Twelve of the 18 scales showed significant differences between the black males at NSC and white males at ODU. All Class I scales showed significant differences with Tolerance from the Class II scales having significant difference between the two groups; all Class III scales exhibited significant differences and two scales, Psychological Mindedness and Flexibility from Class IV scales showing significant differences. As with the females attending ODU, the black and white males attending ODU would appear to score more nearly alike than the black males attending ODU score like the black males attending NSC.

Table 7 of correlation coefficients showing the relationship of race, sex and school attended to scores made on the CPI reveals several significant correlations. Significant relationships were found on Dominance, Socialbility, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Tolerance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychological Mindedness, and Flexibility for race. Significant relationships were found on Capacity for Status, Social Presence, Self Acceptance and Commumality when correlated with sex. The educational choice showed significant relationships on Dominance, Capacity for Status, Socialbility, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Well-Being, Responsibility, Self-Confidence, Tolerance, Socialization, Commumality, Achievement via
TABLE 7

RELATIONSHIPS OF RACE, SEX AND EDUCATIONAL CHOICE TO SCALES ON THE CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 20  p > .05
Conformance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychological Mindedness, Flexibility and Femininity. Although many of the relationships are moderate, they are significant .05 level.

Factor Analysis - CPI

The scores for the two groups of black students were combined and factor analyzed using the principal components method and the results rotated to meet Kaiser's criteria. The resulting table of intercorrelations will be found in the appendix, page .

Table 8 presents the five unrotated factor, their eigenvalues, percentage of variance each factor accounts for and the cumulative percentages.

**TABLE 8**

FACTORS, EIGENVALUES AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE FOR BLACK STUDENTS - CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>PCT of Var</th>
<th>Cum PCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.79712</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.14236</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21455</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15776</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75678</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the varimax rotated factor matrix. The
TABLE 9

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

BLACK STUDENTS; CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scales that load the highest on Factor 1 are Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, and Self Acceptance, all of which correspond to the Class I scales. To a lesser extent, scales Psychological Mindedness and Intellectual Efficiency also load on Factor 1 and Self-Confidence loads negatively on Factor 1. Loading high on Factor 2 are Psychological Mindedness, Intellectual Efficiency, Good Impression, Well-Being with Capacity for Status and Flexibility loading moderately and Femininity loading negatively. Factor 3 has high loadings on Communality, Socialization and Well-Being. Factor 4 contains high loadings on Self-Confidence and Good Impression with negative loadings on Social Presence and Flexibility. Achievement via Conformance is the only scale loading on Factor 5.

INTERPRETATION, ANALYSIS AND LABELING OF FACTORS

Factor 1 - Dominance - Adjustment by Control of External Reality

In the summary of factor analytic studies, Megargee reports that "Self-Confidence and Good Impression invariably have high loadings on Factor 1 and in many analyses Self-Confidence provides almost a pure measure of Factor 1." With the population in this study, Good Impression had an extremely low loading on Factor 1 and Self-Confidence loaded moderately negative. Megargee concludes that the factor 1 in most factor analyses bears a strong resemblance to Gough's Class II with some scales in Class III and Well-Being from Class I. For these researchers, Factor 1 is some form of
positive adjustment. The black college student's Factor 1 corresponds to Gough's first five scales which, according to research, have been shown to form a single factor. (Megargee, 1972) In other reported studies, this cluster is generally Factor 2, accounting for less variance than the Factor 1. Megargee notes that the first five scales usually form a cluster with other scales rarely loading high on it. However, in this study, in addition to being the first factor and accounting for the greatest percent of the variance, another scale, Psychological Mindedness, loads moderately high on it. Megargee reports that the study by Crites, et al (1961), refers to this factor as "dominance - adjustment by control of external reality" because the Dominance scale has the highest loading on the factor. Since in this study, the same situation occurs - Dominance loading highest, (.86) - the same label could be attached.

Factor 2 - Cognitive-Affective Independence

Factor 2 in this study corresponds in some ways to the Factor 3 reported for most other factor analytic studies. In most studies the scales Achievement via Independence, Flexibility have the highest loadings, with strong secondary loadings from Tolerance and Intellectual Efficiency and occasionally Psychological Mindedness. (Megargee, 1972) The Factor 2 in this study had high loadings on Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency and Tolerance with secondary loadings on Psychological Mindedness,
Well-Being, Flexibility and Capacity for Status. In most of the labels attached to this factor in other studies, the concept of independence has been used, thus a logical label for this Factor 2 could be independence for self and others with insight and sensitivity to others.

**Factor 3 - The Larger Culture Attitudes and Response Set**

In the summary of factor analytic studies, Factor 4 is defined by high loadings from Communalitiy and Socialization. Femininity also loads on this factor when only four factors are extracted, but always appears on Factor 5 when five factors are extracted. In this study, Factor 3 is characterized by high loadings on Communalitiy and Socialization with moderate loadings from Well-Being. However, five factors were extracted in this study and Femininity did not load high on any factor. Others feel this constellation of scales, Communalitiy and Socialization, reflect test-taking attitudes or sets. (Megargee, 1972) Thus, Factor 3 in this study, corresponds to Factor 4 in most other factor analytic studies for the most part.

**Factor 4 - General Adjustment**

Self-Confidence and Good Impression load high on Factor 4 in this study. Megargee (1972) reports that, although the pattern of loadings varies from one analysis to the next, Self-Confidence and Good Impression invariably have high loadings on Factor 1. Most investigators regard this as a "general adjustment factor"
and almost always accounts for the largest percentage of the variance as well as having the largest number of scales to load on it. Thus, Factor 4 in this analysis, has few scales to load on it and does not follow the usual pattern of high loadings from Communality and Socialization.

**Factor 5 - Noninterpretable Factor**

An all other factor analytic studies that extracted 5 factors summarized by Megargee, Femininity was the only scale to load on this factor. In this study, Achievement via Conformance was the only scale to highly load on Factor 5.

It is of interest that Megargee reports that Factors 2 and 5 are quite reliable, always defined by the same scales and those scales never have significant loadings on any other factor. The results of the analyses in this study have not followed the usual pattern. Table 10 presents the differences between the study and most other studies on scales that load on the various factors.

After looking at the structure of the various scales underlying the factors extracted for the black college population the factors could be labeled;

Factor 1 - dominance-adjustment by control of external reality.

Factor 2 - independence for self and others with insight into behavior of self and others.

Factor 3 - the larger culture attitudes or response set.

Factor 4 - general adjustment
TABLE 10
DIFFERENCES IN SCALE LOADING
ON THE FIVE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Present Study Scales</th>
<th>Other Studies Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DO, CS, SY, SP, SA</td>
<td>WB, RE, SO, SC, TO, GI, AC, AI, IE, PY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TO, AI, IE, WB, SC, PY, FX</td>
<td>DO, CS, SY, SP, SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WB, SO, CM</td>
<td>TO, AI, IE, PY, FX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SC, GI</td>
<td>SO, CM, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>FE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5 - achievement in accord with society's values.

RESULTS ON THE ACL

The means, standard deviations and ranges of the scores made on 22 of the 23 scales on the ACL are presented in Table B. If the cut off points of 60 and 40 are used as indications of being above and below "average", an examination of the mean standard scores, reveals that Group 1 scored very slightly below average on the scale measuring Deference (DE), with all other mean scores for all groups falling within the "average" range.

Table 11 shows the results of t-tests between Groups 1, 2
TABLE 11

RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS BETWEEN GROUPS ON THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU, NSC-Black (N=61)</th>
<th>ODU Black-White (N=59)</th>
<th>NSC Black-ODU White (N=66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>2.143 *</td>
<td>2.05 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>2.54 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2.67 ***</td>
<td>2.06 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>3.76 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.99 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3.36 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>2.83 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>2.84 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2.094 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.68 ****</td>
<td>2.32 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3.86 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>5.12 ****</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.98 ****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .02, ***p > .01, ****p > .001
and 3 on each of the scales on the ACL. There were significant differences on 10 of the 22 scales, Defensiveness, Favorable Adjectives Checked, Self-Confidence, Lability, Achievement, Dominance, Heterosexuality, Change, Abasement and Deference. Between Groups 1 and 3 there were significant differences on 5 scales; Defensiveness, Self-Control, Succorance, Abasement and Deference. Significant differences between groups 2 and 3 were found on the scales measuring Lability, Heterosexuality, Change and Succorance.

Group 1 students' mean scores were higher than Group 2 on all scales where significant differences were found with the exceptions of the scales measuring Abasement and Deference where Group 2 students scored higher.

Group 3 students scored higher than Group 1 students on scales Succorance, Abasement and Deference and scored lower on scales Defensiveness and Succorance. Group 3 students scored higher than Group 2 students on Lability, Heterosexuality, and Change and scored lower on Succorance.

The breakdown of the distribution of mean scores on the ACL by sex is presented in Tables C, 12, 13. Table C shows the breakdown of means, standard deviations and results of t-tests for black students attending ODU. All of the mean scores for the female students fell within the "average" range of 40 - 60. Except for Deference, the standard deviations were fairly consistent for
the other scales indicating a similarity of the variability of
the students across scales.

The black male students had a mean score above the "average"
range on Defensiveness and scored below the average range on
Abasement and Deference. Their mean scores also approached the
upper range on Favorable Adjectives Checked, Achievement,
Dominance and Heterosexuality. An examination of the distribution
of standard deviations shows considerable variation with very
large deviations on the Self-Confidence, Abasement and Deference
scales, indicating considerable variability among these black
males on the ACL.

T-tests revealed significant sex differences beyond the .05
level on Defensiveness, Lability, Achievement, and Affiliation
with the males scoring higher on the average, than did the females.

Table presents the means, standard deviations and results
of t-tests by sex for the NSC black sample. As was the case with
the black females at ODU, the mean scores for the black females
at NSC tended to cluster around the mean - 50. All mean scale
scores fell within the average range.

The black males attending NSC had most of their mean scores
below 50, although none fell below 40 or above 60. On 18 of the
22 scales, mean scores were below 50 which may indicate a
characteristic slight depression of scores for this group.

The t-tests show significant sex differences of Favorable
Adjectives Checked, Lability, Personal Adjustment, Nurturance and Change and unlike their black counterparts attending ODU, the females tended to score higher on all scales than did the males. On all scales except Unfavorable Adjectives Checked, Autonomy and Aggression, the females tended to score higher.

The means, standard deviations and t-test results for white students attending ODU are presented in Table E with the breakdown by sex.

The mean scores for the females fell within the average range with only the mean score for Aggression approaching the upper limit of the range. The standard deviations evidenced considerable variability of scores for the white females attending ODU.

The mean scores for the white males also fell within the average range with only the scores for Heterosexuality and Change approaching the upper limit of the average range. Some of the standard deviations are relatively large, noticeable on the scales, Self-Control, Lability, Intraception, Heterosexuality, Autonomy and Aggression.

The t-test for sex differences show significant differences on the Defensiveness, Affiliation, Aggression and Change scales. The white males scored higher, on the average, on all scales showing significant differences than the females except for the scale, Aggression.

The t-tests for significant differences for the female sub-
groups are presented in Table 12. Only one scale, Defensiveness was shown to differ significantly between the black females attending ODU and NSC with the ODU group scoring lower. The black and white females attending ODU differed significantly on Lability, Aggression and Succorance with the white females tending to score higher on all three scales. The white females at ODU differed significantly from the black females at NSC on Favorable Adjectives Checked and Aggression with the black females scoring higher on Favorable Adjectives Checked and the white females scoring higher on Aggression.

Table 12

RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT T-TESTS FOR FEMALES ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU-NSC Black</th>
<th>ODU Black-White</th>
<th>NSC Black-ODU White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>2.82***</td>
<td>3.86****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>2.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>2.97***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, ***p > .01, ****p > .001

Table F presents the results of t-tests between the males in the study. Twelve of 22 scales were found to differ significantly between the black males attending ODU and black males attending NSC. The scales differing significantly were:
Defensiveness; Favorable Adjectives Checked, Self-Confidence, Lability, Achievement, Dominance, Affiliation, Heterosexuality, Change, Succorance, Abasement, and Deference. The black males attending ODU tended to score higher on all of these scales except Succorance, Abasement and Deference.

Four scales, Achievement, Succorance, Abasement and Defensiveness showed significant differences between the black and white males attending ODU. The black males tended to score higher on the scale Achievement and lower on scales Succorance, Abasement and Deference.

The black males at NSC scored significantly different than white males at ODU on Self-Confidence, Defensiveness, Lability, Achievement, Dominance, Nurturance, Heterosexuality and Change. On all of the scales showing significant differences, the white males tended to score higher. It is interesting to note that the black males at ODU score significantly different from the other two male populations on Succorance, Abasement and Deference, and the white males at ODU tended to score more like the black males at NSC on this cluster of scales. On most other scales, the black males at ODU tended to score more like their white counterparts at ODU then their black counterparts at NSC.

Factor Analysis of the ACL

The scores of the two black populations were combined and factor analysed. The resulting table of intercorrelations is in
the appendix, page 130.

Table 13 presents the percentage of variance attributed to each factor after rotation. Factor 1 accounts for over 50 percent of the variance, Factor 2 accounts for 31 percent of the variance and Factors 3 and 4 account for less than 18 percent of the total variance.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS, EIGENVALUES AND PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE - ACL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G is the matrix of the rotated factors. Loading highest on Factor 1 are the scales measuring self-confidence, Achievement, Dominance, Heterosexuality, Exhibition, Autonomy, Aggression, and High Negative Loadings on scales measuring Succorance, Abasement and Deference. Factor 2 has high loadings from scales measuring Defensiveness, Favorable Adjectives Checked, Self-Control, Achievement, Endurance, Order, Affiliation and loads negatively on Aggression. Factor 3 is loaded high by scales, Personal Adjustment, Intraception, Nurtrance and moderately on Favorable Adjectives Checked and Affiliation. Factor 4 loads high
on Change and moderately on Succorance.

**Factor 1 - Dominance With Control of External Reality**

An Examination of the structure underlying the scales that load high on Factor 1 reveals that this factor describes traits of self-assurance, attention getting, striving for attainment and leadership independence and aggression.

Parker and Veldman (1969) in their discussion of the results of many factor analyses of the ACL, identified the first factor as "social facilitation" with high loadings from the scales; Favorable Adjectives Checked, Nurturance and Affiliation. Factor 1 in this analysis had its highest loadings from; Dominance Exhibition, Self-Confidence, Autonomy, Aggression and Achievement with high negative loadings from Succorance, and Abasement.

Therefore, the cluster of scales for the Negro population would be more properly labeled the same as their factor 1 from the analysis of the CPI - "dominance with external control of reality". This factor accounts for over half the variance and is unusual in that generally less than half the variance is accounted for by any one factor. Thus, the black college students could be described as confident, aggressive, independent, ambitious, capable, opportunistic, seeking the limelight, demanding and forceful. The negative loadings indicate that this population is aloof, individualistic and does not seek or sustain subordinate roles.
Factor 2 - Social Desirability

With the scales measuring Defensiveness, Self-Control, Achievement, Endurance and Order and Number of Favorable Adjectives Checked, the underlying structure of the scales would tend to describe this factor as one of structure, conventionality, practicality, emphasis on attaining the ends of social living, self-discipline and seriousness. This factor would appear to correspond somewhat to Parker and Veldman's Factor 3 - Ego Organization which is characterized by high loadings on Favorable Adjectives Checked, Endurance, Order and Achievement. Thus, the black students could be described as seeking to attain the ends of the majority culture and attempting to "fit in."

Factor 3 - Helpful Attitude Toward Life

Factor 3 has high loadings from scales measuring Intraception, Nurturance and Personal Adjustment. Since Personal Adjustment tends to reflect attitudes toward life rather than the relative absence of worries and problems and because Intraception and Nurturance reflect the desire to understand the behavior of self and others together with the desire to help others, it could be said that this factor describes the helping attitude toward life. Factor 6, for Parker and Veldman, was the only factor containing Intraception. They too found disparate scales loading on this factor and found it difficult to pin a label on it. As it accounts for only 9.6 percent of the variance, its relative
importance is minimum.

Factor 4 - Flexibility

Factor 4 has high loadings on the scales measuring Lability, and Change. Therefore, it would appear that this factor bears some relation to Flexibility in the description of underlying personality dynamics, for the ACL. This factor 4 did not correspond to any factors determined in previous studies.

The factors extracted from the results of the ACL are consistent with the factors extracted on the CPI. There are differences however, on the major personality dimensions both factor analyses are in essential agreement.

Thus, the factors on the ACL for the black college population could be labeled:

Factor 1 - Dominance with External Control of Reality
Factor 2 - Social Desirability
Factor 3 - Helpful Attitude Toward Life
Factor 4 - Flexibility

Table H presents the relationship of race, sex and educational choice to scales on the ACL. All eta coefficients except the relationship of Deference to school could be considered moderate although coefficients at .20 and above are considered to be significant beyond the .05 level. Therefore, race correlates significantly with; Unfavorable Adjectives Checked, Lability, Heterosexuality, Change, Succorance and Deference. Sex correlates
significantly with; Defensiveness only and school correlates with; Favorable Adjectives Checked, Unfavorable Adjectives Checked, Self-Confidence, Lability, Achievement, Dominance, Exhibition, Aggression, Change, Succorance, Abasement and Deference.
Chapter V contains; an overview of the study, summary of results, testing of hypotheses, conclusions and directions for further research. The summarizing statements are intended to be applicable only to the populations studied and the conclusions drawn are based, in part, on the limitation of sample size.

Overview of the Study

Research into the personality characteristics of negroes attending Old Dominion University and Norfolk State College was conducted. The colleges are both in Norfolk, Virginia with tuition, student enrollment and course offerings approximately the same at both schools. Their major difference is in the composition of the student body. Approximately 98 percent of the students attending ODU are white and approximately 98 percent of the students attending NSC are black. Therefore, it would appear that one of the areas involved in deciding which school to attend is personality.

Full-time negro students at the sophomore level and above formed Group 1. A random sample of negro students at NSC formed Group 2. Group 3 was comprised of a random sample of white students attending ODU and Group 4 were white students attending NSC. As there were only 5 students in Group 4, no attempt was
made to analyze their scores beyond the descriptive statistics.

The groups were administered the California Psychological Inventory and the Adjective Checklist and the results subjected to statistical and factor analyses.

Summary of Results

All of the mean standard scores on the various scales for both tests fell within the "normal" range of 30 - 70. That is, there were no extremely high or low scores for any of the groups, although in each group there were individuals who did score in the extreme ranges.

The most significant differences were found on the CPI between the two black groups. When the scores were analyzed by sex, the same kind of significant differences were found between the two black populations. However, the black and white students at ODU, both male and female, tended to score alike. Almost the same pattern of differences between the black students attending ODU and those attending NSC was found between the white students attending ODU and black students at NSC. These results would tend to support a hypothesis that black college students do not form a monolithic group as far as personality characteristics and profiles are concerned and that there are at least, two distinctly different populations of black collegians.

Significant differences were found also on the ACL, although it did not appear to be as sensitive in picking up sex differences.
One of the areas that gave added information to the findings of the CPI were the significant differences between the black groups in Succorance, Abasement and Deference. In addition to scoring higher on measures of Confidence, Self-Assurance, Poise, Achievement, Intellectual Efficiency, Flexibility and Intrapersonal Structuring of Values, the black students at ODU tended to score significantly lower on the need to be dependent on others, to be submissive and to maintain subordinate roles. This is not to conclude that the black students at NSC are low on these characteristics, it just means they tended to score significantly different than their black counterparts at ODU.

The analyses of the relationships of sex, race and type of school attended to scores made on the CPI and ACL revealed that educational choice bears significant relationships to scores on more scales than either race or sex. Since college environments have been shown to differ, it may well be that the interaction of personality and college environment operates to produce significant differences.

When the data for the two black populations were combined and factor analyzed for the CPI and ACL, a differing factor structure from that determined in previous studies was found for both tests. There were unusually high scale loadings on the five factors found for the CPI. Loadings above .60 are considered extremely high and on Factor 1 the scales; Dominance (.86),
sociability (.66), social presence (.67), self-acceptance (.77) could all be considered as extremely high loadings. Moderate loadings were found for capacity for status (.57), and psychological mindedness (.47) with a moderate negative loading on self-control (-.50). The underlying structure of these scales caused Factor 1 to be labeled "dominance-adjustment with control of external reality".

Factor 2 was characterized by high loadings on; tolerance (.78), achievement via independence (.72), intellectual efficiency (.66) with moderate loadings from; capacity for status (.48), well being (.52), psychological mindedness (.50) and flexibility (.40) with a moderate negative loading from femininity (-.53). The label attached to Factor 2 was "cognitive-affective independence."

Factor 3 - "the larger culture attitude or response set" had high loadings on; socialization (.69) and communality (.80) with moderate loadings from well being (.48) and intellectual efficiency (.43).

Good impression (.86) was almost a pure measure of Factor 4. High loadings were found also on self-control (.67), a negative loading on flexibility (-.61) and a moderate negative loading on social presence (-.41) giving this factor the label, "general adjustment".

Factor 5 was characterized by an extremely high loading on achievement via conformance (.82) however, since there were
no other scales loading even moderately on this factor it was
deemed interpretable. In all other reported factor analytic
studies where 5 factors were extracted, femininity has been the
only factor to load even moderately on this factor.

There were only four factors extracted on the ACL. Factor
1, "dominance by control of external reality" had high loadings
from; dominance (.80), exhibition (.74), autonomy (.82), self-
confidence (.62), achievement (.63), high negative loadings on
abasement (-.88) and succorance (-.65) with secondary loadings
from heterosexuality (.50) and deference (-.52).

Factor 2 had extremely high loadings on order (.85), defen-
siveness (.77), endurance (.77) with secondary loadings from;
favorable adjectives checked (.60), self-control (.63), achieve-
ment (.58) affiliation (.59) and aggression (-.55). This factor
was labeled with the concept of seeking goals in accordance with
the values of society.

Factor 3 had a high negative loading on unfavorable ad-
jectives checked (-.70), high positive loadings on nurturance
(.70), and secondary loadings on personal adjustment (.64), in
traception (.64) and affiliation (.49). Thus, it was labeled
"helping attitude toward life".

Factor 4 had moderately high loadings on lability (.66),
and change (.68) with no secondary loadings. It would appear
that factor 4 bears a relationship to the concept of flexibility
as an underlying personality dimension.

**Testing of Hypotheses**

**Hypotheses:**

1. There will be no significant difference on personality scales between negro students attending Old Dominion University and a random sample of negro students attending Norfolk State College.

Significant differences between the two negro populations were found on 13 of the 18 scales on the CPI. The scales showing significant differences were; dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, sense of well-being, self-control, tolerance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological mindedness, flexibility and femininity.

When the data for the CPI were compared by sex for the black populations, 11 of the 18 scales were found to differ significantly between the two groups of females. The negro females differed significantly on; dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, sense of well being, tolerance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological mindedness and flexibility.

The two negro male populations differed significantly on 9 of the 18 scales; dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, tolerance, good impression, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency and psychological mindedness.
The black males at ODU tended to score higher on the average, than the black males at NSC on all of the differing CPI scales.

T-tests on the ACL revealed significant differences between the two negro populations on; defensiveness, number of favorable adjectives checked, self-confidence, lability, achievement, dominance, heterosexuality, change, abasement and deference. The black students attending ODU tended to have higher scores on the average, than did black students attending NSC on all differing scales except deference.

When the data were analyzed for sex differences on scores between the two black populations, only one scale was found to differ significantly between the two black female populations, deference with the females at NSC scoring significantly higher. However, 12 of the scales showed significant differences between black males attending ODU and black males attending NSC; defensiveness, number of favorable adjectives checked, self-confidence, lability, achievement, dominance, affiliation, heterosexuality, change, succorance, abasement and deference. Except for succorance, abasement and deference, the mean scores for the negroes at ODU tended to be higher than the scores of the negroes at NSC.

Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant differences on personality scales is rejected.

2. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between negro students and a random
sample of white students attending Old Dominion University.

Three of the 18 scales on the CPI showed significant differences between the negro and white students attending ODU; tolerance, achievement via independence and flexibility with the white students tending to score higher. With a breakdown of scale scores by sex, it was found that the black and white females attending ODU differed significantly only on the scale, good impression. The black males at ODU differed from the white males on three scales; tolerance, intellectual efficiency and femininity with the white males tending to score higher.

The results of the ACL revealed significant differences between black and white students attending ODU on five scales; defensiveness, self-control, succorance, abasement and deference, with the white students scoring higher on abasement and deference and scoring lower on the other three scales.

When sex differences were analyzed, the white females differed significantly from the black females on; lability, aggression and succorance with the white females tending to score higher on all three scales. Four scales; achievement, succorance, abasement and deference showed significant differences between the black and white males attending ODU. The black males tended to score higher on the achievement scale and lower on the other three differing scales.
Since there were few scales differing significantly, the hypothesis of no significant difference between the two groups is accepted.

3. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between white students attending Norfolk State College and a sample of white students attending Old Dominion University.

4. There will be no significant differences on personality scales between white students and the sample of negro students attending Norfolk State College.

As the white sample at Norfolk State College contained only 5 students, the size of the sample was too small to analyze and determine if significant differences did exist.

The results were also compared between the white students attending ODU and black students attending NSC. On the CPI all the scales that showed significant differences between the black students at ODU and the black students at NSC with the exception of the femininity scale where no significant differences were found between the white ODU and black NSC students, exhibited the same pattern of significant differences between the white students at ODU and the black students at NSC.

When the results were analyzed by sex, the white female students at ODU and black female students at NSC differed on 11 of 18 scales; capacity for status, sociability, social presence,
self-acceptance, well-being, tolerance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological mindedness, flexibility and self-control. The black females at ODU differed from the black females at NSC on all of the same scales except self-control thus, exhibiting the same pattern of differences as their white counterparts at ODU.

The white males at ODU differed significantly from the black males at NSC on 12 of the 18 scales; dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, well-being, tolerance, achievement via conformance, achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, psychological mindedness, and flexibility. With the exceptions of; self-acceptance, well-being, achievement via independence and flexibility, the pattern of differences is essentially the same between black and white males attending NSC.

On the ACL the scales measuring lability, heterosexuality, change and succorance showed significant differences with the white students scoring higher on all but succorance. With the results broken down by sex, the white females differed on number of favorable adjectives checked and aggression.

The black males at NSC scored significantly different than white males at ODU on self-confidence, defensiveness, lability, achievement, dominance, nurturance, heterosexuality and change. On all of the scales showing significant differences, the white males tended to score higher.
Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from the results of the study are limited by the sample size and generalizations must be made with caution. The aims of the study were:

1. To identify those personality characteristics of the negro population in predominately white and predominately negro colleges.
2. To determine the personality profiles of successful negro students as identified on the CPI and ACL.
3. To ascertain if a cluster of personality traits exists and is the discriminating personality variable that distinguishes between negroes enrolled in predominately white institutions and those enrolled in predominately black institutions.

In line with the aims of the study the conclusions are:

1. There are significant personality differences between black college populations as exhibited on the objective personality measures - the CPI and the ACL. The black college students at the predominately white college tended to score higher on all significantly different scales on the CPI and those differing scales on the ACL except for the scales measuring abasement and deference. Over-all, the black students attending a predominately white college tended to score more like their white counterparts than like their
black counterparts attending a predominately black institution. There were more significantly differing scales between the two black populations than would be expected by chance. Therefore, it is concluded that real personality differences do exist between those negroes who attend predominately white and predominately black colleges.

2. When the results of the tests are analyzed for sex differences the black females differ significantly on 11 of the 18 scales on the CPI. However, only 1 scale on the ACL showed significant differences between the two black female populations. On both tests the black females attending the predominately white institution tended to score more like their white counterparts than their black counterparts at a predominately white institution.

3. The black males attending a predominately white college differed from the black males attending a predominately black institution on 9 of the 18 scales on the CPI and 12 of 22 scales on the ACL. They differed significantly from the white males on only 2 scales on the CPI and 4 scales on the ACL. Thus, personality test scores of the black males at a predominately white college are more like their white counterparts than they are like their black counterparts in a predominately black college.

4. There does appear to be a cluster of personality traits
that distinguishes the negro college student at a predomi-
nately white college from a negro college student at a
predominately negro college. On the CPI the cluster con-
forms to Gough's Class I scales measuring poise, ascendancy,
self-assurance and interpersonal adequacy. In addition the
self-control, tolerance, achievement via independence, in-
tellectual efficiency, and Class IV scales of intellectual
and interest modes are contained in this cluster. Combin-
ing all these scales, the profile of the negro student at
a predominately white college could be said to reflect the
characteristics of relatively more confidence, intraper-
sonal adjustment, self-discipline, intellectual and personal
effectiveness, openness to experience and bluntness and
directive in thinking and action. The results on the ACL
would tend to reinforce this profile with the addition of
indicating that these students tend to be less able to su-
stain subordinate roles.
Because of the individual differences exhibited on scales
on both tests, it must be noted that the conclusion con-
cerning the personality profile is based on the average
scores of the respective groups. Thus, there are deviations
from the profile in both of the black populations.
5. The CPI would appear to be a more sensitive instrument
to detect significant personality differences than the
ACL. Although group scale scores showed significant differences when the results were analyzed by sex, the female scores failed to show significant differences as were found on the CPI.

6. The results of the factor analysis for the black college students reveals that their factor structure differs significantly from the factor structure of most other factor analytic studies. Although the sample was small (N = 61) extremely high factor loadings were found for several scales - above .70. There were also extremely high negative loadings on some factors. Whereas, self-control "provides almost a pure measure of Factor 1", in this study dominance was the scale loading highest on Factor 1, (.86). (Megargee, 1972) Since this population's Factor 1 corresponded almost exactly to other researchers' Factor 2 where dominance loaded highest, the same label was used - dominance - adjustment by control of external reality. Factor 2 corresponded in some respects to other reported Factor 3. In this study the high loadings on achievement via independence, intellectual efficiency, tolerance with secondary loadings on psychological mindedness, well-being, flexibility and capacity for status determined the label - cognitive-affective independence. In the summary of other factor analytic studies, Factor 4 is defined by high loadings from communality and socialization.
Since Factor 3, in this study, followed somewhat the same pattern the label "larger culture attitude or response set" was attached. Factor 4 had high loadings on self-control and good impression with good impression being an almost pure measure (.86), thus this factor was labeled "general adjustment". Factor 5 in all other studies is characterized by the femininity scale loading high and is also the only scale to load on Factor 5. However, in this study, achievement via conformance loaded extremely high, .82. From these results, it becomes more probable that the personality structure of black college students may differ from that of white college students.

As with any analysis of personality structure or profiles, no attempt was made to judge the relative merits of scores on the personality tests. Although significant differences were found, it should not be concluded that the relative strength or weakness of a scale score is indicative of a value judgement. This study was more an attempt to describe what personality profiles and differences exist rather than to make any judgements concerning the desirability of any of the characteristics or traits.

Directions for Further Research

As recently as 1972 (Hilliard, 1972) there were few studies on negroes using objective personality assessment measures. Megargee (1972) also calls for more normative data for the CPI on
minority group Americans. Other personality researchers have proposed that separate norms for racial groups be devised as there have been separate sex norms. The results of this study would appear to indicate that comprehensive descriptive studies should be conducted to determine if separate norms should be devised for minority group Americans. It may well be that separate norms are not needed, just more flexible interpretations of scores based on research findings.

In order to ascertain if the results hold true for other kinds of colleges a study along the lines of the comprehensive Minnesota study could be conducted. Black college-bound high school students could be tested and re-tested upon enrolling in college using various objective personality measures. Thus, it would be possible to obtain personality profiles and differences among the black students attending small liberal arts colleges, junior colleges, large universities, technical colleges, etc., all of which could be paired as to the relative racial composition of the student body, i.e. predominately black or predominately white. The results of such a study could do much to aid the black students along with their parents and counselors in the decision as to what kind of college to attend.

Another fruitful area of research could be the gathering of descriptive data on the CPI and ACL from black college students in both kinds of colleges from many geographical areas across the
United States. The results of the tests could be correlated with background variables and thus determine meaningful relationships as well as profiles. Of particular interest would be the amount and kind of interracial experiences of the various college students. For example, did those negroes who chose to attend a predominately white college attend integrated public schools - not tokenly integrated - full integration. Other personality measures could be added to the CPI and ACL such as Holland's Vocational Preference Inventory to see what the relationship is between type of educational institution, personality and vocational choice. Another instrument that could possibly yield fruitful results is the Sensation Seeking Scale in combination with other objective personality measures.

A scale of items discriminating between negroes enrolled in a predominately white college and those enrolled in a predominately black college could be formulated and cross-validated. It could be administered to black college bound high school seniors and predictions made. A follow-up study of the students after a year in college would determine the predictive validity of the scale.

There are numerous studies that could be carried out in the area of personality and career choices of negroes. Since testing of personality as well as other types of testing is becoming increasingly prevalent in screening procedures for job
and school placement, it is necessary to obtain more data on minority group Americans in order to aid in more objective decision making.

Although there are many areas of research into the personality of negroes, the most pressing need at this time, is for descriptive data. Inferences, conclusions and decisions cannot be made wisely without a basis for comparison and such a basis is not available until descriptions of the populations are formed.
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# TABLE A

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGE OF SCORES

FOR ALL GROUPS ON THE CALIFORNIA

PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU - Black N=27</th>
<th>NSC - Black N=34</th>
<th>ODU - White N=32</th>
<th>NSC - White N=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>46.78</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>34.79</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR ALL GROUPS ON THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY
CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU - Black N=27</th>
<th>NSC - Black N=34</th>
<th>ODU - White N=32</th>
<th>NSC - White N=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>28-63</td>
<td>46.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>34-61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>35-58</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>30-54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>43-68</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>33-70</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>29-67</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>ODU - Black N=27</td>
<td>NSC - Black N=34</td>
<td>ODU - White N=32</td>
<td>NSC - White N=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25-68</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>29-67</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>35-71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>31-72</td>
<td>46.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>34-65</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>39-61</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>16-63</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36-68</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>36-69</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>32-66</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30-65</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGES
OF SCORES ON THE ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST
CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>ODU - Black N=27</th>
<th>NSC - Black N=34</th>
<th>ODU - White N=32</th>
<th>NSC - White N=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>51.89</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>25-62</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>26-62</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24-62</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>39-69</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>38-70</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>40-68</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>34-65</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>39-61</td>
<td>46.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>26-69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19-61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE C
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS
ON THE ACL FOR ODU - BLACK STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=17</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male N=10</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF
T-TESTS ON THE ACL FOR ODU - BLACK STUDENTS
CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=17</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male N=10</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .01, ***p > .001
TABLE D
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS
FOR NSC- BLACK STUDENTS ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=22</th>
<th>Male N=12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>52.13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>47.68</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>52.59</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>50.36</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>51.59</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS
FOR NSC - BLACK STUDENTS ON THE ACL
CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=22</th>
<th>Male N=12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05,  **p > .02
TABLE E
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS
FOR ODU - WHITE STUDENTS ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=19</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male N=13</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>48.37</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RESULTS OF T-TESTS
FOR ODU - WHITE STUDENTS ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Female N=19</th>
<th>Male N=13</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .02, ***p > .01
TABLE F
RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT t-TESTS FOR MALES ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N=22 ODU-NSC Black</th>
<th>N=22 ODU Black-White</th>
<th>N=25 NSC Black-ODU White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>4.42**** .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>2.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2.86*** .01</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>3.43*** .01</td>
<td>2.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>3.88**** .001</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>3.49*** .01</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>2.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>3.24*** .01</td>
<td>2.6**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>3.46*** .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2.84*** .01</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE F

RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT t-TESTS FOR MALES ON THE ACL CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N=22 ODU-NSC Black</th>
<th>N=22 ODU Black-White</th>
<th>N=25 NSC Black-ODU White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>2.37* .05</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>3.06*** .01</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2.104* .05</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p > .02, ***p > .01, ****p > .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>$h^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE H

**RELATIONSHIP OF RACE, SEX AND EDUCATIONAL CHOICE TO SCALES ON THE ACL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE H
RELATIONSHIP OF RACE, SEX AND EDUCATIONAL CHOICE TO SCALES ON THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = .20, p > .05
## Table I

**INTERCORRELATIONS FOR THE CPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>GI</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PY</th>
<th>FX</th>
<th>FE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table J

INTERCORRELATIONS FOR THE ACL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>FV</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>NU</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
The 18 scales of the CPI and the characteristic assessed by each one are:

I. Measures of Poise, Ascendency and Self-Assurance

1. Dominance - identifies strong, dominant influential and ascendent individuals who are able to take the initiative and exercise leadership. (DO)

2. Capacity for Status - appraises those qualities of ambition and self-assurance that underlie and lead to status. (CS)

3. Sociability - devised to differentiate people with an outgoing, sociable participative temperament from those who shun involvement and avoid social visibility. (SY)

4. Social Presence - assesses poise, self confidence, verve and spontaneity in social interactions. (SP)

5. Self-Acceptance - assesses factors such as sense of personal worth, self acceptance and capacity for independent thinking and action. (SA)

6. Sense of Well-being - derived to discriminate individuals feigning neuroses from normal and psychiatric patients responding truthfully. (WB)

II. Measures of Socialization, Maturity and Responsibility

7. Responsibility - identifies people who are conscientious, responsible, dependable, articulate about rules and order and who believe that life should be governed by reason. (RE)
8. Socialization - reflects the degree of social maturity, integrity and rectitude the individual has attained. (SO)

9. Self-control - designed to assess the adequacy of self-regulation, self control and the degree of freedom from impulsivity and self-centerness. (SN)

10. Tolerance - identifies permissive, accepting and nonjudgmental social beliefs and attitudes. (TL)

11. Good impression - identifies people who are able to create favorable impressions and who are concerned about how others react to them. (GI)

12. Communality - designed to detect protocols on which the respondent answered in a random fashion. The purpose is similar to the F scale on the MMPI. (CM)

III. Measure of Achievement Potential and Intellectual Efficiency

13. Achievement via conformance - assesses the need for achievement coupled with a deeply internalized appreciation for structure and organization. (AC)

14. Achievement via independence - predicts achievement where independence of thought, creativity and self-actualization are rewarded. (AI)

15. Intellectual efficiency - constructed to provide a set of personality items that would correlate significantly with accepted measures of intelligence. (IE)
IV. Measure of Intellectual and Interest Modes

16. Psychological Mindedness - reflects the degree to which the individual is interested in and responsive to the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others. (PY)

17. Flexibility - identifies people who are flexible, adaptable and somewhat changeable in their thinking, behavior, and temperament. (FX)

18. Femininity - the purpose is to define psychological continuum which may be conceptualized as masculine versus feminine. (FE)
ADJECTIVE CHECKLIST

The 23 scales of the ACL are:

1. Number checked - Total number of adjectives checked. Checking many adjectives appears to reflect surgency and drive and a relative absence of repressive tendencies.

2. Defensiveness - measures a bipolar dimension of test taking response which is interpretable at either extreme. Therefore, if standard scores on DF falls above 70 or below 30 an interpretation of dissimulation may be necessary. (DF)

3. Favorable - Number of favorable adjectives checked a self-description scale. Although the social desirability component is present on this scale it is not seen as a facade or an artifact but sincere concern with behaving appropriately and with doing one's duty. (FV)

4. Unfavorable - Number of unfavorable adjectives checked. From working individually with subjects who scored high on this scale the authors conclude the checking of unfavorable adjectives reflects a kind of impulsive lack of control over the hostile and unattractive aspects of one's personality rather than a sense of humility and self-effacement. (UF)

5. Self confidence - This corresponds to the "poise and self-assurance" cluster of scales on the CPI. (SF)

6. Self-control - The self-control scale was developed empirically and is intended to parallel the responsibility-socialization cluster of scales on the CPI. (SN)
7. Lability - The scale was based on item analyses of subjects rated higher on characteristics indicating flexibility, need for change, individuality, etc. (LB)

8. Personal adjustment - Subjects rated high and low on personal adjustment and personal soundness were the validating group for the scale. The scale is seen as depicting an attitudinal set toward life rather than the present or of problems and concern. (PR)

9. Achievement - To strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance. (AC)

10. Dominance - To seek and sustain leadership roles in groups or to be influential and controlling in individual relationships. (DO)

11. Endurance - To persist in any task undertaken. (EN)

12. Order - To place special emphasis on neatness, organization, and planning in one's activities. (OR)

13. Intraception - To engage in attempts to understand one's own behavior or the behavior of others. (IN)

14. Nurtance - To engage in behaviors which extend material or emotional benefits to others. (NU)

15. Affiliation - To seek and sustain numerous personal friendships. (AF)

16. Hererosexuality - To seek the company of and derive emotional satisfactions from interactions with opposite-sexed peers. (HE)

17. Exhibition - To behave in such a way as to elicit the immediate attention of others. (EX)
18. Autonomy - To act independently of others or of social values and expectations. (AU)

19. Aggression - To engage in behaviors which attack or hurt others. (AG)

20. Change - To seek novelty of experience and avoid routine. (CH)

21. Succorance - To solicit sympathy, affection or emotional support from others. (SU)

22. Abasement - To express feelings of inferiority through self-criticism, guide or social impulse. (AB)

23. Deference - To seek and sustain subordinate roles in relationships with others. (DE)
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AN INVESTIGATION OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF
NEGROES ATTENDING A PREDOMINATELY WHITE
UNIVERSITY AND NEGROES ATTENDING A
BLACK COLLEGE

The California Psychological Inventory and the Adjective Checklist were administered to: black students at the sophomore level and above attending a predominately white university, a random sample of black students attending a predominately black college, a random sample of white students attending the predominately white university and the white students attending the predominately black college. Results of statistical analyses showed the black students at the white university to differ significantly from the black students attending the predominately black college on 13 of the 18 scales on the California Psychological Inventory. However, the black and white students at the university differed significantly on only 4 scales. When the results were analyzed for sex differences, the black and white females and males at the predominately white university scored more alike than did the two black populations. The Adjective checklist results bore the same pattern of results as did the California Psychological Inventory although it did not appear to be as sensitive in picking up significant sex differences. Thus, it was concluded that the negroes attending
a predominately white university score more like the white students attending the white university than like the negroes attending a predominately black college.

The standard scores of the two negro populations were combined and factor analyzed. The factors extracted differed from those extracted in previous studies. Other researchers obtained fairly consistent results across studies and found the same scales loading high on the same factors. The findings of this factor analysis tend to support the hypothesis that there may be a significantly different underlying personality structure for negroes as a group. As there are few personality studies on negroes using objective personality assessment measures, the directions for research points out the necessity for gathering a baseline of data on negro populations.