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Compared five aspects of generalized expectations (internality, powerful others external control orientation, chance control orientation, hopelessness, and machiavellianism) of alcoholics and nonalcoholics. Ss tested were 56 nonalcoholics and 50 alcoholics just starting a treatment (middle socioeconomic class). Data analysis was done by a multivariate analysis of variance. The two samples differed in their generalized expectations. Alcoholics were, on the average, more external in powerful others control orientations, more external in chance control orientations, more hopeless, and more machiavellianistic than the nonalcoholics. The results support the findings of alcoholics' relative externality in locus of control of reinforcement and refer to the relevance of generalized expectations for the treatment of alcoholism.

Findings that concern the relationship of locus of control of reinforcement and alcoholism are contradictory. Some authors found that alcoholics are more internal (e.g., Costello & Manders, 1974; Gozali & Sloan, 1971), which is explained by the thesis that alcoholics control the most powerful reinforcer of their life; other authors (e.g., Butts & Chotlos, 1973; Nowicki & Hopper, 1974) found that alcoholics are more external than nonalcoholics, which is explained by their loss of internal control about important social reinforcers. In these studies one-dimensional questionnaires of locus of control and no other instrumentality variables were used. Here a three-dimensional approach to locus of control (cf. Levenson, 1973) and two other variables, which are also generalized expectancies, are considered. The theoretical common possession of the constructs of locus of control of reinforcement, hopelessness, and machiavellianism is their relationship, as generalized instrumental expectancies to value-expectancy theories like the social learning theory or the instrumentality-theoretical approaches.

METHOD

Subjects and Procedure

Ss tested were 56 nonalcoholic and 50 alcoholic adults (middle socioeconomic class). The alcoholics were tested at the beginning of a treatment; average time of alcohol-abuse was 8 years. The average age of the alcoholic sample was \( \bar{X} = 39.1 \) years (SD = 11.21; 16 female and 34 male alcoholics); those of the nonalcoholic was \( \bar{X} = 36.2 \) years (SD = 15.35; 16 women and 40 men).

Locus of control was measured by the IPC-Scales from Levenson (1973), who distinguishes between internality, control by powerful others, and control by chance forces. Hopelessness was measured by the H-Scale from Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler (1974), machiavellianism was measured by a short form MACH-Scale (Christie & Geis, 1970). These questionnaires were translated into the German language and pretested for their intelligibility and psychometric characteristics. Sex differences in the five variables were not significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed. Table 1 shows the results, means, and standard deviations of the two samples. The MANOVA
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OVA F-score for overall discrimination is significant; the two samples differ in their generalized expectations. As one can see from the univariate F-scores in Table 1, alcoholics have on the average higher scores in both scales for external

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Alcoholics</th>
<th>Nonalcoholics</th>
<th>Between</th>
<th>Within</th>
<th>$F_{1,44}$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal control orientations</td>
<td>35.32</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>36.55</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful-others external orientations</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>351.64</td>
<td>28.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External chance-control orientations</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>785.21</td>
<td>37.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>414.38</td>
<td>28.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopefulness</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>211.13</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANOVA F for equality of dispersions $F = 1.191$ (ns; $df_r = 15$; $df_i = 42335$)
MANOVA F for overall discrimination $F = 5.94^{**}$ (df$_r = 5$; df$_i = 100$)
Wilks Lambda $= .77$; $\eta^2 = .23$.

* $p < .01$.
** $p < .001$.

locus of control: They are more external in powerful others control orientations and in chance control orientations than the nonalcoholics. In the I-scale no significant differences were found (cf. Levenson, 1973). Furthermore, the mean differences in the MACH- and the H-Scale are significant, i.e., alcoholics are more hopeless concerning their own person and their personal future, and they are more machiavellianistic than the nonalcoholics.

Accordingly, alcoholics have different generalized expectancies in external control expectations for reinforcement, in negative expectations about the future, and in expectations concerning interpersonal behavior. This is a proof of the relevance of generalized expectations or instrumental beliefs for the development, explanation and treatment of alcoholism. The contradictory findings in the relationship of locus of control and alcoholism can here in fact not be broken up (cf. Rotter, 1975), but the finding of alcoholics’ relative externality is supported by their relative strong hopelessness and machiavellianism.
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