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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, a growing concern has erupted over juvenile delinquency. Despite the increasing awareness in this social issue, our understanding of juvenile delinquency is limited. It has been recognized that the term juvenile delinquency is too all encompassing to be of research benefit in and of itself; yet, students classified as such seem to reveal a common experience with failure. The extensiveness of educational failure is beginning to be recognized as having direct effects on the child’s overall experience of success or failure in a variety of learning situations (Beck, 1971; Phares, 1973; Thomas, 1979). In this paper, an attempt is made to cultivate a theoretical approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency as related to the school environment.

Several propositions have been noted in order to explore the possibility that educational failure is directly related to delinquent youth. The first suggests juvenile delinquency is partly caused by adverse school experiences. Second, those adverse school experiences: academic failure, misbehavior, and psychological or physical withdrawal, are partly caused by forces inherent in the structure and practice of the school itself. And,
third, school experience may generate and maintain delinquency (Polk & Schafer, 1972). The line of thought explaining juvenile delinquency in part as spawned by occurrences within and of the school experience itself may be unified under the concept of learned helplessness.

**Learned Helplessness**

The most prominent researcher and theorist in this area has been Martin E. Seligman. He has written extensively on the nature, etiology, and significance of the learned helplessness phenomenon (Seligman, 1973; 1974; 1975). Seligman (1975) suggested that learned helplessness consists of three interrelated areas: (a) motivational, (b) cognitive, and (c) emotional. Seligman hypothesized that learned helplessness "(1) reduces the motivation to control the outcome; (2) interferes with learning that responding controls the outcome; and (3) produces fear for as long as the subject is uncertain of the uncontrollability of the outcome," (Seligman, 1975, p.56).

Seligman and Maier (1967) and Overmier and Seligman (1967) used the term learned helplessness to describe an interference with escape-avoidance behavior produced in dogs by prior inescapable shock. Much research has been generated since these early studies. Although the early work investigating the parameters of the learned helplessness phenomenon used animals as subjects (Miller and Norman, 1979), the more recent body of knowledge regarding the
Learned helplessness theory has been investigated using human subjects (Chapin and Dyck, 1976; Hiroto and Seligman, 1975; Thorton and Jacobs, 1971).

Learned helplessness is the perception that one cannot control the outcomes that he or she experiences (Weisz, 1979). Control is understood in terms of the degree to which one's actions change or effect a desired outcome. When an individual's actions do not alter a situation, there appears to be no connection between outcome and action. The person perceives events as happening despite his/her efforts and beyond control such that he/she eventually ceases those efforts (Thomas, 1979). Persistence at a task drops sharply, while emotional accompaniments such as passivity and anxiety may also be observed (Klein & Seligman, 1976; Roth & Bootzin, 1974; Thorton and Jacobs, 1971). The person's perception is associated with attributions of failure to stable, uncontrollable factors, like lack of ability, and is accompanied by deterioration in performance following failure (Dweck, 1975; Dweck & Repucci, 1973).

At the center of the learned helplessness concept is the conclusion that it is not the loss of rewards as such, but the loss of control over the situation that produces those rewards, which causes the passivity and decrease in persistence. In addition, it may be that over the course of development, individuals come to differ from one another.
in their inclinations to manifest learned helplessness. Thus, an important consideration is how individuals interpret their current situation in order to account for future events.

As implied in the previous statement, human information processing seems to play a key role in the learned helplessness theory. Consequently, current research within the learned helplessness model has attempted to look at the contribution of individual cognition to the development of helplessness. Through this process a basic learned helplessness paradigm has evolved. Inherent in this design is the association of attribution and expectancy as two cognitive variables within the learned helplessness theory. To explore the issue of learned helplessness further, a brief discussion of the basic paradigm used in this type of research is needed.

In most studies, subjects receive a training phase: subjects are exposed to a training task in which they receive (a) contingent (response-dependent) reinforcement, (b) noncontingent (response-independent) reinforcement, or (c) no treatment (control). After this training phase, the performance of the three groups is compared on a task, in which reinforcement is contingent for all groups. Learned helplessness occurs when subjects receiving noncontingent reinforcement in the training phase show deficits in the test phase relative to the contingent
control groups. Thus, learned helplessness refers to behavioral deficits produced by exposure to noncontingent outcomes (Miller & Norman, 1979).

Juvenile Delinquency

One group that might be particularly susceptible to helplessness is juvenile delinquents. There are several reasons for this possibility. What appears to be happening today is that the education experience serves as an achievement-based mechanism (Polk & Schafer, 1972) that exerts a mediating and, at times, independent effect between the student's academic and social functioning. Consequently, educational failure poses a "double-edged sword" (Polk & Schafer, 1972), targeting failure at the academic, as well as the social or activity realm of the student's life.

Emphasis on the lack of academic skills as a fore-runner to delinquency has been noted by several researchers (Hirschi, 1969; Polk & Schafer, 1972; Rubel, 1977). Failing to receive high grades, to be promoted from one grade to the next, or to receive informal rewards for achievement may indicate to students that they are not succeeding in reaching a goal. Most youth are exposed to and internalize goals for educational attainment (and later of financial and occupational success) (Cohen, 1955; Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). However, some students fail to achieve the
acquired goals of education and perceive little likelihood of achieving later occupational rewards. Hence, when internal controls are sufficiently weak, some of these students reject or rebel against legitimate patterns of conduct. The youngster appears to have the perception of being unable to control the outcomes he or she experiences. Thus, a characteristic of learned helplessness may be observed.

Dweck et al., (1978) have linked helplessness to patterns of teacher-to-child feedback. This work reveals that a relatively high proportion of critical comments regarding the intellectual quality (as opposed to factors such as messiness) leads the child to interpret negative feedback generally as indicative of low ability, a stable, uncontrollable factor. An example by Liddle (1964) more clearly illustrates this notion. He speaks of a noisy classroom in which he spotted a child who was smaller and more poorly dressed than most of his classmates. The child slouched in his seat and teased several of his peers before class began. The instructor started class in a harsh voice, "Joe, if you're too sick to sit up, go see the nurse."

Then, he continued to the entire class, "You did pretty well on yesterday's test; you should have, you've had it three times now. I want them (the papers) back. I need them as ammunition when your parents come in to find out why their little darling got a "C" on the report card."
(Liddle, 1964). A relatively well-adjusted child can probably take this behavior for a portion of the day without much damage. However, a child who has already known frequent failure in academic work would probably not be so fortunate.

Perceptions

There are still other, less obvious, implications for inferring school delinquents as children susceptible to learned helplessness. The passivity and anxiety that are often observed with learned helplessness, may also be promoted in the school experience. Education is something done to young people, not necessarily with them. Thus, the student role is passive, not active. Among the consequences that stem from the passively defined student role emerges the expectations established within the school. This includes everything from the "seen, but not heard" expectation about children to teacher judgments that yield particular students as "smart", "dumb", "nice", and, of course, "troublesome". Teachers expect the child to exhibit certain behaviors, so it happens (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). Hence, the self-fulfilling prophecy comes into play as children then perceive themselves according to their perception of the teacher's feelings toward them. Again, where such attributes are constituted, helplessness inducing patterns develop.
Fitting into this conception of identification that these youth have of themselves, Vinter and Sarri (1965) found that they were accurately perceiving themselves as "not doing well in school." This conclusion is indicative of the previously mentioned double-edged sword. These students are subjected to a pattern of punishments, including a denial of a wide variety of privileges and opportunities within the school, loss of esteem among classmates, being chosen, but seldom, for minor but prestigious classroom assignments and exclusion from participation in certain extracurricular activities. The integration of all these factors creates the perception that reinforcement is independent of their actions. They feel helpless in controlling consequences of an academic setting.

Individual Differences

Although Seligman has not included any individual differences variables in his theory of learned helplessness, research has indicated that this aspect warrants further explanation. Several studies (Dweck et al., 1978; Dweck & Bush, 1976; Dweck & Repucci, 1973) have pointed out possible effects of sex differences. In fact, Dweck et al. (1978) have demonstrated that the pattern of evaluative feedback given results directly in girls greater tendency to view failure feedback as indicative of their level of ability than do boys.
As revealed by Dweck et al. (1978), it appears as though teachers are generally more critical of boys. Thus, boys can more easily attribute failure feedback to the attitude of the teacher. Teachers used negative evaluations in a more diffuse fashion for boys than for girls: 45% of the negative evaluation boys received for their work was unrelated to its intellectual quality and was based instead on failure to comply with rules of conformity. Thus, boys may view failure feedback as irrelevant to the intellectual quality of performance. In addition, teachers attribute boys’ failures to lack of motivation more often than they did for girls. Therefore, when boys do view negative feedback as contingent on the quality of their work, they can blame their effort. In contrast, teachers were generally positive in the assessment of girls. They tended to use negative feedback in a highly specific manner for girls’ intellectual failures and did not emphasize motivation as a determinant of girls’ failures. These factors appear to promote attribution of failure feedback to lack of ability (Dweck et al., 1978).

Additionally, literature has shown (Dweck et al., 1978) failure feedback from adults resulted in impaired performance for girls, but improved for boys. Also, children’s attribution of failure varied with the sex of the examiner. Again, girls attributed performance to ability with adult evaluators and boys attributed failure to
amount of effort.

Thus, the use of negative evaluation in the classroom proved to be a powerful determinant of how children interpret negative feedback. Children receiving failure feedback that referred exclusively to the intellectual adequacy of their performance (like the girls in the classroom) were far more likely to regard subsequent failure feedback as indicative of their ability than were children receiving solution relevant and solution irrelevant feedback (like boys in the classroom). Students in the latter condition more frequently attributed negative feedback to effort.

As a result of these findings, the present study used a single sex sample. Males, rather than females, were selected as males are generally less likely to exhibit learned helplessness than females. Since the researcher was attempting to compare the phenomenon of learned helplessness between the two groups it was thought that the findings of the study would have greater value if the difference between the groups was found using males as subjects.

To control further for the effect of sex differences, a male examiner was used for each group. Once again, note that the likelihood of boys' attributes of performance deficits to ability are lessened with the use of adult male evaluators. Thus, the present study tightly controls for
the sex difference found to be associated with learned helplessness and classroom feedback.
Definition of Terms

Attribution to failure: causal categories from which the student may choose a response that most closely resembles his feelings about a failure situation:
(a) effort - did not try hard enough
(b) agent - an outside individual, in this case, the examiner
(c) ability - can not do the task very well

Juvenile delinquent: any school age youth who has committed a violation of the law and has been subjected to legal action.

Learned helplessness indicators: measures on which the boys:
(a) receive a score of 10 or above on the Perceived Influence Questionnaire
(b) mark "C" (lack of ability) on the Attribution questions
(c) receive a rating of 36 or below on the Teachers' Helplessness Questionnaire

Solution irrelevant feedback: failure feedback related to the nonintellectual aspect of performance:
(a) "You didn't do that very well, you were taking too long."
(b) "You didn't do very well, it wasn't neat enough."

**Solution relevant feedback**: failure feedback related to the correctness of the solution:
(a) "Your answer wasn't the same as the correct one."
(b) "That didn't make a word."
(c) "You didn't spell that right."
(d) "That wasn't quite right."
Objectives

Thus far, research has pointed out that learned helplessness is a factor in depression (Beck, 1974; Calhoun, Cheney, & Dawes, 1974; Miller and Seligman, 1975, 1976), mental retardation (Weisz, 1979), and attribution of failure to personal incompetence (Dweck, 1975; Dweck & Repucci, 1973; Klein et al., 1976; Tennen & Eller, 1977). However, there has been no research to date exploring learned helplessness and academic failure among juvenile delinquents. Therefore, the present study investigates learned helplessness in delinquent youth within an academic setting. This study will focus on how juvenile delinquents view evaluative feedback on academic tasks, and as a result, whether this feedback promotes the tendency toward learned helplessness. An additional concern is whether teacher perceptions are congruent with subject perceptions of themselves.
HYPOTHESES (Conceptual)

$H_{c1}$: Juvenile delinquents are more likely to exhibit learned helplessness in an academic setting than public school boys in an academic setting.

$H_{c2}$: Students who receive failure feedback based only on the correctness of their response are more likely to have learned helplessness than students receiving a mixture of failure feedback.

$H_{c3}$: Youth who receive failure feedback both directly and indirectly related to the correctness of their responses are more likely to attribute failure to their degree of effort or to another individual than those students who receive failure feedback relating to the correctness of their responses.

$H_{c4}$: Students designated as showing learned helplessness by their teachers are more likely than those students not identified as such to see themselves as helpless.

$H_{c5}$: Students’ perception for their attribution for failure will be congruent with their responses toward failure on learned helplessness tasks.
CHAPTER II  
METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were twenty-eight males: fourteen were students from a local public junior high school in Columbus, Ohio, and fourteen were juvenile delinquent students from the Ohio Youth Commission. The subjects were selected on the basis of age (twelve to seventeen years old) and intelligence level (within the average range, an IQ of 85 to 115). The average range of intellectual ability was determined from scores achieved on previously administered individual intelligence tests (Stanford-Binet, 1972; Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, 1955; Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised, 1974) and achievement data (California Achievement Tests; Mathematics, 1970; Gates-MacGinitie, 1972; Iowa Test of Basic Skills, 1975; KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, 1976, Spache, 1972).

The demographic data collected on these subjects has been analyzed in order to get a better understanding of the composition of the sample. The mean age of the boys in each group as well as their respective reading achievement grade level may be found in Table 1.

Learned Helplessness Measures

Perceived Influence Questionnaire: A Questionnaire that allowed the student to indicate his attribution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>AGE (Years)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reading Achievement</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Delinquent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All students fell within the average range of intellectual ability.
for failure (Diener and Dweck, 1978; Weisz, 1979). The questionnaire consists of twenty items in which the subject may respond with one of two choices (see Appendix A).

Teachers' Helplessness Questionnaire: The Questionnaire (compiled and utilized by Weisz, 1979) consists of ten items presented in pairs of balanced alternatives so that a helpless behavior was pitted against a confident or response initiating behavior. The teachers were asked to respond to each statement with one of seven Likert-type choices: one, most indicative of learned helplessness, and seven, least indicative of learned helplessness (see Appendix B).

Attribution Measure: Upon completion of each of the puzzle tasks, a question was given to each subject in order to determine his feelings about the previous task. The attribution question read as follows: "If the man told you that you did not do very well on this puzzle, why do you think that was?" The attribution choices were as follows: (a) I did not try hard enough, (b) The man was too fussy, (c) I am not very good at it. This attribution measure replicated the one found in Dweck et al., (1978).

Hypotheses (Operational)

H0: Juvenile delinquent boys are more likely than public school boys to score 10 or above on the perceived
Influence Questionnaire and mark "C" (lack of ability) on the Attribution Questions.

Hop₂ Boys receiving solution relevant feedback during the "word puzzle" task are more likely to mark "C" (lack of ability) on the Attribution Questions than those boys receiving a mixture of solution irrelevant and solution relevant feedback during the same "word puzzle" task.

Hop₃ Boys receiving both solution relevant and solution irrelevant feedback during the "word puzzle" task are more likely to mark "A" (effort) or "B" (agent) on the Attribution Questions than those boys receiving only solution relevant feedback during the same "word puzzle" task.

Hop₄ Boys receiving a rating of 36 or below on the Teachers' Helplessness Questionnaire are more likely than those receiving a higher rating to mark "C" (lack of ability) in response to the Attribution Question following the two puzzle tasks.

Hop₅ The subject's score on the Perceived Influence Questionnaire will correspond with their choice, either "A" (effort), "B" (agent), or "C" (ability), on the Attribution Question following a contrived failure situation.
Procedure: Prior to the testing situation, all students were asked to complete the Perceived Influence Questionnaire. In each case, the examiner read the questions and responses aloud, and the subject was instructed to choose the response that told how he felt. The public school boys were given the questionnaire individually before the testing session. The boys from the Ohio Youth Commission were administered the questionnaire at least one week prior to the testing session.

Male examiners were used throughout this study because past research (Dweck & Bush, 1976) has shown less pronounced sex differences in response to failure feedback from males than from female adults.

The methodology in the next section followed the technique used by Dweck et al. (1978). Students were asked individually to accompany the examiner to the testing room. The subject was seated at a table across from the experimenter and was told that the experimenter was interested in how adolescents solve puzzles. The student was given instructions for a "word puzzle" that consisted of twenty-four letter anagrams. The experimenter presented a stack of four two inch laminated cardboard squares, each with a single letter printed on it. The student was instructed to rearrange the letters so that they formed a word and then to print the word on paper beside them. The level of difficulty for these words was at or below the sixth grade.
according to the Science Research Associates standards (Naslund, Thorpe & Levevre, 1975). The boys were told that if they did not complete a word in the allotted thirty seconds, the experimenter would say "Stop." They were then to print the letters on the paper in whatever order they were at the time. Subjects were given an initial practice trial on which everyone succeeded. The twenty experimental trials consisted of ten solvable (e.g. DLUO) and ten insolvable (e.g. ANZN) anagrams presented in random order except for the constraint that neither the first nor the last trial be a failure trial. For the ten success trials, students were permitted to complete the anagram even if they exceeded the time limit (with a maximum time limit of two minutes).

The experimental conditions differ with respect to the stated contingencies of the failure feedback. Those youth in the first condition (I) received failure feedback related to both the correctness of the solution ("You didn't do very well that time - you didn't get the word right.") and to the nonintellectual aspect of performance ("You didn't do very well that time - it wasn't neat enough.").) Negative feedback was administered on ten of the trials, half of which feedback was solution relevant and half was solution irrelevant. This apportionment of criticism for intellectual and nonintellectual aspects of performance reflects roughly the relative occurrence of these two types of work-related criticism observed in the classroom for boys.
(Dweck et al., 1978). All of the solution relevant feedback were administered on failure trials (which were randomly selected from the ten). Two of the five solution irrelevant criticisms were given on success trials (also randomly selected from the ten). This reflects classroom usage (Dweck et al., 1978).

In the second condition (II), the students received failure feedback specifically addressed to the correctness of the solution. Thus, negative feedback was given for the ten insoluble trials.

Following the last trial of the anagram task, an attribution measure was taken. The student was handed a large envelope filled with questions. He was told to pick one and mark the answer that "tells how you feel." The subject was told that when he had finished, he should put the question into another envelope (A) near him. Meanwhile the experimenter set up the next task or waited across the room. This was done in order to encourage subjects to give truthful responses rather than socially desirable ones.

Upon completion of the attribution measure, subjects were introduced to the "matching puzzle," a digit-letter substitution task. The student was presented with a practice box of problems, eight numbered boxes and a chart listing ten letters, with a digit below each letter. The subject was then told that each box contained twenty papers like the one he was shown, which had a blank square marked out with a letter above the square. The student was
instructed to take the papers from the box, one at a time and fill in the square with the appropriate number according to the chart. The subject was asked to place each completed paper on the box top for the experimenter to see if the number was correct. A practice trial was done. For the actual trials, students were told that they had a one-minute time limit and urged to hurry.

On the first three boxes of problems, all children were stopped after they had completed fifteen of the twenty problems. They were told after each trial that they had not done very well, since they had not finished on time. Thus, the feedback referred specifically to the adequacy of their performance relative to the defined time criterion. Following the feedback on the third box, the attribution measure was taken again. The student was told, "On the bottom of the pile you'll find an envelope with a question in it. Answer the question by putting a mark next to the choice that tells how you feel. When you finish, put the question into the big envelope (B) with the envelopes from the other students." The experimenter again waited across the room.

All subjects were allowed to succeed to Trials four and five of the task and were given positive feedback, such as "Great, you did them all! That was super, you were really quick this time. You did really well. In fact, since you got the last two boxes, there's no need to do these three." When the experimenter was certain that the
student viewed his performance as commendable, he allowed the student to go back to his classroom. The boys were requested not to discuss the experiment with their classmates until all the boys had had their turn.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

H0p1: Juvenile delinquent boys are more likely than public school boys to score 10 or above on the Perceived Influence Questionnaire and mark "C" (lack of ability) on the Attribution Questions.

To assess the likelihood that juvenile delinquents are more likely to view failure feedback as indicative of lack of ability than public school boys, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was calculated with the attribution question and student questionnaire scores included as dependent measures. According to Wilks’ criterion, no significant effect was found: F (2,25) = ρ < .94 ρ < .40 and F (2,25) = .42 ρ < .66 (attribution questions (A) and (B) respectively). Table 2 and 3 summarize these results.

Task and Attribution to Failure

H0p2: Boys receiving solution relevant feedback during the "word puzzle" task are more likely to mark "C" (lack of ability) on the Attribution Questions than those boys receiving a mixture of solution relevant feedback during the same "word puzzle" task.
## TABLE 2

MANOVA for differences between juvenile delinquent and public school boys as reflected by the Perceived Influence Questionnaire and Attribution Question "A"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ρ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSQ*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>152.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIBUTION &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TSQ. Total score for the Perceived Influence Questionnaire.
Hop3: Boys receiving both solution relevant and
solution irrelevant feedback during the "word puzzle" task
are more likely to mark "A" (effort) or "B" (agent) on the
Attribution Questions than those boys receiving only solu-
tion relevant feedback during the same "word puzzle" task.

Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 present the percentage of boys
in each condition who attributed failure feedback on the
dependent task to each of three causal categories - ability,
effort or the agent.

Chi-square analyses on the proportion of boys in each
condition attributing failure feedback to lack of ability
revealed no significant difference between subjects in
their attribution choices, \( x^2(1) = 2.29, \rho < .13 \) and
\( x^2(1) = 1.35, \rho < .25 \) (Attribution questions (A) and (B)
respectively).

Similarly, the chi-square analyses on the proportion
of boys in each condition attributing failure feedback to
their effort or to the examiner revealed no significant
difference between subjects in their attribution choices
(A and B respectively): \( x^2(1) = 2.29, \rho < .13 \) and \( x^2(1) =
1.3, \rho < .25 \).

Teacher's Helplessness Questionnaire and Attribution to
Failure

Hop4: Boys receiving a rating of 36 or below on the
Teacher's Helplessness Questionnaire are more likely than
those receiving a higher rating to mark "C" (lack of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Condition*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent or</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Top Number: frequency  
Bottom Number: percent
### Table 5

Chi-square analysis for differences in solution relevant feedback and attribution to ability (Attribution Question "B")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Condition*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent or</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Top Number: frequency
Bottom Number: percent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Condition*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent or Effort</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Top Number: frequency
  Bottom Number: percent
TABLE 7
Chi-Square analysis for differences in mixed-relevant feedback and attribution to effort or agent (Attribution Question "B")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Condition*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpless:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent or</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Top Number: frequency
Bottom Number: percent
ability) in response to the Attribution Question following the two puzzle tasks.

Using a one way analysis of variance (2 x 2), the results indicated no difference between boys receiving a learned helplessness rating by their teacher and their attribution to failure according to their response on the Attribution Questions (Attribution (A) and (B) respectively): $F(1,23) = 1.12$, $p < .30$ and $F(1,23) = .48$, $p < .49$. Tables 8 and 9 illustrate these findings.

**Perceived Influence Questionnaire and Attribution to Failure**

Hyp3: The subjects' score on the Perceived Influence Questionnaire will correspond with their choice, either "A" (effort), "B" (agent), or "C" (ability), on the Attribution Question following a contrived failure situation.

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that students' scores on the Perceived Influence Questionnaire were not necessarily indicative of their responses on the Attribution Question, (A) and (B) respectively: $F(1,26) = 2.90$, $p < .10$ and $F(1,26) = 0.00$, $p < .99$. Tables 10 and 11 summarize these results.
TABLE 8
ANOVA for differences in Teacher Helplessness ratings and attribution to failure (Attribution "A")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \rho )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
ANOVA for differences in Teacher Helplessness ratings and attribution to failure (Attribution "B")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( \rho )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 10
ANOVA for differences in Perceived Influence Questionnaire and attribution to failure (Attribution "A")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>141.21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156.96</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 11
ANOVA for differences in Perceived Influence Questionnaire and attribution to failure (Attribution "B")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>156.96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156.96</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The learned helplessness theory provides a unified theoretical framework to account for the effects of experience with uncontrolability. Utilizing a theoretical approach, this study investigated the problem of juvenile delinquency as related to the school environment. The line of thought explaining juvenile delinquency, in part, as indicated by occurrences within and of the school experiences itself has been unified under the concept of learned helplessness. In order to thoroughly explore the possibility of learned helplessness in the juvenile delinquent population, it was necessary to take a look at the theoretical concept of learned helplessness.

Reviewing the literature in this area highlighted the need for careful consideration of both the original stance of the learned helplessness theory as well as more recent revisions. Hence, this investigation integrated the major hypotheses of Seligman's learned helplessness theory with the revised formulation (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Miller & Norman, 1979) as an attempt was made to illustrate that juvenile delinquent boys are more likely to exhibit learned helplessness than public school boys.
Noting this combination, several facts should be kept in mind about the importance of this study. Although this study is a preliminary investigation of learned helplessness in juvenile delinquents, it is also one of the first studies to heed the inadequacies of Seligman’s original theory. Consequently the research should be evaluated in light of the theoretical implications for learned helplessness and in addition for the basic hypotheses about juvenile delinquency. Hence, it is possible that no significant differences were found in this study because the basic paradigm established to indicate learned helplessness is not an appropriate measure in humans. More research is required to substantiate and expound upon these results.

The following discussion will review critical issues raised regarding the learned helplessness hypothesis: cognitive and motivational deficits; etiology; individual differences; the attribution theory model and generalization.

Cognitive and Motivational Deficits

In an attempt to operationalize Seligman’s proposed cognitive and motivational deficits, with few exceptions, studies have used a test task requiring the development and use of cognitive problem-solving strategies (Miller & Norman, 1979). Following suit, this study does the same. Anagrams and a matching puzzle task were used respectively for the training and test phases in the experimental
procedure. Most research has defined the cognitive and motivational criteria in terms of response-speed or with evidence suggesting that expectancy change in task is a function of response-outcome contingency. The literature pertaining to the performance changes produced by exposure to such strategies supports the conceptualization of learned helplessness as a performance deficit in cognitive problem solving tasks. However, the available evidence does not allow a distinction between cognitive and motivational explanations for this deficit. Hence, Miller and Norman (1979) suggest that performance deficits defined as learned helplessness may have a cognitive or motivational basis, or they may result from the impairment of both processes.

In light of this proposition, it has been suggested that the deficits resulting from learned helplessness be separated into affective and performance components rather than into affective, motivational and cognitive aspects (Miller & Norman, 1979). Additionally, it has been suggested that expectancy changes following success and failure are not due to perceived response-outcome contingency, but are due to the perceived stability of attributions of performance.

The current study took Miller and Norman's (1979) criticisms under consideration and used the Attribution questions to account for the performance of the subjects. Because significant results were not obtained, the cause
of performance deficit, whether it be cognitive, motivational or attributional, is still unclear.

**Etiology**

Seligman (1973, 1974, 1975) has postulated that the major causal factor in the development of learned helplessness is the organism's belief or expectancy that its responses will not influence the future probability of environmental outcomes (expectancy or response-outcome independence). In the learned helplessness paradigm, it is only when the organism forms the expectancy that its response will not be effective that learned helplessness is predicted to occur. Seligman has also mentioned three variables that may limit the acquisition of learned helplessness: (a) previous response-outcome expectancy, (b) the relative importance of the situation and (c) discrimination between situations (Miller & Norman, 1979). These variables have not been discussed in any detail by Seligman, nor have they been integrated into his general theoretical framework. The present study, however, has taken these factors into consideration as follows:

**Previous response-outcome expectancy:**

When an individual's actions do not alter a situation, there appears to be no connection between outcome and action. The person perceives events as happening despite his/her efforts and beyond control such that he/she eventually
ceases those efforts (Thomas, 1979). Hence, learned helplessness is the perception that one cannot control the outcomes that one or she experiences (Weisz, 1979).

As emphasized in Chapter I, juvenile delinquent youth appear to be one group that may be particularly susceptible to helplessness. Their frequent exposure to failure (Dweck et al., 1978; Folk & Schafer, 1972; Rubel, 1977) in both educational achievement and classroom feedback lead to especially supportive evidence of the learned helplessness theory. Given this history of failure, it was thought that these students would have the perception of being unable to control outcome experiences. Consequently, juvenile delinquents were expected to have a greater tendency toward learned helplessness than public school students, and thus were selected for this study.

Relative importance of the situation:

The subjective value the person assigns to the task may affect his/her behavior toward the situation. Two studies noted by Miller and Norman (1979) are illustrative of this point. It was found that subjects exposed to contingent, yoked-noncontingent, and randomly reinforced groups attributed no differences between unimportant groups, but significant differences between all important groups. Thus, these studies have indicated that the perceived importance of the experimental task is a potent factor in the development of learned helplessness.
This being the case, it is possible that the subjects in the present study did not consider the tasks as highly important to them, and, as a result, did not view the task as reflective of their ability, or in this experiment, lack of ability. This outlook may have affected the outcome of this study as, like the results of the Roth and Rubal (1975) and Miller and Gold (1979) studies mentioned earlier (in Miller & Norman, 1979), no differences between the groups of juvenile delinquent and public school boys were found.

**Discrimination between situations:**

As the subtitle implies, this section is concerned with those elements the subject may perceive in his/her environment, besides conditions established in the experiment, that may influence his/her response to the situation. Inherent in this investigation are several such important factors: (a) academic structure, (b) group versus individual instruction, and (c) affect.

Overlapping an earlier discussion of the juvenile delinquent in the school setting, it has been illustrated that juvenile delinquents have encountered more failure experiences in the regular classroom than nondelinquent youth; a factor contributing to the development of learned helplessness. However, a group of juvenile delinquent students with which this experiment dealt had since been transferred from their public day school placement to a residential reform school, where no individual is singled
out as the "dumb" or "troublesome" student. Instead, the students are given more attention and more experience with success. In essence, the instructors in this setting are reversing the continual failure pattern the youth had come to expect. This procedure may be "undoing" the hypothesized learned helplessness effect. Though the juvenile delinquent students may have felt helpless previously, the current exposure to this academic environment may be altering this phenomenon.

A second factor to consider in discriminating between situations is that of the customary group classroom instructional setting versus the individualized instructional setting of the experiment. The subject's performance in a group situation may differ from his performance in a one-to-one situation. The juvenile delinquent student may be easily ignored or receive mainly failure feedback in a group arrangement, whereas, in most individualized situations, such treatment does not occur as frequently. Yet, this is not the case in this study as the conditions were established so that the subject would be receiving failure feedback or no feedback at all. However, what may account for some variance in the results is the effect of the examiner's immediate presence as the subject responds. Since the student is likely to be most at ease without an
"instructor" beside him/her as he/she responds in the classroom, the individualized situation may lead the change in response behavior.

As the examiners worked with the groups of students, an interesting observation was made. Each group of boys, public school and juvenile delinquent, seemed to hold a different attitude toward the tasks. The public school boys became frustrated, verbally and nonverbally showing their displeasure: "Boy, I should have been able to get that one." "Is this one right?" "Not another one of these," or, the examiner noted that the boys grew increasingly fidgety, tapping the table top, shaking a foot or leg, and sighing as they attempted to solve the "insolvable" anagrams. On the other hand, juvenile delinquent boys appeared to be indifferent about the entire situation, shrugging their shoulders, an occasional "Oh well," or "what the heck". At the present, the reason for this apparent indifference in reaction may be only speculative. However, it seems likely that the juvenile delinquents' past experience with failure and the perception of not being in control of their outcome may be a determinant of this type of behavior.

**Individual Differences**

Due to research revealing sex differences in learned helplessness with regard to classroom feedback (Dweck et
al., 1978) discussed in detail in Chapter I, (pages 8-11), it is important to recall that gender was tightly controlled in this study. Restricting the study to a male sample decreased the likelihood of finding learned helplessness. This seems to occur since males tend to attribute previous response-outcome expectancies to effort or agent more frequently than to ability, the learned helplessness response. Hence, by firmly controlling for sex differences in this investigation, the effect of learned helplessness may have been mediated.

**Attribution-Theory Model**

In view of the current criticisms of Seligman's theory of learned helplessness, two studies (Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale, 1978; Miller and Norman, 1979) have presented a revised model of learned helplessness. The reformulated version serves to resolve some of the inadequacies about the effects of uncontrollability in humans. These investigators postulate that an attributional framework more appropriately fits the available data and gives definite directions for continued research in this area.

This investigation has attempted to integrate Seligman's model with the revised attribution theory of learned helplessness. Throughout the discussion some of the deficiencies to which these researchers speak have been taken into consideration. Hence, a brief overview of the
attribution theory model as it relates to this study will be provided with emphasis on those variables not previously discussed.

**Cause**

Miller and Norman (1979) focus on two aspects concerning the etiology of learned helplessness. The first aspect concerns the content of expectancy that is hypothesized to produce helplessness. Seligman (1975) suggested an expectancy of response-outcome independence is a necessary and sufficient condition for the development of learned helplessness. Recent research has suggested that an expectancy of response-outcome independence and an expectancy of failure to obtain desired outcomes are necessary for the development of learned helplessness. This implies that outcome cues in the experimental task situation must include both response-outcome independence and failure. As reviewed before, both of these conditions are represented in this study of learned helplessness. The conditions established in the experimental procedure incorporated specific failure feedback. These were provided by the examiner regardless of the subject's responses, thus accounting for response-outcome independence. Ascribing to the inclusion of failure as a necessary element for learned helplessness, this study makes use of insolvable tasks combined with the negative feedback so that failure on the exercises is inevitable.
The second aspect regarding the etiology of the revised version is the inclusion of the attribution term. In contrast to the single expectancy term of Seligman's model, attribution theory suggests that analysis of the person's aspirations of causality of environmental events will lead to more accurate representations of cognitive processing and to better prediction of future behavior (Miller and Norman, 1979). The current research, therefore, utilized an attribution question to account for this factor. In response to the question, the subject selected one of three causal categories to express his feelings about his performance on the puzzle tasks. This particular aspect of the revised model plays a major role in the methodology section of this study.

The attributions, as postulated by Miller and Norman (1979), can be characterized by four dimensions (a) locus of control (internal versus external), (b) stability (stable versus variable), (c) specificity (specific versus general), and (d) importance (important versus unimportant). These variables are thought to have a specific effect on the future development and parameters of learned helplessness. In brief, the characteristics of the attributes constructed are predicted to determine the development, type, and generalization of learned helplessness deficits (Miller & Norman, 1979). These investigations provide a good summary of these components.
"...the dimension of locus of control is predicted to determine the resulting affective components of learned helplessness, with an attribution of learned helplessness outcomes to an internal cause hypothesized to result in depression and anxiety. Stability of attribution is predicted to determine cross-situational generalization, with attributions to a stable cause resulting in cross-situational generalization of learned helplessness deficits. Specificity of attribution is hypothesized to control cross-task generalization, with attributions to general causes resulting in cross-task generalization. The importance dimension is hypothesized to affect the intensity of the deficits produced in learned helplessness, with attributions to important causes resulting in maximum disability. (p. 111)

As suggested by these hypotheses, attributions to causes that are internal, stable, important, and general are predicted to maximize the severity and generalization of learned helplessness.

In spite of the conscious effort to include elements mentioned by Miller and Norman (1979) regarding attributions, no significant differences were found. Support for the attribution theory of learned helplessness was not obtained. Thus, whether this particular attributional model is an appropriate inclusion to the learned helplessness theory remains to be determined.

Generalization

Although this investigation accounted for many of the inadequacies of Seligman's learned helplessness model, criticisms to this procedure should be noted. Before
delving into the specific limitations of this particular study, one weakness relevant to this investigation as well as past research on the learned helplessness theory surrounds the issue of generalization. Generalization of performance deficits beyond specific experimental tasks and situations is a major unresolved issue of the learned helplessness literature (Miller & Norman, 1979). Seligman's theory does not delineate the process and circumstances under which learned helplessness will generalize. Yet, the value of the learned helplessness paradigm is anchored to the degree of generalization that occurs.

The attributional model of learned helplessness considers this aspect of the learned helplessness phenomenon. It speculates that cross-situational generalization of learned helplessness is a function of the stability dimension. Thus, generalization should occur when attributions of learned helplessness outcomes are made to relatively stable causes.

This research, like numerous other studies, has not adequately addressed the issue of generalization. And, since the relevance of the learned helplessness paradigm seems to hinge upon the generalization, this is a substantial weakness.

Limitations, Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

A limitation of this study was the size of the sample population. It should not be assumed that the responses of twenty-eight subjects and their teachers are
representative of the entire population of teenage boys. Therefore, caution should be exercised in generalizing these findings.

Another limitation is the difference in ages between the two groups, mean ages of 16.77 and 14.02 for juvenile delinquent and public school boys respectively. Due to the small number of students available to participate in this study, a balanced proportion of boys was not possible. The limited number of subjects in each group did not allow for analysis of group and age effects. This, no doubt, would have led to further insight into the age of the student and its relation to the learned helplessness phenomenon.

The use of two different examiners is also seen as a weakness in this study. It is possible that the personality of each examiner had an effect on their respective group, despite the fact that both examiners followed the same structure.

A final critical limitation to this research concerns the use of the Perceived Influence Questionnaire. Although this instrument may be the best available, it is questionable whether or not the items on this tool are valid. Individual confusion about the items by this investigator and other individuals familiar with the theory plus minimal analyses (correlations between items and stepwise multiple regression) run on this questionnaire have
created doubt about using this particular tool for future research.

The potential for future use of the learned helplessness theory relies upon further research to examine this phenomenon. Critical issues were raised and accounted for concerning possible weaknesses in this investigation. For example, would it have been better to use juvenile delinquents who were not in reform school? The Perceived Influence Questionnaire - is it valid? What about incorporating a generalization task into the paradigm? Other studies examining learned helplessness and juvenile delinquents may help clarify these questions. More insight into this area may provide numerous possibilities for the growth and development of this theoretical concept.
APPENDICES
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name
Teacher
School

Answer the question by circling the choice that tells how you feel.

1. When you are happy, are you happy
   a. because you did something that was fun, or
   b. because somebody was nice to you?

2. When you don't understand something in school, is it
   a. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
   b. because you can't understand things very well?

3. When somebody tells you that he/she likes you, is that
   a. because you are a good person, or
   b. because he/she is being nice to you?

4. When you are at school and you can't find your sweater, is that
   a. because you lost it, or
   b. because somebody took it?

5. When you hear a story and you remember it, is it
   a. because you are good at remembering things, or
   b. because the story was a good one?

6. When you beat someone at a game, does it happen
   a. because you are good at the game, or
   b. because the other person doesn't play the game well?

7. If a boy/girl tells you that you are dumb, is that
   a. because he/she doesn't like you, or
   b. because you can't think very well?

8. If you solve a problem quickly, is it
   a. because it was an easy problem, or
   b. because you did good work on it?

9. If your parents tell you you're acting silly, is it
   a. because of something you did, or
   b. because they are feeling bad?

10. When you are sad and unhappy, is it
    a. because you haven't done anything that's fun, or
    b. because somebody wasn't very nice to you?
11. When you learn something quickly in school, is it
   a. because the teacher explained it very well, or
   b. because you are good at learning things?

12. When you hear a story and you can't remember it, is it
   a. because the story wasn't very good, or
   b. because you can't remember things very well?

13. If a boy/girl tells you that you are smart, is it
   a. because he/she likes you, or
   b. because you are a good thinker?

14. When you forget something you heard in school, is it
   a. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
   b. because you didn't try very hard to remember?

15. When you help your friend find something he lost, is
    it
   a. because it was easy to find, or
   b. because you looked hard for it?

16. If you can't solve a problem, is it
   a. because you didn't try very hard, or
   b. because it was a very hard problem?

17. When another person beats you at a game, is it
    a. because the other person is very good at the game, or
    b. because you are not very good at the game?

18. When you remember something you heard at school, is that
    a. because you tried hard to remember, or
    b. because the teacher explained it very well?

19. When somebody tells you that he/she doesn't like you, is that
    a. because you are not very nice, or
    b. because he/she is just being mean to you?

20. If your parents tell you they are proud of you, is it
    a. because they are feeling good, or
    b. because you did something special?
The questions below describe specific situations which might arise during a school day. Please read each question with the mind, and circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

The questions are:

D. Young person asks another young person what his name is.

1. You ask the other young person his name. He knows the answer. Is he likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

2. You introduce yourself to another young person. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

3. You ask him for his name. In fact he is completely innocent. Is he likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

4. You ask him to do some what involves using a pencil. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

5. You ask him to do some what involves using a pencil. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

6. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

7. Suppose you gave the entire class a set of tasks to do which involved using a pencil. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

8. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.

9. He is likely to:
   1. give no answer
   2. give an answer (both are equally likely)
   3. give an answer, but not come into your mind, your circle one of the numbers beneath the question to indicate how you think this particular child would probably behave in the situation. For example, if you feel that he would be very likely to behave as is described under number 1, then you should circle number 1. If you think he (she) would behave in this way, but you are not certain, then you should circle a less certain number, such as 2 or 3.
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