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Adopting a structural-cognitive perspective, this study posited causal models of personal powerlessness among 620 Filipino women solicited through multistage sampling. A combination of original, Likert-type scales and a closed-ended questionnaire using the Bicol language tapped the cognitive and structural variables used in the models. Through path analysis, the investigation demonstrated that powerlessness generates a sequelae of maladaptive cognitions, namely, low self-esteem, low success expectancies, and a weak motivation for self-improvement, respectively. Despite widespread poverty, 620 Filipino women exhibited self-efficacy, high self-esteem, and a strong propensity for self-improvement. These constructive cognitions can be attributed to a strong achievement ethic, high educational attainment, knowledge of government agencies, strong religious faith, and spirituality. However, success expectancies were low. The respondents' pessimism can be traced to unfulfilled potentials of an otherwise highly educated group, gender-role traditionalism, minimal political participation, and a relatively low level of feminist awareness. The depressive impact of low success expectancies on the propensity for self-improvement, however, was cushioned by the respondents' high levels of self-efficacy, achievement valuation, educational attainment, the possession of skills, knowledge of government agencies, and other factors.
agencies, strong religious faith, and spirituality.

Findings suggest the indispensability of cognitive modification in empowerment strategizing. Cognitive modification, however, requires validation in real-world situations through problem-solving, social, and everyday management skills. For instance, building social networks through organizational involvement provides opportunities for adaptive competencies. Within families, rewarding female children’s competence deserves greater attention from parents. In schools, sensitizing students and teachers to gender stereotyping needs reinforcement. Using the "legitimate power" of their status, women leaders can propagate sharing information and collaboration as alternative values to ruthless competition. These structural actions combined with cognitive transformation will facilitate coping with "perpetually numbing experience of powerlessness."
CHAPTER I

The human individual possesses...purpose; the will to make decisions and a capacity to execute them in subtle ways...And more, man possesses Potentiality, a power to realize his Potentiality in Actuality; a power to which no limit is known.

-James C. Malin

THE PROBLEM: ITS CULTURAL CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

Filipino Women and Philippine Society

Bearing in mind the nexus between women's subordination and personal powerlessness (Ferguson & Johnson 1990), the author formulated two issues of contemporary relevance. What structural factors predispose women to the perception that external and uncontrollable forces determine life's outcomes (Ball 1965)? What chain of cognitive consequences does personal powerlessness trigger?

Interest in the dynamics of women's powerlessness came from the writer's firsthand experiences as a member of the dominant gender in Philippine society. Women's status in the Philippines presents fascinating paradoxes. Largely because of the high visibility Filipino women enjoy in society (Fox 1965), their status is a taken-for-granted facticity (Licuanan 1991). In addition to Corazon Aquino, the country's first female chief executive, numerous Filipino women (a.k.a. Filipinas) have distinguished themselves in both public and private arenas (Licuanan 1991). Let not this popular perception mislead the unwary reader. Beneath the veneer of prominence lie the
various forms of informal and formal discrimination engendered by a society still essentially patriarchal in character (Licuanan 1991; Fox 1965). Patriarchal notions coexist with traditional values that accord Filipino women respect and esteem (Fox 1965). Beliefs in biological differences between the sexes and stereotypical characterizations of women as "homemakers" or men as "decision-makers" still abound. These beliefs have provided justifications for existing social inequalities experienced by Filipinas (Sobritchea 1990).

Politically, the female share of elective offices from the village to the national levels has remained minimal. Filipinas appear to have fared better in appointive offices where they have obtained recognition in the diplomatic corps, the career services, and the judiciary (Rodriguez 1990).

While 54% of all Filipino college students and 65% of postgraduates are women, this high level of educational attainment has not led to high labor force participation and financial advantages (Licuanan 1991). While 87% of Filipino men are economically active, only slightly more than half of the Filipinas aged 15 or older are so (Licuanan 1991). In 1986, Filipinas earned 37 centavos for every peso their male counterparts earned. Even when employed, Filipinas constitute a mere 25% of managerial positions but are disproportionately represented in the clerical, sales, and domestic service sectors (Licuanan 1991). In view of the largely low-paying jobs Filipinas hold, it is not surprising that these women regard poverty as their single most important problem (Gonzalez 1977).

Filipinas are overworked. In rural areas where 68% of Filipinas live, women work the farms aside from performing traditional household chores. It has been estimated that Filipino husbands work only 2/3 to 3/4 as much as their wives (Aguilar 1987). The typical busy everyday schedule of Filipinas has not been conducive to political participation (Licuanan 1991; Eviota 1979). As if poverty, domestic, and occupational
burdens were not enough, preventable diseases associated with poverty such as tuberculosis, nutritional deficiencies, pneumonia, and gastroenteritis continue to be the leading causes of death among Filipinas (Licuanan 1991).

The dismal conditions experienced by Filipinas have been aggravated by the so-called "green revolution program." This program promoted new strains of rice and other crops requiring agricultural machinery which, in turn, has displaced many women workers (Aguilar 1987). As a result, migration to urban centers and foreign countries has increased dramatically with serious consequences. Poorly educated, most of these female migrants end up as domestics, prostitutes, and hospitality workers. Many of these workers have become victims of physical and sexual abuse perpetuated by their domestic or foreign employers (Aguilar 1987).

Exploitation of Filipinas extends to the advertising and tourism industries. Objectification of women as sexual beings appear to be an entrenched consumer advertising strategy. In the tourism business, many unscrupulous tour managers have continued to focus on the availability of Filipina prostitutes as their major selling point in their marketing campaigns (Blanc-Szanton 1990).

Confronted by various hostile forces, Filipinas have been observed to attribute poverty, hunger, death, and other forms of hardship to fate, the supernatural, and other uncontrollable external circumstances (e.g. Pineda 1981; Gonzalez 1977). In Western societies as well, feelings of powerlessness, helplessness, and hopelessness have been noted as women's responses to subordination and exploitation (Ferguson & Johnson 1990).

The Respondents and the Setting

Bicolanas, female residents of the Bicol Peninsula in the Philippines, constituted the focus of this study. Like their Filipino sisters, Bicolanas have a string of accomplishments to their credit. Among their ranks can easily be found engineers, bank
managers, military officers, technicians, high-level politicians, university presidents, bar topnotchers, lawyers, accountants, entrepreneurs, surgeons, dentists, and tenured full professors among other careers (Mercado 1966). Bicolanas are equally known for their strength of character, leadership skills, sense of responsibility, and entrepreneurial talent (Polotan 1967; Mercado 1966). Paradoxically, Bicolanas also show a deep strain of conservatism (Mercado 1966). Ethnographic vignettes characterize Bicolanas as models of feminine charm and experts in the arts of endearment. Filipinos widely regard Bicolanas as dutiful wives who pamper their husbands (Polotan 1967) and as devoted mothers (Mercado 1966). The Bicolanas' impressive educational accomplishments, however, have steadily eroded these folk conceptions (Mercado 1966).

Bicolanas take pride in their birthplace, the Bicol Peninsula (Mercado 1966). Home is located in the southeasternmost tip of Luzon Island. Despite its richness in natural resources such as an breathtaking tourist attractions, an extensive coastline, rich fishing grounds, abundant mineral resources and fertile soil complemented by its proximity to urban centers such as Metro-Manila and Cebu, the peninsula registers a 73% poverty incidence which is the highest in the country (Bicol University Development Foundation, Inc. a.k.a. BUDFI 1990). The region's poverty is better understood within the context of structural and natural forces. Poverty, government neglect, corruption in public office as well as a terrain of jungles, remote areas, and mountains have conspired to make the region a hotbed of Marxist insurgency. Nature has complicated things further. The province of Albay, the research site, continuously sustains considerable damage to life and property from periodic eruptions of Mayon Volcano. In addition, the province has been strained from endless rebuilding after destructive typhoons, mudflows, landslides, storm surges, and floods (BUDFI 1990). These conditions make the Bicol Region an ideal setting for the study of personal powerlessness in view of Lewis' (1959) observation that people who share a "culture of poverty" harbor a sense of
resignation and fatalism, possibly a result of living under "the constant threat of having life completely overturned by forces that can neither be predicted nor controlled (Steinberg, 1966)." Similarly, Lefcourt (1976) contended that members of denigrated minority groups, the poor included, share a common characterization of abject helplessness and a sense of despair. The relationship between poverty and personal powerlessness obtains support from attitudinal studies conducted among Filipinas. Pineda (1981) observed how the majority of rural Filipinas will often attribute hunger, death, and economic difficulties to fate or the supernatural. Gonzalez (1977) reported a similar attitude among mothers and daughters who felt that their problems are due to uncontrollable external conditions.

Significance of the Study

Using attribution theory in combination with a structural perspective, this study situated its theoretical and practical contributions within sociological social psychology. Women's and Third World studies also benefited from the emphasis on women in a Third World country.

The review of the sociological and psychological literature on attribution theory indicated that this investigation constituted a pioneering attempt to demonstrate the applicability of attributional processes in a Third World context. The choice of a developing country resonated with the challenge for more research on the repercussions of poverty on women's behavior within the context of regional specialization (Papanek 1975). In view of the dearth of cross-cultural studies on women (Sherman & Denmark 1978), the focus on Filipinas will enhance the visibility of Asian women and encourage a search for commonalities in women's conditions worldwide.

By applying attribution theory in understanding Filipino women's typical cognitive schemata, this research responded to Lewin's (1992) call for a closer cooperation
between the theoretical and the applied. Lewin envisioned a situation where the "theorist does not look toward applied problems with highbrow aversion or with a fear of social problems." Lewin further anticipated that applied social scientists realize "that there is nothing so practical as a good theory." Contributing to applied sociology, this study responded to Soedjatmoko's (1965) call for Third World scholars to identify attitudes and values consistent with development imperatives. Dysfunctional cognitions observed in this investigation suggested the indispensability of incorporating cognitive modification in empowerment strategies for women (e.g. Gutierrez 1990; Pinderhughes 1983; Pernell 1985; Burghardt 1982). In identifying specific socialization processes where cognitive intervention can be validated, this study enriched the repertoire of effecting sustainable change in an individual's value system.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

An Overview

Research on powerlessness can be classified according to two general categories, namely, sociological and psychological. The sociological literature explores the relationship between powerlessness and structural factors such as race, class, occupation, religion, social support system, political participation, feminism, and demographic variables. The psychological literature focuses on individual phenomena such as attributional styles, cognitive processes, responses to stimuli, and psychopathological conditions. Through its cognitive-structural framework, the current study attempted to bridge the structural or psychological foci of existing studies. Moreover, its use of primary data contributed to the scant body of research providing empirical support to theoretical models of powerlessness. In its use of path analysis, this investigation also presented an alternative to widely-used techniques such as regression, analysis of variance, chi-square, and correlation.

The Sociological Literature

Although Seeman (1983) observed that most powerlessness studies have been essentially psychological, he also noted that the powerlessness construct recurs under varied names in specifically sociological literature. The recurrence of the notion of powerlessness in structural studies has led Seeman to conclude that although structuralists may profess no affinity for the language of alienation or powerlessness, they are nevertheless constrained to deal with it, however directly or indirectly.
Illustratively, Seeman cited Sennett and Cobb's (1972) description of "hidden injuries" of social class which feature a sensed absence of control among the working class which remains fundamentally deprived despite advances and increased income. Relatedly, studies have linked personal powerlessness with low occupational status (Kohn 1983), poverty, lack of education, and membership in a minority group (Mirowsky & Ross 1983; Gans 1982; Slomczynski et al. 1981; Lefcourt 1976; Kohn 1969; Lewis 1961; Vann 1948)). In contrast, Schooler (1983) found evidence that ethnic groups long free from serfdom place a greater value on moral autonomy (the tendency to believe themselves responsible for their own fates and to have more personally responsible moral standards) relative to those ethnic groups who have more recently emerged from feudalism. Studying the attitudes of subordinated groups, Portes (1971) noted the tendency to blame the system rather than oneself or fate for one's deprivations ("system blame"). Illustrating this variant of powerlessness, Taylor and Walsh (1979) noted how African Americans blame discrimination rather than personal inadequacy as the source of their inferior status and low achievement. Aside from responding passively to powerlessness, people can take proactive measures such as collective violence. In accounting for more than a century of fluctuating collective violence in France, Seeman (1983) posited that these events may have been caused by a sense of relative political powerlessness (having less power than is deemed appropriate in the face of perceived availability of resources). Seeman, however, hastened to add that the relationship between powerlessness and social action is not a simple one. Generally, the propensity to take action correlates with an internal locus of control. Strickland (1965) noted that Southern black students who actually participated in civil rights action were unusually internal. Another group of college students in a southern black college described as having greater commitment to and involvement in civil rights showed an internal rather
than an external locus of control (Gore and Rotter 1963). Relatedly, Crawford and Naditch (1970) observed that participation in civil rights activities, demonstrations, and the NAACP was consistently higher for internals vis-a-vis externals. They further saw that people with a high degree of internal locus of control and a high degree of deprivation preferred more militant forms of protest relative to those who had an external locus of control and who were relatively content. The association between powerlessness and general passivity, on one hand, and internality with goal-directed action, on the other, (Silverman and Nakamura 1971) may be due to the propensity of internal subjects to gather and remember information relevant to improving their situation (Seeman 1963). Contradictory evidence, however, indicates that activists may be relatively external. Such externality might predict a preference for high risk activities, lofty goals, and low probability of success which all characterize much social-political action (Highbee & Streufert 1969).

In addition to status variables, belief systems have been associated with powerlessness. For instance, membership in a religious denomination can encourage certain values and attitudes inconsistent with self-efficacy (Miller 1981; Ruether 1972). Sered (1992) observed that women who believed in an omniscient and omnipotent god possessed a fatalistic attitude toward life. Similarly, discussing the impact of Asian traditional religions which emphasize fatalism, Manglapus (1965) posited that if the future is believed to be in the hands of fate and gods, life and the natural environment are to be submitted and never to be mastered. Contradicting these arguments is the contention that faith can be empowering (Niebuhr 1986; Elhard 1968; Smith 1949; Arboleda, 1993; Schuller 1985). In the secular realm, feminism has been associated with self-efficacy. Women who held nontraditional sex-role attitudes possessed perceptions consistent self-efficacy such as high self-esteem (Walstedt 1977; Cott
1975), independence (Walstedt 1977), assertiveness (Mainiero 1977), control over their bodies through successful contraception (Fox 1977), and resistance to depression (Danker-Brown & Baucom 1982; Baucom 1983). Veroff (1983), however, maintained that more traditional women are more likely to have a greater sense of well-being than their nontraditional counterparts.

Aside from church membership, membership in organizations correlates with self-efficacy (Dionisio 1991; Scott 1991; Palacios 1977; Miller 1983; Gutierrez 1990; Lee 1985; Ravindran 1985; Thomson 1984; Bachrach et al. 1970). Mathiason (1972), however, noted that mere membership in an organization is not sufficient. Active participation during meetings is essential. The type of organization also matters. Winter (1973) found politically-inclined organizations more effective than recreationally-oriented or "clubhouse" associations. Performing leadership roles in organizations has been shown to enhance self-efficacy as well (Cantor & Bernay 1992; Godfrey 1992; Zientara 1987; Ferguson 1984; Mueller-Deham 1957).

Demographic variables such as age, marital status and its related construct of social support have been identified as cognates of personal powerlessness. A tendency toward personal powerlessness has been observed among the elderly (Jessor et al. 1968; Butler 1975; Curtin 1972; Lesnoff-Caravaglia 1984), single parents or singles (Guttentag & Salasin 1977; Lerner 1986; Worell & Garret-Fulks 1983; Johnson 1978), and people with minimal social support (Wilcox 1981; Dean & Lin 1977; Hirsch 1980; Cobb 1976; Vanfossen 1966).

The Psychological Literature

Attributional research with a psychological focus, following Weiner (1974), can be classified into six thematic concentrations, namely, men and women's attributional
styles, response to aversive events, psychopathology, response to social influences, cognitive activity, and achievement behavior.

**Studies on Attributional Styles**

Women's attributions have been noted to be more external than men's (Deaux & Emswiller 1974), although this pattern of general externality may not be a simple one (Frieze et al. 1978). For instance, factors such as modesty, fear of social rejection, and fear of success may mediate the external attributions of some women.

Concerning modesty, women may actually feel pride and confidence in their abilities but may attribute success to luck to avoid appearing boastful. Regarding fear of social rejection, women's fear of negative consequences as society's response to their achievements may influence them to attribute their successes to luck thus denying responsibility for performance. This denial, in turn, eliminates any ground for social rejection if they perform well (Frieze et al. 1978). The "fear of success" (Horner 1968) could likewise inhibit women's achievement-oriented behavior.

**Response to Aversive Events**

It has been noted that aversive events, experienced in a state where individuals do not believe that they can extricate themselves from duress, yield untoward consequences (Lefcourt 1976). Davison & Valins (1969) contended that the use of drugs during psychotherapeutic treatment might hinder improvement if the patient attributes improvement to the drug rather than himself or herself. Losing control over activities and other people's actions can make unpleasant events profoundly stressful (Langer & Rodin 1976) and anxiety-inducing (Watson 1967) as well. On the other hand, people can tolerate extreme distress if they believe they have the ability to control the source of that distress (Thompson 1981; Averill 1973). Among hospital patients, Langer et al. (1975) noted that patients trained to believe in their ability to control stress required fewer pain relievers and sedatives. Nurses also noticed them as exhibiting less
anxiety. Similarly, Langer and Rodin (1976) observed that nursing home patients who were given greater opportunities to influence nursing-home policies showed improved alertness, activity and happiness. Moreover, institutionalized residents allowed a wider range of choices regarding everyday activities were happier and may live longer (Timko & Moos 1989; Deci & Ryan 1987; Seeman & Evans 1962; Seeman 1963). In the workplace, employees involved in decision-making showed improvements in morale (Miller & Monge 1986). In prisons, inmates allowed to move chairs, control TV sets, and switch lights experienced less stress, exhibited fewer health problems, and committed less vandalism (Ruback et al. 1986; Wener et al. 1987).

The advantages of a sense of personal power or efficacy have been noted in animal research as well. Seligman's (1975b) experiments on learned helplessness showed that dogs learned a sense of helplessness. Dogs who were taught that they could not escape shocks later failed to take the initiative of escaping when they could have. Conversely, dogs trained to escape initial shocks adapted successfully to new conditions.

Seligman, noting that the behavior pattern of dogs that learned helplessness was similar to that of depressed people, proposed that human learned helplessness emanated from uncontrollable experiences. The most severe depression, Seligman observed, arises when people attribute negative events to stable, internal, and pervasive aspects of themselves. The application of Seligman's findings to humans has been made possible by the reformulation of the learned helplessness model performed by Weiner (1972, 1974, 1979), Abramson et al. (1978), and Abramson, Garber and Seligman (1980).

The reformulated model of learned helplessness postulates that exposure to uncontrollable events elicits attributions that vary on four critical dimensions (Anderson & Arnoult 1985), namely, controllability, locus (external vs. internal), stability (stable vs.
unstable), and globality (global vs. specific). To illustrate, ability can be regarded as stable and internal; effort as unstable and internal; luck as unstable and external; task difficulty as stable and external. Controllability refers to whether or not an outcome can be modified, changed, controlled, or escaped. Globality refers to the range of situations to which an attribution is seen as applicable. Global causes are applicable to a wide range of situations while specific ones are associated with one or few situations (Anderson & Arnoult 1985).

**Response to Social Influences**

Sherman (1973) found that internals change their attitudes more following their writing of counter-attitudinal statements than in response to others' persuasive arguments, while the reverse obtained for the externals. Relatedly, Snyder and Larson (1972) observed that externals were more accepting of extensive personality descriptions than were externals. Other researchers have likewise noted that externals are facilitated and internals distracted by the presence of social stimuli during various task performances (Baron et al. 1974; Pines 1974; Fitz 1971). The general pattern obtained from these studies show that externals are more attentive, positively responsive, and facilitated in their task performances by the presence of social cues.

**Cognitive Activity**

Internals are quicker at extracting cues that facilitate making accurate judgments than externals (DuCette & Wolk 1973; Williams & Stack 1972; Brecher & Denmark 1969). Studies on humor reveal that internals more rapidly assimilate the meaning of the ensuing events, to accept those meanings with less rancor than are externals, and to be more able to transform a state of uncertainty to one of humor. Further, Epstein (1987) observed the correlation between constructive thinking and belief in personal control combined with effective optimism. Expounding on this relationship, Epstein contended that the belief that one possesses skills coupled with the optimism that the
use of this skills will be successful lead people to develop effective thinking skills. In much of the cognitive research done, internals seem to be more cognitively alert than externals and more ready to grasp for information that can contribute to the interpretation of and coping with situations.

Attributions have been linked with cognitive dissonance phenomena as well. Nisbett and Valins (1971) found support to the attribution theory's account of cognitive dissonance: the less the extrinsic forces are consistent with behavior and the less able persons are in identifying the reasons for their actions, the more likely the action will be attributed to internal factors such as the intrinsic merit of the behavior. On the other hand, the greater the extrinsic reward for behavior consonant with one's beliefs, the less the likelihood that the behavior will be ascribed to internal factors (beliefs). For example, being paid to state a belief consistent with one's true feelings might result in a weakening of that belief (Weiner 1972).

Achievement Behavior

No firm conclusions can be drawn from the extant research on the relationship between achievement and locus of control. However, in the most basic sense, internal locus of control has been associated with higher grades and achievement scores, controlling for IQ and cognitive impulsivity (Messer 1972). More importantly, Messer further noted that boys who assumed responsibility for success and girls who assumed responsibility for failure were the most likely to obtain higher grades and achievement scores. In other studies concerning responsibility for intellectual achievement, Crandall and associates (1965, 1962) saw a positive correlation between internality and variables such as grade-point average, intelligence-test scores, time spent in free-play activities, and intensity in such activities. Relatedly, helpless children who were taught to take responsibility for failure and to attribute failure to lack of effort showed maintained or improved performance in math problem-solving tests (Dweck 1975; Dweck & Bush
Further, internals show greater adaptability to task demands relative to externals (Gozali et al. 1973; Julian & Katz 1968).

Regarding goal attainment, Rotter et al. (1962) and Phares (1957) observed differences in expectancies corresponding to internal (e.g. ability) or external (e.g. luck) attributions. Greater increases or decreases in expectancy were noted in skill situations relative to chance situations after success or failure (Meyer 1970; Rotter et al. 1961). For instance, successful subjects in the skill condition were more likely to increase their bet on the next trial than subjects in the chance situations. On the other hand, there were more atypical shifts among subjects in the chance conditions relative to the skill conditions. This finding supported the "gambler's fallacy" of expecting to win after a loss.

In responding to failure, internals expressed more dissatisfaction than externals when the task was thought to be easy. Conversely, externals seemed to be more discontented with failure experiences than internals when the task was perceived as difficult (Karabenick 1972). The affective responses of internals, then, were more in accord with what might be expected from realistic, goal-oriented individuals. On the other hand, for externals to strongly regret failure at difficult tasks and to be too joyous in response to success at simple tasks suggests an individual with little confidence in his or her own potentialities. Weiner and Kukla (1970) showed positive correlations between evaluations of achievement-related outcomes and an internal locus of control. Further, respondents with high levels of achievement motivation more frequently attributed their successes or failures to the degree of effort expended than did intermediate or low achievers (Kukla 1972; Weiner & Kukla 1970; Weiner & Potepan 1970). Attributions to effort have also been demonstrated to magnify relative reward for success and punishment for failure when people evaluate their achievements (Weiner et al. 1972; Beckman 1970; Lanzetta & Hannah 1969; Weiner & Kukla 1970). Moreover,
greater persistence, greater motivation, higher expectations, a more vigorous response to challenging tasks (Bandura 1977; Dweck & Licht 1980; Atkinson 1964; Mischel 1973; Weiner 1979; Webster & Sobieszek 1974), more effective performance and ultimately greater success (Taylor 1989) have been noted among persons with a sense of self-efficacy relative to those who have little desire to control.

Integrating these disparate findings, Weiner (1972) and Atkinson (1964, 1966), formulated general models of motivation using attribution theory. Essentially, their models contend that attributions yield affective (Nisbett & Schachter 1966; Schachter & Singer 1962; Morse & Gergen 1970; Valins 1966) and expectancy effects (Phares 1957; Rotter et al. 1961). In turn, affect and expectancy influence an individual's response.Attributions, however, are themselves influenced by the individual's attitude toward achievement which, also impacts the consequences of attributions (Abramson et al. 1978; Weiner 1972; Rosenbaum 1963; Green 1963; Atkinson & Litwin 1960; Atkinson 1963; Northcutt 1985).

Psychopathology

An external locus of control has been associated with a predominance of negative affective experiences (Marone 1992; Blechman 1984; Melges & Weisz 1971; Gorman 1971; Ryckman & Sherman 1973). Relatedly, Kilpatrick et al. (1974) demonstrated that internals maintain their mood of "vigorousness, exuberance, and high energy" in the face of uncertainty. They also observed that tension and depression were the more common self-attributes of externals than they were of internals. If tension and depression can be construed as debilitating and vigor as a mood-facilitating instrumental activity, then internals are less likely to succumb to demanding circumstances and to remain active in the confrontation with challenges. It is interesting to note that a decline of instrumental activity is a major source of depressive episodes (Ferster 1973; Lewinson 1972). Mirowsky and Ross (1983) noted that belief in external
control among people in social positions characterized by powerlessness interacts with the threat of victimization or exploitation to produce mistrust. In turn, mistrust can develop into paranoia. In their study which explained the relationship between class position and psychological distress, Turner and Noh (1983) found that psychological distress and personal control were significantly related in an inverse relationship among middle-class women who experienced medium- and high-stress levels. They also observed that when personal control and social support levels were high, these variables explained entirely the inverse relationship between class and psychological distress.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Personal Powerlessness as a Construct: The Conceptual Framework

The notion of powerlessness derives from Seeman's (1959) theoretical formulation of alienation. Seeman defined alienation as the estrangement from or disillusionment with the larger social world or oneself. Forms of alienation include powerlessness, self-estrangement (the inability to find self-rewarding activities), normlessness (high expectancy that socially unapproved goals are required to achieve goals), and cultural estrangement (the low regard for socially valued goals and beliefs (Kohn, 1983).

Aside from Seeman, Heider (1958) may also be acknowledged for contributing to the formulation of the powerlessness construct, albeit indirectly. Heider (1958) construed "effective personal force" as composing of two factors, namely, trying (motivation) and power. Power refers to ability or other stable personality traits (Weiner, 1972). Heider believed that trying and power are related multiplicatively. The absence of either one does not enable the person to overcome environmental obstacles.

Ball (1965), whose definition was adopted in this study, defined personal powerlessness as the perception of the environment as uncontrollable by any but external forces such as luck, fate, chance, or powerful others over which the actor has no control. The reciprocal of powerlessness, therefore, is self-efficacy or volitional causality; that is, the perception of the environment as amenable to deliberate actions
initiated by the individual (Ball 1965). Alternatively, self-efficacy represents a belief that outcomes are contingent on one's behavior (Mirowsky & Ross 1983) and not on others' repertoire (Abramson et al. 1978). Similarly, Kohn and Schooler (1983), using Seeman's (1983) definition, define powerlessness as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine occurrence of the outcomes...he seeks."


According to Rotter, external control is the tendency to believe that outcomes are caused by external forces such as luck, fate, or chance. This concept's antithesis, internal locus of control, refers to the belief that events are contingent on one's own behavior (Silvern & Nakamura 1971). Alternatively, the internal-external control construct refers to the perception that people do or do not have the power over what happens to them (Lefcourt 1966). Personal powerlessness, therefore, can be viewed as a continuum that ranges from a perception of absolute uncontrollability to a belief in some degree of control over one's fate (Kohn 1983).

Aside from internal-external control, another analogue of personal powerlessness is Seligman's (1975, 1991) construct of "learned helplessness" which is a belief that there is no connection between one's action and final outcomes of events. In his pivotal experiment with dogs, he noted that dogs, which were previously exposed to a situation where they had no means of escaping the discomfort of electric shocks, subsequently ceased to attempt escape to safety even when they were given the
opportunity to do so. The dogs were said to have acquired "learned helplessness." The construct appears to be applicable to human beings since the characteristics of learned helplessness seem to be at the core of depression (Seligman, 1991). In fact, Anderson and Arnoult (1985) noted that locus and controllability were the strongest predictors of depression, loneliness, and shyness.

On the other extreme of the continuum are the constructs which negate personal powerlessness. Bandura's "self-efficacy" Kelley and Thibaut's "fate control", and Douvan and Walker's "self-efficacy" all refer to the confidence in one's ability to influence outcomes or to produce desired results. Similarly, Pearlin and associates' "mastery" refers to the "extent to which one regards one's life chances as being under one's own control in contrast to being fatalistically ruled."

Further ramifications on the domain of personal powerlessness need be clarified. Ball's (1965) definition of personal powerlessness must be distinguished from powerlessness construed as the inability to obtain what one needs or wants (the social desiderata), the inability to influence others effectively in ways furthering one's own interests (Parenti 1978; Chittister 1990), or the inability to achieve one's ends when in opposition to others (Mirowsky & Ross 1983). While Parenti and Chittister contemplated the actual lack of power, Ball contemplates the subjective perception of the lack of power. By the same token, Mirowsky and Ross conceived of the lack of influence over others while Ball focused on the lack of influence over one's internal states and personal surroundings. A further distinction has to be made between Ball's definition and those of Neal and Seeman's (1964) and Neal and Groat's (1974) who defined powerlessness as "low expectancies for control of events." The events being construed in this definition were those of importance to mass societies such as control over political and economic
events (Robinson et al. 1991). In choosing Ball's definition, this researcher wanted to confine his notion of powerlessness within the immediate and personal context of everyday life as opposed to the broader political-economic contexts construed in the Neal and Seeman and Neal and Groat definitions of powerlessness. It must be noted that Ball's domain of meaning corresponds to those of Douvan and Walker (1965), Pearl et al. (1981), Berglas (1986), Abramson et al. (1978), Kelley and Thibaut (1978), and Bandura (1977).

The different contextual domains of powerlessness could be indicative of multidimensionality. Providing empirical evidence for the multidimensional nature of powerlessness, Levenson's (1974) factor analytic study produced three dimensions of powerlessness, namely, mastery over one's personal life, expectancy for control by powerful others, and belief in fate or chance happenings. Similarly, Gurin et al. (1978) distinguished between "control ideology" and "personal control" as a result of their factor analysis of Rotter's I-E (Internal-External) Scale. The ideology factor refers to beliefs about the degree to which external forces such as institutional practices, legal and political standards rather than personal qualities determine the distribution of rewards in society. Note that "personal control" is analogous to personal powerlessness as defined in this investigation. Gootnick (1974) also found support for the multidimensionality of powerlessness when he noted a significant correlation between his multidimensional personal opinion survey and political participation of college students, a relationship not predicted by Rotter's I-E Scale.

**Theoretical Framework**

This investigation, positing the important consequences of cognitions, adopted attribution theory as its theoretical framework. The theory, being cognitive in nature,
argues that cognitions intervene between incoming stimuli and final responses (Baldwin 1969).

In its simplest terms, attribution theory deals with "why" questions or the relationship between phenomena (effects) and the reasons (responsible agents) for those events (Weiner 1972). Attribution theory was originally not formulated as a theory of individual motivation (Weiner 1972). Defining the theory as one which describes how a person perceives motivation of another, Kelley (1967) referred to attribution theory as one which described "how a typical observer infers a person's motivation from his action". Heider (1958) and the author, however, contended that the theory can be employed in the study of self-perception and in the formulation of a theory of individual motivation (Heider 1958) as well.

Heider, widely acknowledged as the founder of attribution theory (Weiner 1972), was concerned with the common man's perceptions about causality or "naive descriptions of behavior" (Heider 1958). He believed that an action outcome may be dependent upon a combination of effective personal force and effective environmental force. It must be emphasized that Heider was interested in the perceived causes of behavior and not the factors actually impinging upon the person or influencing a certain outcome (Weiner 1972).

When people construct attributions, they are attempting to link outcomes to causes such as intention, ability, skill, luck, traits, and motives. The connections which are made seem to satisfy the tendency to ask the whys of human behavior and appear to enhance the perception of control (Harvey & Weary 1985). In constructing attributions (Abramson et al. 1978), perceivers may attribute actions to external vs. internal factors (locus); controllable or uncontrollable factors (controllability); stable vs. transitory causes (stability); and all-encompassing or specific factors (globality). To understand these dimensions, consider the following illustrative postulates: In regard to
the dimension of locus, the more the person is seen as causing the action, the less influence the environment will be perceived to exert. Conversely, the more the environment is seen as causative, the less influential the person is perceived to be. In regard to the dimension of stability, there is a general tendency for people to attribute causes to enduring rather than transitory factors. In regard to the dimension of controllability, powerless individuals perceive events to be beyond their effective control. Concerning globality, the powerless tend to attribute failure to global factors.

In their attempt to explain causes of everyday occurrences, people develop tendencies toward particular attributional styles. Parenthetically, the notion of "style" implies consistent differences in the ways people interpret or explain their performance outcomes to themselves (Abramson et al. 1978). This consistency was noted by Lefcourt (1976) who described internal or external control as "an individual's more common tendencies to expect events to be contingent or noncontingent upon their actions." Support for Lefcourt's position can be seen in several constructs which characterize people's way of accounting for events as being consistent. For example, the notion of "cognitive style" (Gardner et al. 1959) deals with the idea of individual regularities in the manner in which persons defend against drive stimuli and adapt to the external world. Adler's (1956) concept of "style" of the individual emphasized how individuals structure their existence according to "fictional goals". Seligman's (1991) "explanatory style" referred to the manner in which people habitually explains to themselves why events happen. Taylor's (1989) "self-schemas" pertain to enduring beliefs that people have about themselves.

Placing Ball's (1965) definition of personal powerlessness within the framework of Abramson et al.'s (1978) conceptualization of attributions, the perceptive reader would note that personal powerlessness can be considered an attributional style on account of its incorporation of the dimensions of locus (i.e. external) and controllability
A particular attributional style generates a sequelae of attitudes, beliefs, affect, and expectations. Kaufman (1989) posited that powerlessness as a psychological condition can yield profound consequences. Sharing this view, Harvey and Weary (1985) noted that behaviors are consistent with the attributions people make. Similarly, Taylor (1989) averred that interpretations which enable people to make sense of their experience can have important personal consequences. In the like manner, Seligman (1991) stated that one's explanatory style determines how helpless one can become or how energized when one encounters everyday setbacks or major failures. Relatedly, (Taylor 1989) asserted that self-schemas are important because they guide the selection and interpretation of information in social situations. Along the same vein, Adler (1956) maintained that "fictional goals" provide directions for structuring choices and a filter through which the world is perceived and its meaning interpreted.

The various consequences of attributions are consolidated within a sequential framework in Atkinson's (1964, 1966) attribution model of achievement motivation and Weiner's (1972) general attribution model of action. Atkinson argued that people with high achievement needs are more likely to attribute success to ability and effort. Such attribution yields a more positive affect for success which, in turn, increases success expectancies and, consequently, probability of achievement behavior. Weiner (1972), for his part, contended that attributions determine achievement-related affects (pride or shame) produced by attainment or nonattainment of goals as well as future expectancies of success. Both future expectancies and affect, in turn, influence a person's subsequent response.
CHAPTER IV

MODELS AND METHODS

Statement of Hypotheses: the proposed models

The proposed core model, culling from the Weiner and Atkinson formulations, hypothesized the causal paths contained in Figure 1. Guided by Atkinson’s (1964, 1966) attribution model of achievement motivation, core model postulated that achievement valuation impacts personal powerlessness which, in turn, affects self-esteem, success expectancies, and propensity for self-improvement, respectively.

Consistent with Weiner’s (1982) general attributional model of action, the core model further hypothesized that personal powerlessness will yield separate, direct effects on success expectancies.

Based on the findings of Seeman and Evans (1962) and Seeman (1963) on the relationship between locus of control and efforts to improve one’s life, it was postulated that personal powerlessness would have a direct impact on the propensity for self-improvement.

Guided by Northcutt’s (1985) hypotheses in her study on characteristics of successful women, the core model also proposed that apart from impacting personal powerlessness directly, achievement valuation will directly impact self-esteem, success expectancies, and the propensity for self-improvement.

From Figure 1, it must be noted that achievement valuation acts as the lone
exogenous variable (functions purely as a predictor variable as indicated by the fact that there are no arrows pointing at it) in the core model. The other four variables are endogenous variables (variables with at least one arrow directed at them).

Fig. 1. The Core Personal Powerlessness Model

As it stands, however, the core model ignores the social-psychological truism that an outcome is dependent upon environmental forces aside from personal factors (Heider 1958). Concurring, Ochs (1986) contended that our perceptions are shaped by our social experiences aside from psychological variables such as talents, sensitivities, and expectations. Hence, a more viable model will necessarily have to incorporate structural variables. Guided by the model-building approach by Kohn et al. (1983) and the sociological literature on powerlessness with emphasis on Philippine and Third World studies, the following exogenous variables were hypothesized as most saliently impacting the Filipino woman's cognitive schemata: socioeconomic status (e.g. Lewis 1950; Gonzalez 1977); knowledge base (Jessor et al. 1960; Lefcourt 1976); political participation (Palacios 1977; Winter 1973; Scott 1991); religiosity (Sered 1992;
Manglapus 1965; Featherman 1971); gender-role perceptions (Baucom 1983; Veroff 1983; Sobritchea 1990); and social support system (Wilcox 1981; Hirsch 1980).

A typical appearance of an expanded model follows:

Exogenous Variable

Valuation of Achievement

Personal Powerlessness

Propensity for Self-Improvement

Self-Esteem

Success Expectancies

Fig. 2. A Typical Expanded Model

Measurement

The five variables in the core model were measured by scales (Appendix A) constructed by the researcher, namely, the Culture-Sensitive Personal Powerlessness Scale (CSPPS), the Valuation of Achievement Scale (VAS), the Success Expectancies Index (SCXI), the Self-Esteem Scale (SES), and the Propensity for Self-Improvement Scale (PSIS). Three variables in the expanded model, namely, faith in God, spiritual vs. material orientation, and sex-role attitudes were likewise measured through the author's Faith-in-God Scale (FIGS) Other-Worldly Orientation Scale (OWOS), and the Sex-Role Attitude Scale (SRAS). Preliminary versions of the scales were pre-tested among 100 Bicolano women.
In constructing the scales, the author constantly reminded himself that a Western theoretical perspective was being applied to a Third World setting. Moreover, he took cognizance of Filipino social scientists' apprehension about the use of Western models to interpret the Filipino's non-Western mind (Feliciano 1965; Mercado 1975). A happy medium, however, appears possible as demonstrated by the successful application of Western concepts such as the Synanon and Daytop models by Filipino therapists in rehabilitation therapy (Mercado 1975). The key to this success was the adaptation and Filipinization of the Western constructs in order to make them more compatible with the Filipino character.

Hence, guided by the notions of adaptation and Filipinization, this writer conducted a thoughtful assessment of the viability of assuming homologous constructs in the Filipinos' cognitive schema. The central question which pervaded this reflection was: Were there parallels of the Western constructs in the Philippine context? After mobilizing his experiences as a Filipino native and his sociological training, the author responded in the affirmative.

For instance, personal powerlessness found its conceptual parallel in the Filipinos' deep streak of fatalism (Manglapus 1965) manifested in expressions frequently invoked in everyday discourse. These expressions include "Bahala ang Diyos", "destino", and "suwerte." "Bahala ang Diyos", literally translated as "Let God take care", is an eloquent manifestation of the Filipino devout Christian religiosity (Constantino 1966). It refers to an amalgam of fatalistic resignation and faith in the divine Providence. These words are commonly uttered by Filipinos beleaguered by widespread poverty and natural calamities occurring in merciless regularity (Torpigliani 1988; Constantino 1966). Likewise connoting religious roots is the concept of "destino" which is a belief in predestination. "Suwerte", literally translated as "luck", can either be
attributed to the "hand of God" or the confluence of circumstances which bring about windfall benefits or advantages (Merino 1965).

The construct, valuation of achievement, struck a familiar chord in the Filipino people's sensibilities. Its Philippine counterpart is "pagsusumikap" which refers to the high premium placed on accomplishment, striving, and effort in the hierarchy of the Philippine value system (Constantino 1966; Andres 1985). "Magsumikap ka" (You work hard to achieve something) is a common admonition and challenge heard by many poor Filipino children from their parents as well as by Filipinos perceived by their families and associates as lazy, unmotivated, and aimless.

Intertwined with valuation of achievement is the construct, propensity for self-improvement. To the Filipino people, "pagsusumikap" bears fruit in "asenso" which evokes images of "improvement", "progress" or "development." (Landa Jocano 1974; Andres 1985). Filipinos deeply appreciate verbal and nonverbal manifestations of self-improvement or personal development efforts. As a rule, these efforts are actively encouraged and supported by a vast network of kin, associates, and neighbors.

The construct, self-esteem, founds its match in the Filipino's famed "amor propio", literally translated as "love of self." Filipinos will do almost anything to build or preserve their feelings of self-worth. In fact, observers have described Filipinos as vain, image-conscious, and acutely sensitive to others' impressions of themselves (Vinacke 1949; Merino 1965). Overzealous attempts to protect "amor propio" may predispose a Filipino toward extreme measures.

The construct, success expectancies, found its parallel in the Bicolanos' notion of "guila-guila", Bicol culture scholar and professor Merito Espinas (1992) explains. Bicol residents who have taken professional examinations, applied for jobs or promotions, or are embarking on new endeavors are most likely to be confronted by family, friends, and neighbors with the all-too-predictable question, "Ano lamang ang guila-guila?" (roughly
translated as "What are your prospects?"). Because most Bicolanos do not consider
this query as a violation of privacy, unwritten rules of interaction demand some kind of
answer from the interviewee.

Lastly, the gender-role construct found relevance in the ongoing discourse on the
impact of patriarchy on Filipino women's societal participation. Patriarchy, for instance,
assumes that Filipino woman is physically weaker than her male counterpart. This
preconception thus dictates that she be restricted to less demanding and less risky
contexts such as the housekeeping, childcare, and subordinate occupational positions
(Sobritchea 1990).

Following Bentler's (1992) treatment of the variables anomie, education,
powerlessness, and occupational status index in his analysis of the stability of
alienation, this researcher treated the constructs measured by the scales as observed
variables. This approach is based on the assumption that the scale items which were
conceptualized in accord with these constructs could be meaningfully aggregated into
scales measuring the constructs. The assumption of aggregation into meaningful
constructs was tested through factor analysis and, subsequently, the determination of
each scale's internal consistency and criterion validity.

As a validity measure, the concept of criterion validity was chosen. Criterion
validity is the correlation between a measure and some criterion variable of interest
(Bohrnstedt, 1983). Based on the relationships specified in the core model, it was
hypothesized that the variables in the core model would all be positively correlated with
one another.

The scales were incorporated in a questionnaire, written in English and Bicol (the
native language of the respondents), which was prepared taking into account local
conditions and cultural factors. The Bicol version was used as a formal interview guide
by field workers to obtain responses from less literate and older women. Questionnaire leaflets were distributed to the more literate respondents.

The Culture-Sensitive Personal Powerlessness Scale (CSPPS)

The formulation of the CSPPS items (Appendix A) which measured the respondents' level of personal powerlessness was guided by Ball's (1965) and Abramson et al.'s (1978) definitions of personal powerlessness, Pearlin et al.'s (1981) Mastery Scale, and Kohn and Schooler's (1983) Powerlessness Scale. More importantly, the scales incorporated the localisms, folk sayings, proverbs, and beliefs of the Bicolanos regarding work, striving, accomplishment, initiative and related concepts. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with each of 9 items using five response alternatives, to wit: strongly disagree, disagree, not sure, agree, and strongly agree. Item scores varied from 1 to five for a possible CSPPS range of 9 to 45, with low scores reflecting a strong perception of personal powerlessness and high scores reflecting a strong sense of self-efficacy. Cronbach's alpha, as a measure of internal consistency, was 0.82. Significant positive correlations (Appendix B) of CSPPS scores with the PSIS (0.47), the SES (0.37), the SCX1 (0.30), and the VAS (0.53) indicated the scale's criterion validity.

The Self-Esteem Scale (SES)

This researcher's version of the Self-Esteem Scale (SES) followed Rosenberg's (1965) conceptualization of self-esteem as a person's global feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance. Alternatively, self-esteem refers to a general favorable attitude toward oneself. This 11-item scale was scaled and scored like the CSPPS. High scores represented higher self-esteem while low scores represented low self-esteem. Cronbach's alpha was 0.81. Significant correlations with the CSPPS (0.37), the VAS (0.46), the SCX1 (0.30), and the PSIS (0.25) indicated the scale's criterion validity.
The Valuation of Achievement Scale (VAS)

DeCharms et al.'s (1955) v-Achievement construct served as basis for the construction of the VAS. DeCharms and associates defined the v-achievement construct as a learned and consciously recognized motive of placing great importance to achievement-related activities. The measurement of this construct is through self-ratings of achievement drive and, thus, has to be distinguished from McClelland's (1953) n-Achievement (need achievement) construct which is measured indirectly from content analyses of creative stories. Atkinson (1964) defined the n-Ach construct as a "capacity to experience pride in accomplishment." Alternatively, achievement need may be defined as the desire to overcome obstacles and attain a high standard, to excel oneself, to rival and surpass others, to increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent (Murray 1938 cited by Weiner 1985, p. 180).

The 10-item VAS was scaled and scored like the CSPPS. High scores manifested a higher premium on achievement-oriented behavior while low scores manifested a lack of importance given to achievement-oriented behavior. Cronbach's alpha was 0.87. Significant positive correlations with the CSPPS (0.53), the SES (0.46), the SCXI (.23), and the PSIS (0.48) indicated the scale's criterion validity.

The Success Expectancies Index (SCXI)

The Success Expectancies Scale (SCXI) measured the respondents' personal beliefs about or subjective anticipation of success or failure in on-going or future tasks, projects, or assignments. The 6-item SCXI was scored like the CSPPS. High scores and low scores reflected high and low success expectations, respectively. Cronbach's alpha was 0.67. Significant positive correlations with the CSPPS (0.30), the SES (0.30), the VAS (0.23), and the PSIS (0.22) indicated the scale's criterion validity.
The Propensity for Self-Improvement Scale (PSIS)

The Propensity for Self-Improvement Scale (PSIS) and question numbers 23 thru 29 in Appendix C measured the respondents' inclination to engage in achievement-oriented behaviors with the end of self-development or self-improvement. The 6-item PSIS was scaled and scored like the CSPPS. High scores indicated strong tendencies toward achievement-oriented behaviors while low scores indicated weak tendencies. Cronbach's alpha was 0.88. Significant positive correlations with the CSPPS (0.47), the VAS (0.48), the SCXI (0.22) and the SES (0.25) indicated the scale's criterion validity.

Faith-in-God Scale (FIGS)

The FIGS and OWOS scales items were derived from relevant biblical passages. The FIGS measured the respondents' subjective assessments of their strength of faith and trust in an omniscient God. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement to each of seven items scaled and scored like the CSPPS. High scores indicated a strong perception of faith in God while low scores indicated a weak perception. Cronbach's alpha was 0.81. A significant positive correlation (0.59) with the OWOS indicated the scale's criterion validity. This is based on the position that faith in God complements a strong spirituality (Smith 1949; Elhard 1968).

Other-Worldly Orientation Scale (OWOS)

The OWOS was designed to measure attitudes toward the importance of acquiring material wealth and power as opposed to the priority accorded to spiritual values. This 9-item scale was scaled and scored like the CSPPS. High scores reflected a greater importance placed on spiritual values while low scores reflected a materialistic orientation. Cronbach's alpha was 0.77. Criterion validity was indicated by a significant correlation with FIGS (0.59) consistent with the ideas of Elhard (1968) and Smith (1949).
**Sex-Role Attitude Scale (SRAS)**

The Sex-Role Attitude Scale (SRAS) tapped into the respondents' attitudes toward gender roles. This 7-item scale was scaled like the CSPPS. High scores reflected a traditional position on gender roles (man is dominant, woman is subordinate) while low scores reflected a favorable attitude toward more egalitarian relationships between the genders. Cronbach's alpha was 0.84. Criterion validity was manifested by significant negative correlation with the SCXI (-0.15), guided by the findings of Danker-Brown and Baucom (1982) and Baucom (1983).

**Exogenous Variables**

The following section lists all exogenous variables with their operationalizations corresponding to the questions in the interview schedule (Appendix C):

1. Achievement valuation (VAS)

2. **Knowledge base variables:**
   - (a) educational attainment (#3)
   - (b) possession of marketable skills (#10)
   - (c) knowledge of government agencies (#s 11 and 12)

3. **Political participation variables:**
   - (a) Awareness of the feminist movement (#s 15a, 15b, 16a, 16b, 18, 19)
   - (b) Type of organizations joined (#s 20a, 20b, 16c, 17a)
   - (c) Extent of participation in organizational activities (#s 21, 22, 13a, 13b, 14a, 14b)

4. **Religiosity variables:**
   - (a) Declaration of faith in Divine Providence (FIGS)
   - (b) Spiritual orientation (OWOS)
   - (c) Religious affiliation (#6)
Exogenous variables (continued)

5. Socioeconomic status (#s 4 and 5)
6. Social support system (#s 8 and 9)
7. Gender-role attitudes (SRAS)

Sampling Method

Aiming to capture the widest range of socioeconomic conditions possible, this researcher chose the province of Albay among the six constituent provinces of the Bicol Peninsula. Research documenting marked differences in poverty incidence obtaining in Albay’s 17 municipalities (BUDFI 1990) guided this choice. Subsequently, the investigator selected the municipalities of Polangui, Guinobatan, and Camalig because these areas represented low (Polangui) and high (Guinobatan and Camalig) degrees of poverty, respectively (BUDFI 1990).

A multistage sampling strategy generated the final sample. Initially, barangays (villages) in each municipality were categorized into low- and high-poverty groups. In every municipality, two barangays from each category were randomly chosen, making for 12 clusters. Census enumeration provided data sources for the generation of lists of female residents aged 18 years or older. Each cluster contained 51 to 52 names that were randomly chosen, making for a total of 620 respondents.

Statistical Analysis

Bentler’s (1992) EQS path analysis program for structural equation models determined the adequacy of the proposed models. Bentler’s procedure not only evaluates the accuracy or fit of a proposed causal model, but also provides guidelines for altering a model by the addition of unanticipated causal paths or, conversely, by the
deletion of proposed theoretical links based on the actual empirical relationships that emerge from the data (Ichiyama 1993).

Parenthetically, structural equation models are generally multiple equation models with multiple dependent and independent variables. A structural equation is a regression equation in the context of a causal model. A sound model meets theoretical specifications and includes adequately operationalized relevant causal variables or constructs (Pratt & Schlaifer 1984).

Several statistics and indicators evaluated the adequacy of the hypothesized models. The key statistics were the probability value for the chi-square statistic (probability values beyond the cut-off of 0.05 indicate acceptance of the model), the Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit, Nonnormed Fit, and Comparative Fit Indices (values above 0.90 are desirable). Additional indicators consulted were the frequency distribution of the standardized residuals (symmetric distribution and values centered around zero are ideal), the residual covariance matrix (residuals should be small), and the parameter condition codes. In regard to the latter, the researcher checked for linear dependence among parameters, a sign of theoretical or empirical underidentification of the model (Bentler 1992). Linear dependence may also reflect computational problems which may render the solution unreliable.

The resulting coefficients of the measurement equations were evaluated for significance through the univariate large-sample normal z-test of the null hypothesis that a given parameter is zero (large values, e.g., exceeding +1.96 for a 0.05 test indicate that the structural coefficient is not zero).

The coefficient of determination which provides information on the amount of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the regressors was computed using the difference between 1 and the squared coefficient associated with the residual variable given in the standardized solution.
The Lagrange Multiplier and Wald tests evaluated the potential for model improvement. The former tests whether or not the restrictions imposed on the model were reasonable or appropriate while the latter determines whether sets of parameters treated as free in the model could in fact be simultaneously set to zero without substantial loss in model fit.

Bentler and Bonett's (1980) formula tested the equivalence of models being compared (e.g. a non-saturated model vs. a saturated model). Bentler and Bonett's analytical tool is a chi-square difference test between model residuals which assesses the importance of the parameters that differentiate models. The null hypothesis for this test is that the models being compared are equivalent.

Factor analysis ascertained unidimensionality. Cronbach's alpha served as the measure of internal consistency of the item clusters resulting from factor analysis.
CHAPTER V

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND STATISTICAL ESTIMATES

This section begins with the respondents' demographic profile followed by discussions of statistical estimates. Sample computations of indirect effects and multiple paths will be presented for both core and expanded models.

Respondents' Profile

On the average, the respondents showed self-efficacy (an average category score of 4.37 out of 5.00 as the most self-efficacious) rather than personal powerlessness, a strong motivation for self-improvement (4.25), a high regard for achievement (4.32), and high self-esteem (3.87). Success expectancies, however, were low (2.02). Respondents declared a strong faith in the Divine Providence (4.14 with 5.00 indicating the strongest faith) and a strong spiritual (4.47 with 5.00 as the most spiritual) rather than materialistic orientation (1.00 as the most materialistic). The women leaned toward traditional in sex-role attitudes (3.76 with 5.00 being the most traditional).

The respondents' ages ranged from 18 to 70 with an average of 36. Seventy percent were married. Only seven percent classified themselves as entrepreneurs or independent practitioners of professions. The rest considered themselves as employees, housewives, or domestics. About 75% fell below the poverty line. About 80 percent were employed. Of the unemployed, over three-fourths declared that they had
been unemployed for more than one year.

Overwhelmingly Roman Catholic by religious affiliation, less than 1% reported not attending religious services at all. More than half attended services at least twice a month. Only two percent saw religion as unimportant.

With over 40 percent of the women having attended college, over 90% read and accessed the mass media for purposes of self-improvement and were interested in learning new skills. About 60 percent were interested in furthering their education. More than 80% signified their willingness to find time to attend seminars, training programs, and self-development courses. Only six percent of the women reported not having any skills or not having engaged in any crafts or trades at all. Less than 10% expressed little or no interest in improving themselves.

Regarding membership in organizations, 80% reported being members of organizations. Of these members, 80% belonged to organizations with purely recreational objectives while 20% belonged to organizations with political or feminist orientations. Though the membership figure is high, only nine percent declared themselves as active participants during meetings. Relatedly, over 80% had no leadership experience at all and only 5% of the women had held elective offices overwhelmingly on the village level.

In terms of knowledge of the women's or feminist movement, 42% have either heard or read about the movement. Over three-fourths of the women have never heard of GABRIELA, one of the Philippines' most visible feminist organizations. Only 4% identified themselves as members of feminist organizations. However, over 80% expressed interest in becoming members of or helping organize these organizations.
In terms of knowledge of agencies and organizations, only 2% demonstrated total ignorance of government services. Over half of the respondents sought the assistance of at least one agency.

During times of crisis, 95% believed they had friends and relatives who could be counted on during times of crises. Roughly half felt they could count on four or more friends and relatives. About 80 percent shared their problems with other people in varying degrees.

The Core Model

The EQS estimation of the core model yielded an excellent fit which suggests that the model reproduced the observed covariances among the variables in the model with precision. This excellent fit was indicated by the chi-square value of 0.253 (degree of freedom=1) with a probability p=0.61 and fit indices ranging from 1.00 to 1.01. No linear dependency among the parameters was noted; the residual plot was very symmetric; and the covariance residuals were very small. All these were indicators of adequate model specification. Results of the Lagrange Multiplier and Wald tests indicated that the model as specified did not require any parameter modifications.

The hypothesized causal sequence obtained statistical support. As a predictor variable, personal powerlessness had significant positive, direct effects on self-esteem, success expectancies, and achievement-related attitudes; that is, the stronger the sense of personal powerlessness, the lower the self-esteem, the lower the success expectations, and the weaker the motivation to undertake self-improvement efforts (Appendix F, Table 18).

Significant indirect, positive effects of personal powerlessness were noted on success expectancies mediated by self-esteem (Appendix E, Fig. 3). As a mediating variable, personal powerlessness was a significant link in the positive, indirect effect of valuation of achievement on self-esteem (.533 x .166=.089; Appendix D, Table 2).
Along with the independent variables, success expectancies and valuation of achievement, personal powerlessness accounted for 30 percent of the variance in the dependent variable, propensity for self-improvement. With the predictor, valuation of achievement, personal powerlessness accounted for 23 percent of the variance in the self-esteem. Together with the predictors, self-esteem and valuation of achievement, personal powerlessness explained 14 percent of the variance in success expectancies (Appendix F, Table 18).

As a dependent variable, the sense of personal powerlessness was significantly, directly and positively affected by valuation of achievement (Appendix D, Table 2). The lower the respondents' valuation of achievement, the stronger their perception of personal powerlessness. By itself, valuation of achievement accounted for 29 percent of the variance in personal powerlessness, making it the single most powerful determinant of personal powerlessness (Appendix F, Table 18). Achievement valuation, in comparison with all other exogenous variables introduced in the expanded models, also yielded the largest direct and total effects on personal powerlessness (compare Table 2 with Tables 5 thru 16, Appendix D).

Valuation of achievement as an exogenous variable likewise had significant positive, direct effects on propensity for self-improvement and self-esteem (Appendix F, Table 17-B). Among the independent variables in the core model, achievement valuation produced the largest total effects on the propensity for self-improvement and self-esteem (compare Tables 1 thru 4, Appendix D). Together with personal powerlessness, achievement valuation accounted for the largest amount of variance in self-esteem among all other combinations of predictors (Appendix F, Table 18).

Significant positive, indirect effects of achievement valuation were also noted on propensity for self-improvement via multiple paths, to wit: via personal powerlessness (.535 x .282=.150), via personal powerlessness and success expectancies (.535 x .211
x .062=.0069), via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies (.535 x .166 x .217 x .062=.00119), via self-esteem and success expectancies (.374 x .217 x .062=.00503), and via success expectancies (.020 x .062=.00124) for a total of .165 (.150 + .0069 + .00119 + .00503 + .00124=.165; Appendix D, Table 2). Significant positive, indirect effects were seen on self-esteem via personal powerlessness (.535 x .166=.089) and on success expectancies via self-esteem (.374 x .217=.08) as well as via personal powerlessness (.535 x .168 x .217=.133) for a total of .213 (Appendix D, Table 2).

Comparing the core model and a saturated model which estimated all possible paths revealed the equivalence of the two models, per results of the chi-square difference test for model residuals. The basic and saturated models had an identical Comparative Fit Index of 1.0 suggesting a zero potential for model improvement (1.0 minus the fit index of the saturated model). Since the core model hypothesized fewer paths, its parsimony makes it the preferred model.

The Expanded Models

The introduction of exogenous variables in the core model produced expanded models all equivalent in fit to the core model as revealed by the chi-square difference test between model residuals. Further, all the other indicators of model adequacy stipulated in the methodology section showed that the expanded models adequately reproduced the observed covariances among the included variables (note fit indices in Appendix E, Figs. 4 thru 15).

The first section of the following discussion deals with the exogenous variables having significant, direct effects on personal powerlessness. This group of variables can
be construed as causal factors of personal powerlessness. The second section
discusses the exogenous variables producing significant, indirect effects on personal
powerlessness and/or significant, direct effects on the consequences of personal
powerlessness.

EXOGENOUS VARIABLES WITH SIGNIFICANT, DIRECT EFFECTS ON PERSONAL
POWERLESSNESS

This group of variables includes socioeconomic status and the variable clusters,
namely, religiosity and knowledge base factors.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

The lower the socioeconomic status of the women, the greater their sense of
powerlessness, the lower their self-esteem, and the lower their success expectancies
(Appendix F, Table 18-B). Significant positive, indirect effects were noted on valuation
of achievement (Appendix E, Fig. 4) through personal powerlessness; on success
expectancies through multiple paths, to wit: via personal powerlessness; via personal
powerlessness and achievement valuation; and via personal powerlessness, self-
esteem, and success expectancies; and on the propensity for self-improvement through
multiple paths, to wit: via personal powerlessness; via personal powerlessness and
achievement valuation; via personal powerlessness and success expectancies; and via
personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies. The same effects
were observed on self-esteem via personal powerlessness and via personal
powerlessness and achievement valuation.

RELIGIOSITY

This cluster includes professed faith in the Divine Providence, spiritual vs.
materialistic orientation, and membership in a particular religious denomination.
Professed faith in the Divine Providence

The weaker the expressed faith in God, the greater the sense of personal powerlessness, the lower the self-esteem, the lower the valuation of achievement, and the weaker the inclination toward self-improvement. Faith accounted for the largest amount of variance in achievement valuation among all other exogenous variables introduced in the expanded models (Appendix F, Table 22).

Significant positive, indirect effects on personal powerlessness were noted via valuation of achievement; on success expectancies via valuation of achievement, via personal powerlessness; and via personal powerlessness and self-esteem; on self-esteem via valuation of achievement; and on the propensity for self-improvement via personal powerlessness and via achievement valuation (Appendix E, Fig. 5).

Spiritual Orientation

Respondents who placed materialistic concerns over spiritual matters showed significantly greater sense of personal powerlessness, lower valuation of achievement, lower self-esteem, and lower success expectations relative to those who valued the spiritual over the material. Moreover, spiritual orientation, along with achievement valuation, accounted for the largest amount of variance in personal powerlessness among all other combination of predictors (Appendix F, Table 24).

Significant positive, indirect effects were noted on personal powerlessness (Appendix E, Fig. 6) through achievement valuation; on self-esteem through achievement valuation and through personal powerlessness; and on the propensity for self-improvement through multiple paths, to wit: via achievement valuation; via personal powerlessness; via personal powerlessness and success expectancies; via personal powerlessness and achievement valuation; and via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies. The same effects were noted on success
expectancies through two paths, namely, via personal powerlessness and via personal powerlessness and self-esteem

Religious Denomination

Roman Catholic respondents, as opposed to those belonging to other religious denominations, were shown to possess a significantly higher self-efficacy scores (Appendix F, Table 26). Being Roman Catholic also produced significant positive, indirect effects on self-esteem mediated by personal powerlessness; on success expectancies mediated by personal powerlessness and by personal powerlessness and self-esteem; and on the propensity for self-improvement mediated by personal powerlessness and by personal powerlessness and self-esteem (Appendix E, Fig. 7).

KNOWLEDGE BASE

This cluster includes educational attainment, marketable skills possessed by the respondents, and their knowledge of services rendered by government agencies.

Educational Attainment

The lower the women's educational attainment, the greater their sense of personal powerlessness. Conversely, the lower the educational attainment, the greater the sense of personal powerlessness. Educational attainment also produced significant direct effects on self-esteem and success expectancies (Appendix F, Table 28). Educational attainment also had significant positive, indirect effects on personal powerlessness mediated by valuation of achievement; on self-esteem via personal powerlessness and valuation of achievement; and on success expectancies through multiple paths, namely, via personal powerlessness and self-esteem, via self-esteem, and via achievement valuation (Appendix E, Fig. 8).
Possession of marketable skills

The fewer skills the respondents professed to have, the greater their personal powerlessness, the lower their valuation of achievement, success expectancies, and self-esteem (Appendix F, Table 30).

Significant positive, indirect effects of skills were noted on personal powerlessness via valuation of achievement; on self-esteem via valuation of achievement and via personal powerlessness; on success expectancies via achievement valuation and via personal powerlessness and self-esteem; and on the propensity for self-improvement through multiple paths, to wit: via achievement valuation; via personal powerlessness; via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies; and via personal powerlessness and success expectancies (Appendix E, Fig. 9).

Knowledge of government agency services

The fewer public or government organizations and agencies the respondents were aware of, the stronger their sense of personal powerlessness, the lower their valuation of achievement, the lower their success expectancies, and the weaker their propensity for personal development (Appendix F, Table 32).

Significant positive, indirect effects were seen on personal powerlessness through achievement valuation; on propensity for self-improvement through multiple paths, to wit: via achievement valuation, via personal powerlessness, via personal powerlessness and self-esteem; and via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies. The same effects were also noted on self-esteem via achievement valuation and via personal powerlessness and on success expectancies via achievement valuation and via personal powerlessness (Appendix E, Fig. 10).
Summary of Significant Direct Effects

The five exogenous variables which produced the largest significant, direct effects on personal powerlessness were, in the order of their magnitudes, the following: achievement valuation, spiritual orientation, socioeconomic status, knowledge of government agency services and faith. The variables with the largest total effects on personal powerlessness were, in the order of their magnitudes, the following: achievement valuation, spiritual orientation, faith, and knowledge of government agency services (see Tables 1 thru 16, Appendix D).

EXOGENOUS VARIABLES WITH SIGNIFICANT, INDIRECT EFFECTS ON PERSONAL POWERLESSNESS AND DIRECT EFFECTS ON ITS CONSEQUENCES

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

This cluster includes awareness of the feminist movement, club membership, and extent of participation during meetings.

Awareness of the Women's Movement

Respondents who were unaware of the existence of the women's movement, showed significantly lower self-efficacy, self-esteem, lower valuation of achievement, and lower success expectancies than those who were aware of the movement (Appendix F, Table 34). Significant positive, indirect effects were noted on personal powerlessness through valuation of achievement; on self-esteem through valuation of achievement and through personal powerlessness; on success expectancies through achievement valuation, through personal powerlessness, through personal powerlessness and self-esteem, through achievement valuation and personal
powerless, and through achievement valuation, personal powerlessness, and self-esteem. The same effects were noted on the propensity for self-improvement through multiple paths, to wit: via achievement valuation; via achievement valuation and personal powerlessness; via self-esteem and success expectancies; via personal powerlessness and success expectancies; and via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies (Appendix E, Fig. 11).

Nature of Organizations Joined (Political vs. "Clubhouse")

Respondents who were affiliated with the "clubhouse" type or organizations mainly recreational or avocational in its objectives manifested significantly lower success expectancies compared to those who were members of organizations with public service, humanitarian, feminist, or political renewal missions (Appendix F, Table 36). No significant indirect effects on powerlessness were observed.

Participation in Organizational Activities

Respondents who rarely spoke up during meetings or who had minimal leadership exposure possessed significantly lower success expectancies than the active participants (Appendix F, Table 38). Significant positive, indirect effects were observed on the women's propensity for self-improvement mediated by personal powerlessness, by success expectancies, by personal powerlessness and success expectancies; and by personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies (Appendix E, Fig. 13).

SOCIAL SUPPORT SYSTEM

Women who reported having fewer relatives and friends who could be counted on during crises had significantly lower achievement valuation relative to those who
reported more relatives (Appendix F, Table 40). Significant positive, indirect effects were observed on personal powerlessness via achievement valuation; on the propensity for self-improvement through multiple paths, to wit: via achievement valuation; via achievement valuation and personal powerlessness; via personal powerlessness and success expectancies; and via personal powerlessness, self-esteem, and success expectancies. The same effects were seen on self-esteem via achievement valuation; via personal powerlessness; and via achievement valuation and personal powerlessness (Appendix E, Fig. 14).

GENDER-ROLE ATTITUDES

Respondents who expressed more traditional sex-role attitudes had significantly lower success expectancies relative to those who declared a more liberal orientation. However, the more traditional women showed significantly higher achievement valuation and higher self-esteem than their liberal counterparts (Appendix F, Table 42). No significant indirect effects were noted (Appendix E, Fig. 15).
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Generally, findings supported the cognitive perspective of behavior which underscores the importance of the mediating influence of cognitive representation as a bridge between the stimulus situation and the consequent behavior or attitude (Baldwin 1969). Specifically, the investigation provided empirical evidence for the cross-cultural relevance of Weiner's (1972) and Atkinson's (1964) models positing that attributional style yields affective and expectancy effects which, in turn, influence perceptions.

Consistent with Weiner and Atkinson's proposition that attributions can have affective consequences, this study showed how personal powerlessness generates low self-esteem. This finding demonstrating that powerlessness is an activator of affect (Kaufman 1989) corroborated research showing that affective reactions are maximized when success and failure are attributed to controllable, internal elements, particularly effort. (Beckman 1970; Lanzetta & Hannah 1969; Weiner & Kukla 1970). Illustratively, individuals feel the greatest pride when they overcome personal shortcomings (lack of ability) by hard work and consequently become successful. On the other hand, the greatest shame is felt when their potentials are not fulfilled because of their lack of effort (Weiner 1972).

Affective response can also be affected by comparison with others (Morse & Gergen 1970; Rosenberg 1965). Individuals who believe that desired outcomes are not
contingent on their own acts but are contingent on acts of relevant others will show lower self-esteem than individuals who believe that desired outcomes are neither contingent on their own acts nor contingent on the acts of others (Morse & Gergen 1970; Rosenberg 1965). For instance, an unintelligent student who fails an exam his peers pass will have lower self-esteem than a student who fails an exam that all of his peers fail as well (Abramson et al. 1978).

The difference in levels of self-esteem arising from differing attributions can be explained, thus: Personal powerlessness leads people to feel useless or think that they are no good at all at times. Personal powerlessness may also make people believe that they are failures or do not have much to be proud of. They feel that they are helpless victims of fate who frequently are unable to act in their own interest. If they fail to achieve a goal, they unjustifiably feel that others are critical and rejecting. Confidence in their own abilities is shaky (Johnson & Ferguson 1990). Anderson (1974) noted that unless a person learns to provide positive feedback to oneself when the environment is indifferent or oppositional, his or her capacity to move ahead is seriously curtailed. As this study demonstrated, people who have a sense of self-efficacy respect themselves, feel capable, are satisfied about themselves and believe that they have a number of good qualities. On the other hand, people with a strong sense of personal powerlessness have poor self-images, a finding which resonates with Lefcourt's (1976) contention that an individual who is deprived of his sense of self-determination is unable to develop a definite measure of his own worth.

Personal powerlessness tends to make people feel useless or think that they are no good at all. Unable to provide positive feedback to themselves when the environment is indifferent or oppositional, their capacity to move ahead is seriously curtailed (Anderson 1974). On the other hand, those harboring self-efficacy demonstrate a commensurate high self-esteem, as was the case with the respondents.
The strong feelings of self-worth emanate from the capacity to overcome obstacles and effectively influence outcomes through factors perceived to be within one's control.

Consonant with the sequelae proposed in the core model, findings indicated that self-esteem, in turn, impacted success expectancies. Following Rotter et al. (1962) and Phares (1957), this investigation showed that attributions of consequences to controllable factors such as effort or concentration coupled with feelings of self-worth inspire self-confidence. In turn, self-confidence translates into high success expectancies in future endeavors. On the other hand, attributions to uncontrollable forces such as luck or fate and the resultant negative self-images breed self-doubt and insecurity. This perception of incompetence consequently leads to pessimistic views of the future.

The finding on the linkage between self-esteem and success expectancies resonates with those of Phares (1957), Rotter et al. (1961), and Meyer (1970) who all observed how expectancy shifts following success and failure are functions of the kind of ascriptions made. For instance, if a woman attributes a successful outcome to luck, an uncontrollable external factor, her future success expectancies will not increase. As this study indicated, on the other hand, if she attributes success to skill or effort, which are controllable factors, her expectancies will increase. Parenthetically, there is evidence showing that women generally attribute good performance to luck while men attribute good performance to skill (Deaux & Emswiller 1974).

It must be noted, however, that while success expectancies increase to a greater extent among people who attribute success to stable factors relative to those who attribute success to unstable factors, the former also experience greater decrements in success expectancies following failures relative to the latter (Phares 1957; Rotter et al. 1961; Meyer 1970). Between males and females, however, females show increased
helplessness and lower expectancies for future success than boys following failure (Dweck & Bush 1976).

Research shows that females' early learning experiences predispose them to a depressive attributional style and learned helplessness, both of which minimize the impact that controllable outcomes have on the individual's general expectancies for uncontrollability (Blechman 1984). Relatedly, Horner (1968) posits that "fear of success", a stable personality characteristic earned in early childhood, may inhibit women's achievement behavior, particularly if a conflict exists between the feminine image and competitively derived achievement (O'Leary 1977). Research, however, has yet to establish whether women's reluctance to strive for success in traditionally masculine occupations is due to personality dispositions, to motives, or to a learned response to social pressure.

As hypothesized, this investigation revealed that success expectancies significantly impacted the motivation for self-improvement. This finding corroborates studies showing that people with high expectations for success tend to perform better on achievement tasks (Feather 1966). This effect may be the result of a favorable past history of success. However, research which controlled for history of success indicates that the expectancy effect can be observed on people who have been led to believe they will do well or poorly in future tasks independent of their past performance levels (Feather 1966). Along a similar vein, Taylor (1989) observed that respondents with high success expectancies traceable to self-esteem and self-efficacy expressed the strongest desire to pursue self-improvement efforts. Accounting for these chain of cognitions, Taylor contended that people who believe in personal control likewise hold positive views of themselves. This combination results in greater optimism which
enables these individuals to attempt tasks they might otherwise avoid. Moreover, optimistic people tend to be more persistent at these tasks. This combination of perseverance and optimism increases the likelihood of attaining goals, thus, the strong motivation to take on challenging tasks. Similarly, Lefcourt (1976) posited that attributional style can predict attempts to better one's life by acting on the environment. Illustratively, tuberculosis patients and prisoners who were classified as internals retained more information pertinent to improving their conditions relative to those who were externals in terms of locus of control (Seeman & Evans 1962; Seeman 1963). In accounting for this relationship, Webster and Sobieszek (1974) posited that a low self-evaluation may decrease the willingness to perform in the future. In contrast, people who have positive views of themselves tend to attempt tasks that they might otherwise avoid and work harder and longer on these tasks. The perseverance and the optimism increases the likelihood that their goals will be attained that, in turn, enhances the motivation to perform.

In summary, an attributional style which hinges on a lack of belief in personal control generates self-defeating attitudes and affect (Marone 1992) such as low self-esteem, low success expectations, and maintenance of the status quo manifested in procrastination or lack of initiative. Alternatively, an individual with a sense of personal powerlessness faces obstacles with negative self-talk, decreased effort, and lack of strategic planning. On the other hand, an attributional style characterized by self-efficacy exemplified by the Bicolana respondents yields constructive affects such as a strong sense of self-worth, optimism, and a strong drive for self-improvement.

Most strikingly, the respondents' display of constructive cognitions contradicted the well-established connection between poverty and powerlessness. Articulating the dominant view, Lefcourt (1976) and Lewis (1965) contended that people who
continuously live in adverse circumstances perceive life as being subject to external forces beyond their control. In the words of Manuel, the unsuccessful shoe manufacturer in Lewis' (1965) classic ethnographic account of poverty's corrosive effects:

To me, one's destiny is controlled by a mysterious hand that moves all things. Only for the select, do things turn out as planned; to those of us who are born to be tamale eaters, heaven sends only tamales. We plan and plan and some little thing happens to wash it all away.

Clues to the intriguing finding of self-efficacy amidst poverty can be gleaned from a comparison of the effects exogenous variables exerted on the personal powerlessness variable. Decomposition of effects analysis revealed how the adverse consequences of a low socioeconomic status were counteracted by the stronger impact of the Bicolanas' highly favorable attitudes toward achievement, high educational attainment, knowledge of government agencies, strong religious faith, and spirituality (Appendix G, Table 43).

Supporting Atkinson's (1964) model, this research revealed that among the exogenous variables examined, achievement valuation produced the strongest direct and total effects on personal powerlessness. This finding corroborates research indicating that individuals low in achievement needs seldom attribute differential effort, a controllable factor, as a causal factor for success or failure (Kukla 1970; Weiner & Kukla 1970; Weiner & Potepan 1970). Conversely, individuals who place a great value on achievement usually attribute their success or failure to the efforts they had invested in their undertakings.

This study also demonstrated that achievement valuation significantly enhanced the respondents' self-esteem, propensity for self-improvement, and success expectancies. These observations support Weiner's (1972) argument that individuals
with high achievement motivation are more likely to engage in achievement-oriented activities because they have experienced greater positive affect for success. This positive affect can, in turn, be traced to an attributional style premised on controllable factors such as effort and task concentration. Continuing the sequelae, the positive affect results in high success expectancies, which remain high even following failures (Fish & Karabenick 1971). This sustained optimism indicative of persistence can be due to an attribution of lack of effort, a controllable dimension, as the cause of failure rather than deficiency in ability which is a relatively an uncontrollable dimension (Weiner & Kukla 1970). Optimism consequently results in an increased probability of achievement-oriented behaviors (Weiner 1972).

The Bicolanas' positive achievement orientation is consistent with that component of Philippine society's traditional values, conventions, and legal system which generally support women's participation in the social and economic life of the community over and above their domestic responsibilities (Fox 1965). Bicolanas, like most Filipinos, learn early in life the value of striving and the high status bestowed on individuals who have successfully transcended prior socioeconomic disadvantages. Filipino children are constantly made aware of successful people whose accomplishments and prestige serve as challenges and standards for emulation. Not surprisingly, this unequivocal emphasis on the desirability of accomplishments has produced among the respondents a perception of effective control over life's events.

The great importance placed by Bicolanas on achievement emerges from constant encouragement and prodding received from a family and an extended kinship system. Recall that respondents who had a wider network of supportive family members, relatives, and friends had significantly stronger achievement orientation than those with limited access to social support. This finding corroborated studies demonstrating the positive impact of social ties to other individuals (e.g. Wan 1982;
Wilcox 1981; Dean & Lin 1977; Hirsh 1980; Cobb 1976). Related research demonstrates that certain characteristics of women appear to facilitate these effects. Women are more sensitive than men to social interactions, are more giving in these interactions, develop closer and more extensive social networks (Eisenberg & Lennon 1983; Belle 1982; Wheeler & Nezlock 1977), discuss feelings more easily and develop more intimate relationships with other women than men (Maccoby & Jacklin 1974).

Women are all the better because of these proclivities. Illustratively, Vanfossen (1986) who observed that reciprocity and affirmation from husbands most strongly enhanced their wives sense of personal mastery, self-esteem and decreased the probability of depression as well. Moreover, women with clinical depression and suicidal tendencies become more susceptible to treatment once these women realize the barriers they have set against friendship and the possibility of it enriching their lives (Block & Greenberg 1985). Relatedly, Stein and Rappaport (1986) observed that women who reported the fewest mental health problems had contact with a diverse network, while having a few intimates who they feel can be counted on to listen to their problems without fear of negative consequences. This finding is corroborated by Lerner (1986) who concluded that interactions are supportive to the extent they undermine self-blaming. This means that supportive interactions make individuals feel they are not alone and that the situations they face are shared situations. Supportive interactions also underplay personal inadequacies but emphasize external problems whose solutions depend on connecting with other people. It is, therefore, not surprising to note that the most effective advocates of causes experience more support and multiple types of supportive exchanges from family, friends, and coworkers (Bond & Kelly 1984).

While the evidence for the adaptive value of social support is overwhelming, it is important to consider that social support can be a source of stress as well (Stein & Rappaport 1986). As the size of one's social networks increases, so does this person's
vulnerability to psychological distress as the potential for experiencing negative life events increases (Hobfoll 1986). It appears, however, that this is a reasonable risk to take in view of the significantly richer payoff in the form of a strong sense of personal mastery, high self-esteem, better mental health, and efficacy in advocacy roles.

Nowhere is the Filipinos' high regard for achievement more dramatically manifested than in the Filipinos' high priority given to their children's education. Like most Filipinos, Bicolanas view education as the "royal road" to upward social mobility. Poor parents, in particular, consider education as the only legacy they can leave their children. Hence, poor parents work the fields under tropical heat or torrential rains for long hours, forego luxuries, and make numerous sacrifices of heroic proportions in order to invest in their children's education. Such efforts, this investigation revealed, had not been in vain. Forty percent of the respondents went to college. Moreover, an impressive 94% possessed knowledge of different crafts and marketable skills.

The Bicolanas' noteworthy educational achievements have resulted in strong perceptions of self-efficacy giving credence to the adage that knowledge is power (Meditationes Sacrae 1597). As Vann (1948) posited, education produces "makers" or people who think of life "as something to be created by their efforts." Indeed, even if people choose to control their environment or even if others grant them control, individuals cannot experience mastery if they lack the skills and knowledge required in a given situation.

Salient features of the respondents' knowledge base included their possession of marketable skills and their awareness of the existence of government agencies. In a country of double-digit unemployment rate, chronic underemployment, and dirt-cheap wages, incremental earning power contributed by a trade or craft cannot be overemphasized. Among Filipino women bound by household duties, this income-generating ability validates the popular conception of the Filipino woman's control of
family funds as the base of their power in the home. When income is low, it matters little who holds the purse (Gonzalez 1977). With higher incomes, however, women acquire the freedom and power to decide on the allocation of available resources. Going beyond choices predetermined by demands of survival, women can genuinely exercise the privileges of being treasurers of the family.

Supplementing the respondents' marketable skills was their knowledge of government agencies. Where basic needs are unmet by family resources, the ability to secure assistance from the appropriate agencies becomes critical. Such knowledge significantly reduces the helplessness emanating from ignorance and the uncertainty it breeds. Kidd (1978) would account for this outcome by arguing that information helps develop a self so constituted and so self-understood as to deal with reality effectively. Concurring, Shreve (1989) reflected that even if women today have a wider latitude of choice, choice without knowledge, information, or consciousness is not really choice. These ideas reinforce educators' belief about the power of learning to make people "masters of their own destiny" (Coady 1950). In control of their lives, people tap their energies of individuality (De Mott as cited by Gross 1977) and solidify their sense of purpose (Livingstone 1945).

The coping repertoire of Bicolanas extended beyond secular competencies and mortal support systems. Bicolanas are known for their deeply rooted religiosity that this investigation has shown to have substantially enhanced their self-efficacy, self-esteem, and motivation for self-improvement. These findings caught this investigator by surprise. Initially, following Sered (1992), this writer posited that faith in God implies surrendering or entrusting one's life to a power greater than one's own, thus, decreasing the individual's perception of control over outcomes. Further, this writer proposed that a person's belief in the superiority of spiritual goals over materials goals will likewise decrease a person's perception of control over outcomes because this person will tend
to consider worldly accomplishments or conditions as merely a means to a greater reward to be enjoyed beyond this earthly life. As Manglapus (1965) contended, if the future is in the hands of fate and gods, life and natural environment are, therefore, to be submitted to and never to be mastered. Nature is to be feared and obeyed, never to be controlled.

The supposition that religious beliefs can exacerbate feelings of personal powerlessness was bolstered by the idea that the Catholicism, the Philippines' dominant religion, fostered the ideology of female domesticity through preaching which encouraged Filipinas to become "excellent daughters, housewives, mothers and servants of God". This emphasis borrowed heavily from the three basic images of women by the Church Fathers-the woman as whore, wife, and virgin (Ruether 1972). As a whore, woman represent sinful carnality. As wife, woman is defined as submissive body, obedient to her "head", servile and meek even under unjust treatment. As a virgin, considered to be the highest ideal of life, woman rises to spirituality and equality with the male but only at the expense of crushing out of her being all her female "natures" (Ruether 1972). These teachings from the pulpit were reinforced by Spanish colonial education which stressed women's obedience and subservience to males such as priests, colonial officials, their fathers, husbands, and elder brothers. Young women's education during the Spanish regime was limited to rudimentary reading and arithmetic, home crafts and Christian doctrine. No further training was necessary because women's "sphere of action was within the three German Ks, kirche, kuche and kinder—that is, church, kitchen and children" (Mendoza-Guazon 1928).

The other side of the argument, however, posits that faith and self-efficacy are not incompatible. Elhard (1968) proposed that even the most theocentric versions of faith concede some response, some measure of mastery by a man in his own destiny because response is inseparable from the human identity. For a man to be real for
himself, he must self-consciously live his life, not have it lived for him. Further, Elhard recognized the paradoxical nature of faith when he maintains that in faith, people admit their powerlessness. However, this admission is not a projection of their need for centering their world solely in themselves onto God and then "borrows" god's great egocentric identity by being one of "His boys". It is rather the power to turn everything in the flux of experience into a sponsorship of meaning and identity. It is the real mastery of the world by being in the world, not a cheap mastery in the splendid isolation above the world. Concurring, Smith (1949) asserted that having faith allows people to tap into the spiritual world. This world acts as a great cosmic storehouse which generates creativity, purpose, and power not only to live one's own life but also to become creator, purposer, and power-giver. By believing in a most powerful Other, the faithful possess a strong coping mechanism that cultivates optimism (Arboleda 1993).

A strong spiritual orientation complemented the positive impact of faith on the respondents' self-efficacy. People who believe that there is more to life than material reality have access to meanings that material values cannot provide (Arboleda 1993). They see beyond suffering and material satisfactions brought about by everyday life. This awareness of transcendent realities provide them a "reason" for their trials and inner satisfactions which material values cannot provide. When individuals' needs for the transcendent are satisfied, they manage to focus their inner resources on the tasks ahead (Torpigliani 1987).

Findings also indicated that faith in God and a strong spiritual orientation produced significant effects on success expectancies. Torpigliani (1987) posited that women of faith hold positive dispositions that reduce problematic situations to manageable proportions. Similarly, Niebuhr (1986) suggested that an adequate religion always inspires an ultimate optimism. Christianity's optimism, Niebuhr continued, is
based upon a faith in a transcendent center of meaning that is neither meaningless nor chaotic.

Faith and a strong spiritual orientation also yielded positive effects on achievement valuation, self-esteem and propensity for self-improvement. In explaining the impact on self-esteem, Schuller (1985) argued that the positive attitude engendered by faith compels people to give themselves all the motivation possible to maintain self-confidence. Regarding the impact on achievement valuation, Schuller further stated that faith is striving for excellence and that outstanding effort is "faith in action." Concerning self-improvement, Schuller argued that the walk of faith calls one to improve oneself constantly, consistently, and continually.

Aside from faith and spiritual orientation, the other religious variable which affected personal powerlessness directly was religious denomination. Roman Catholic respondents manifested a significantly stronger sense of self-efficacy. This finding supported Featherman (1971) who noted that Catholics show positive motivations toward work as having instrumental or extrinsic value. Christianity, therefore, can be something more than a belief system that draws people away from the real world toward a never-never land "above" or "beyond" (Ruether 1972). Christianity is not an other-worldly religion, but is thoroughly this-worldly (Niebuhr 1986). As such, Christianity has the potential to subvert personal powerlessness through its ability to teach people on the experiential level that things have been different and might be different in the future (Lerner 1986).

The importance of labeling oneself as a member of a particular religious community, therefore, cannot be overemphasized. Parenthetically, recall that over half of the respondents attended church with regularity. One's work ethic, morality, and attitudes are not cultivated in the private sphere as much as it is arrived at through one's interaction with others, through identifying oneself as being "this" and not "that" (Miller
The very act of typifying oneself as belonging to a particular group establishes an identity which carries with it certain expectations (Miller 1981). Participation in rites and rituals is one of the major expectations. The centrality of rite and ritual to the unity and sustenance of communal experience is well-established (Miller 1981). Participation in group worship brings people into the symbolic frame that governs communal existence, thus potentially influencing personal attitudes, dispositions, and proclivities toward action. In any assemblage, there is a considerable incorporative power generated by the coming together of a group united in a common act. This collectivity becomes a reference group which provides specific guidelines for personal behavior and development (Miller 1981). Participation in religious rituals and rites includes the exposure to specific images of worship and parables as well. By providing holistic models of what it means to be truly human, these images can act guidelines for lifestyle choices and provide directions for life. The parables and stories provide universal paradigms through which the member can perceive the world and project personal struggles (Miller 1981).

For a fortunate minority of the respondents, an additional source of constructive cognitions came from their high socioeconomic status. In stark contrast with the helplessness and uncertainty generated by poverty, material prosperity which was enjoyed by a mere 25% of the Bicolana respondents accords an aspect of authority and a certainty of purpose (Galbraith 1983). Further, demonstrating that women blessed with material wealth have significantly higher self-efficacy ratings, self-esteem, and success expectancies than their less fortunate counterparts, this study has reinforced the well-established connection between social class and mental health. In fact, some people refer to power brought about by wealth as the "ultimate aphrodisiac" and the "most effective short-range antidepressant in the world" (Berglas 1986).
Interestingly, this study likewise indicated that socioeconomic status had a significant, positive, indirect effect on achievement valuation as mediated by personal powerlessness. Following DeCharms et al.'s (1955) argument that achievement valuation is learned, it can be posited that being a member of a particular social class breeds certain value orientations through specific family interaction patterns. In this regard, Gans' (1982) concluded that family interaction styles vary with social class. For instance, the upper-middle-class pattern Gans called "adult-directed". This pattern emphasizes individual growth and self-development in accordance with the child's individuality. These are values congruent with self-efficacy. On the other hand, the working class' adult-centered pattern stresses subordination and obedience, values compatible with personal powerlessness. Similarly, Kohn (1969) observed that men of higher "social-class" position are more likely than are men of lower "social-class" position to value self-direction and to have self-conceptions and social orientations founded on the belief that self-direction is both possible and efficacious (Kohn 1969). Similarly, Slomczynski et al. (1981), confirmed that for both the United States and Poland, higher social stratification position is associated with valuing self-direction. Based on the observed relationship between socioeconomic status and personal powerlessness, it can be suggested that the more objective access to opportunity by virtue of one's social class, the more potential control of one's fate will a person acknowledge. Alternatively, those so positioned in society to secure for themselves the social desiderata are more likely to possess self-efficacy than those in positions of disadvantage (Jessor et al. 1968).

The positive portrait of the Bicolanas' perceptions constructed thus far should be tempered by the observation that Bicolanas had low success expectancies. This finding contradicts what might have been predicted by the proposed models. Decomposition of effects analysis indicated that the women's high educational attainment should have
been sufficient to compensate for the depressive impact of poverty on expectations (Appendix G, Table 44). The women's pessimism, therefore, may have been a result of a combination of other factors. Low success expectations may reflect unfulfilled expectations of an otherwise highly educated group. Recall that about 40% of the women went to college but only 25% lived above the poverty line. These statistics support Licuanan's (1991) observation that the Filipinas' achievements in education have yet to be effectively translated into economic advantages. Data further suggested that the women's traditionalism, low level of feminist awareness, and minimal political participation could have contributed to low success expectancies (Appendix G, Table 44).

The ambivalence expressed by the respondents regarding gender roles may be a reflection of contradictory gender-role ideologies operating in Philippine society. On one hand exists an ideology favorable to women's initiatives and aspirations (Licuanan 1991). On the other hand, however, coexists a dominant patriarchal ideology perpetuating Filipino women's subordination in the political and socioeconomic spheres. The dominance of patriarchy is mirrored in the respondents' tendency to favor traditional roles. However, a movement toward more equitous attitudes attributed to the increasing levels of educational attainment of Bicolanas has been noted as early as the mid-sixties (Mercado 1966). This distancing from traditionalism appears to be sustained by the respondents' strong interest in pursuing further education.

At this point, however, it is difficult to say whether this development would be beneficial to Bicolanas over the long haul. As it is, a traditional gender-role orientation appeared to be beneficial to the respondents' self-esteem and valuation of achievement (Appendix F, Table 42). The mixed bag of effects produced by traditionalism observed in this study echoes the literature's conflicting data on the impact of gender-role perceptions on women's well-being. One group has observed that feminine-sex-typed-
women were more likely to develop helplessness after aversive experiences (Danker-Brown & Baucom 1982) or were less likely to regain control of their environment after a loss-of-control experience (Baucom 1983). On the other hand, consistent with this study's findings, the literature also shows that women who conformed most to their sex roles exhibited a high need for achievement, a strong need for control, and were rated as the most socially adjusted (Veroff 1983). Accounting for this observations, Veroff contended that the high need for achievement in women, as in men, is related to sex-role consistent activities. In women, achievement motivation could be more strongly associated with family-oriented tasks (Veroff & Sutherland 1985; Veroff 1983), an observation corroborated by the significant positive correlation between traditional gender-role perceptions and achievement valuation noted in this study (Appendix A). In conclusion, Veroff posited that women who conform with sex-role demands show greater general well-being because of the minimal divergence between their attitudes or behaviors and those prescribed by their gender scripts.

Still another potential source of the respondents' pessimism lies in their relatively minimal participation in political activities. Active participation in organization activities and membership in organizations with a political mission resulted in constructive cognitions (Appendix F, Table 36). These findings support Winter's (1973) observation that organizations of the "clubhouse, old-guard variety" are less effective in empowering women than organizations devoted to "urban renewal power politics." Recall, however, that among the respondents who joined organizations, only 20% affiliated themselves with politically oriented clubs.

Closely related to the beneficial effects of political involvement was the constructive impact of feminist awareness on cognitions (Appendix F, Table 34). This finding reinforces the position that the feminist ideology plays a role in encouraging a greater valuation of one's self, one's potentiality, and one's life (Fox 1977). By
encouraging the exploration of nontraditional sex roles, feminism provides women sanctuaries to evade some of the constraints traditionally imposed by society on women (Scott 1991). Free from these shackles, women are more likely to conscious of themselves as women, the first step to the development of feminist consciousness (Cott 1975). Like the pioneering women members of American voluntary associations, female members of organizations realize that, as a united body, they possess the influence to gain and obtain, whereas as individual women, they are ignored (Scott 1991).

Conducting the associations' affairs provides an excellent training ground for administration, public speaking, and financial management. Consequently, self-confidence grows, abilities rapidly develop and become visible. Women will inspire others to believe in themselves and, thus, the influence is reinforced. Essentially, the collective experiences of women in small-scale voluntary organizations prepare women for politics, broadly defined (Scott 1991). Concurring with Scott's position, Palacios (1977) asserted that people's organizations can get citizens involved in issues which directly affect their daily lives. In dealing with these issues, women can learn to negotiate with public and private institutions instead of waiting for dole-outs. In these collaborative undertakings between those who give and receive help, the active participation in decisions about needed services not only enables the assistance-seekers to get the help they need but in the process divest themselves of the feelings of social alienation and acquire a sense of individual worth (Bachrach et al. 1970).

Moreover, when these negotiations meet with success, the women's self-confidence will be increased and their sense of personal power enhanced. As revealed in this investigation, active participation in meetings significantly elevated the women's success expectancies and strengthened their motivation to improve themselves.

While the respondents revealed a low level of feminist awareness, a potential for heightening such awareness exists. In the Philippines, the most striking examples of
women's organizations engaged in grassroots participation come from women's groups within trade unions. These groups fight for women-specific work issues neglected by male-dominated trade unionism. Other items in these groups' agenda include securing more significant female representation within trade unions, sharing of domestic responsibilities with men within the home, the right to participate in union activities, and change in the relations between labor and capital within the economic system. In addition to unionism, another important example of Filipino women's political involvement is the alternative day-care group whose mission is to challenge the economic system's devaluation of child care and the assumption that child care is largely a woman's concern (Dionisio 1991).

To argue, however, that gender-role traditionalism, weak feminism, and minimal political participation had stymied the Bicolanas' motivation to improve their lot cannot be farther from the truth. In the same manner that poverty has failed to produce personal powerlessness, low self-esteem, and a weak motivation for self-improvement, the respondents' pessimism has not dampened their propensity for self-improvement either. Decomposition analysis indicated how the Bicolanas' high self-efficacy ratings, high valuation of achievement, high educational attainment, strong religious faith, spirituality, possession of skills, and knowledge of government agencies compensated for the deleterious effects of poverty and low success expectancies on the propensity for self-improvement (Appendix G, Table 45).

This strong motivation for self-improvement was explicitly manifested in 90% of the women stating that they regularly read and monitored self-help or personal development programs over the radio, in 80% expressing their enthusiasm to participate in skills training programs and seminars designed to enhance their present capabilities, and in 60% wanting to pursue further formal education. Parenthetically, it is comforting to know that even the poorest of Filipinas have access to an affordable medium of
information dissemination, the radio. In the rural areas, even the poorest of families own a transistorized radio. While citizens of developed countries may be mystified at how Third World people treasure a radio, one need only go on a trek to the Philippines' remotest villages and see how the radio acts as a major artery with the outside world. As Cantril and Allport’s (1935) wrote, the radio provides the stimulation of private ambitions, the encouragement of self-education efforts, intellectual discussion, and tolerance.

What emerged from the findings was an uplifting portrait of a subordinated group successfully carving a niche for themselves within the interstices of a hostile structural matrix. Beleaguered by adverse structural and natural forces, Bicolanas have demonstrated a strong sense of control nourished by a strong achievement-oriented value system, educational accomplishments, and a powerful drive toward continuous self-improvement.
CHAPTER VII

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Repercussions for Theory-Building

Essentially, this study supported cognitive theory's emphasis on cognitive representation as a mediator between stimulus situations and consequent behaviors or attitudes (Baldwin 1969). Specifically, the investigation provided partial confirmation of Western attribution theory-based models. While data supported the causal chain posited by Western formulations, the study did not confirm the hypothesized correlations between success expectancies and the other variables in the proposed model. The inability of the cognitive component to correctly predict the correlation in question shows the irreducibility of the sociological to the psychological, or vice versa (Sherif 1979). Exclusively cognitive or structural models fail to capture the reciprocity of society and the individual (Stryker 1977). They also ignore the interrelationship of social stimulus situations and psychological processes. Moreover, compartmentalized models assume that human issues align neatly along disciplinary demarcations. In reality, however, the behavioral and social sciences study the same, closely related, or overlapping problems (Sherif 1979). A need, therefore, exists for interdisciplinary models that treat the human condition as an open system where sociological and psychological levels of analysis constantly cross and interface.

This study also alerts cross-cultural scholars to the limitations of Western constructs in accounting for Third World phenomena. The English language, for
instance, cannot capture the nuances of Philippine languages. Languages mirror a people's world view (Mercado 1975). In turn, the world view absorbs a unique configuration of cultural, economic, historical, and technological influences (Sherif 1979). Hence, a distinctive cognitive schemata emerges. Filipino social scientists claim that Filipinos possess a "non-Western mind" characterized by group orientation rather than individualism, dependence rather than independence, nonprivacy rather than privacy, and respect for authority rather than interpersonalism (Mercado 1975). Therefore, cross-cultural researchers should treat Western perspectives as sensitizing conceptual frameworks (Blumer 1954) rather than tightly structured analytic induction theories (Douglas 1976). The latter aims at a universal theory intended to fit all cases. In contrast, sensitizing theories unfold naturally and dynamically. They capture the emergent properties of the phenomenon as the researcher progresses from conceptualization and observation to analysis. In this processual chain, the researcher exercises flexibility in modifying the general outlines of a malleable theory.

**Suggestions for Empowerment and Intervention**

Although this study revealed that Bicolanas have high levels of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and drive for personal development, there appears to be room for improvement in the light of the respondents' low success expectancies, minimal political participation and relative lack of exposure to the feminism. The potential for improvement may be realized through a combination of the cognitive and socialization approaches.

**The Cognitive Approach**

Based on the philosophy that the self could improve itself through a self-fulfilling prophecy (Seligman 1990), the cognitive approach aims to identify, challenge, and correct distorted conceptualizations and dysfunctional beliefs or schemata. Simply
stated, this approach hopes to teach people to monitor negative, automatic thoughts; to recognize the connections between cognitions, affect, and behavior; and to substitute more realistic interpretations for the dysfunctional cognitions (Beck et al. 1979).

In the case of women who feel powerless, cognitive therapy will teach them to substitute pessimistic perceptions with an "optimistic explanatory style" (Seligman 1991). Women learn to change their attributional style (Norman et al. 1984) by offering alternative explanations or reattributions and using them to dispute thoughts correlated with personal powerlessness.

In order to succeed in the task of reattribution, women will first have to recognize thoughts related to personal powerlessness, gather evidence which contradicts these thoughts, learn to distract themselves from negative thoughts, and challenge their assumptions about causation which breeds personal powerlessness. Women will need to have more realistic goals, be open to alternative desirable outcomes, and reevaluate unattainable goals (Abramson et al. 1978). Taking a different perspective on goals, Taylor (1989) suggested the importance of maintaining "positive illusions" of self-enhancement, exaggerated beliefs in control, and unrealistic optimism. According to Taylor, the chief value of these illusions may be in their ability to create self-fulfilling prophecies. Taylor, however, cautioned readers about the distinction between illusions, on one hand, and defense mechanisms, on the other. Defenses, such as repression and denial, distort the facts, prompting people to hold misperceptions of reality, whereas illusions lead people to make the most of bad situations by adopting a maximally constructive perspective.

Because the dimension of uncontrollability is a key feature of personal powerlessness, reattribution should include the objective of changing the individual's expectation from uncontrollability to controllability. This entails modifying distorted
expectations that responses will fail or will be in vain (Abramson et al. 1978). One specific approach to attain this goal is through assertiveness training. Central to this technique is the principle of teaching individuals to view themselves as capable of controlling the amount and type of social reinforcement received from the environment (Osborn & Harris 1975). Assertiveness training provides the settings in which the individual can undergo imaginal or miniaturized rehearsals of successful response-outcome sequences (Abramson et al. 1978). People learn to talk in a manner in which they are not taken advantage of (assertive talk), to express preferences spontaneously (feeling talk), and not to pretend to agree when one they disagree (active disagreement).

Reattribution should also include changing unrealistic attributions for failure toward external, unstable, and specific factors and changing unrealistic attributions for success toward internal, stable, and global factors (Abramson et al. 1978). The rationale for these strategies is that failures attributed to stable, global, and internal factors exacerbate people's perceptions that future outcomes will be noncontingent on their behavioral repertoires. Changing the attributions for failure to external, unstable, and specific will enhance perceptions of mastery. Regarding success attributions, helpless individuals tend to make external, unstable, and specific attributions that exacerbate powerlessness. Self-efficacy results if these attributions are changed toward internal, stable, and global ones.

Evidence exists which indicate that reattribution training counteracts helplessness (Miller & Norman 1981; Klein et al. 1976; Dweck 1975). Seligman (1990) suggested that cognitive therapy works on the mechanical level because it produces a permanent shift from a pessimistic to an optimistic explanatory style. The latter provides persons with cognitive skills for talking to themselves when failures or obstacles strike.
On the philosophical level, Seligman continued, cognitive therapy works because it exploits the prevailing belief in the powers of the self to change itself, out of self-interest, for the better.

Aside from reattribution training, another useful cognitive technique is transactional analysis. This technique describes women as living by a "woman's script." Typical women's scripts include the following: "you (man) are O.K. but I (female) am not O.K.", the "depression script," and the "feeling hurt script." These messages exacerbate personal powerlessness. Transactional analysis helps women recognize that they can change scripts which they think are maladaptive. It also enables women to recognize and counter male games. Women also discover where they get their strokes and how these strokes can be rearranged to avoid stroke deficits common to women (Sherman 1979).

Resocialization

In his recommendations to combat the perception of powerlessness, Lerner (1986) argued that rethinking one's assumptions about the world is not by itself adequate. The cognitive approach must be complemented by the socialization approach which will provide people with experiences and contexts within which they could actually engage in successful response-outcome sequences. Abramson and associates (1978) recommended training the necessary skills such as problem-solving skills, social skills, and everyday management skills. The learning of these competencies, Kelley (1983) maintained, may have been retarded by rigid sex-role stereotypes which prescribe traditionally "appropriate" skills. Kelley further stated that adaptive skills can be learned from observing skilled models, having opportunities to practice response in the real world, and receiving feedback and reinforcements from others.
Self-education or adult education must continue to be one of women's top priorities. Women should obtain the training needed to earn a living. Aside from making themselves available for seminars and training programs, women should read continuously in order to obtain a much-needed perspective about their struggles. Equipped with the skills acquired in the process, women are more likely to become well-informed, economically independent, and upwardly mobile—conditions favorable to self-efficacy. Economic dependence and ignorance on the other hand, can breed feelings of helplessness (Johnson & Ferguson 1990).

Building social networks for purposes of political mobilization provide opportunities for women to develop adaptive competencies as well (Leghorn & Parker 1981). The need to establish linkages among women becomes more urgent in the case of Filipinas considering their minimal participation in community and political activities (Licuanan 1991; Eviota 1979). Lacking time and interest and unaware of the existence of community organizations, Filipinas get together with their neighbors mainly for informal talks and celebrations rather than for community organization activities (Gonzalez 1977). Evidently, a potential exists to channel this predilection toward the discussion of common concerns affecting the women's daily lives. Whether these concerns are home- or work-related, the women can benefit from mutual support, sharing of information, valuing each other's competence, and providing role models for each other (Chesler 1972; Shreve 1989), improved self-image, and political mobilization (Reinharz 1984). As members of voluntary associations, women should not hesitate to accept positions of leadership and responsibility inasmuch as these are rich opportunities to build self-efficacy and develop adaptive attitudes. When women realize that there are gains from the process of participation itself regardless of the outcomes of the process (Tilly 1978), they are more likely to be motivated to tackle issues of broader
significance which transcend their individual circumstances. By this time, their involvement in organizations shall have prepared them for effective political participation on a larger scale.

The prospects of a transition from parochial to more encompassing issues as targets of Filipino women's concerns are bright. Evidence indicates that in spite of the absence of professional expertise, Filipino women have succeeded in community-building activities which are defined as actions engaged in by a group on their own initiative to increase social cohesiveness of unrelated persons or to enhance the opportunities or redress the injustices of persons with whom the group identifies beyond their own family (Reinharz 1984). Examples of successful grassroots movements of Filipinas include, but are not limited to the following: alternative day-care, women's groups within trade unions (Dionisio 1991), rape crisis centers, health collectives, groups dealing with family violence, single mothers, prostitutes, and consciousness-raising groups (Anonuevo 1991). Aware of the Filipino women's achievements as a collectivity, scholars have recognized the Philippines as a southeast Asian country with a "strong feminist movement" (Ward 1965) and as a nation where women are aware of the benefits of organizing and becoming a potent social force on the national level (Heyzer 1986), a most notable example of which was the ascendancy of Corazon Aquino to the country's highest political office.

Cognitive changes and exposure to social networks are not sufficient by themselves to produce change in personal attitudes and values. As suggested by Parsons et al. (1976), socialization experiences are important determinants of both individual or societal change. Through socialization, people learn stereotyped expectations about appropriate male and female behavior. Unfortunately, women
receive a disproportionate amount of experience with personal powerlessness or helplessness in their life-course. Girls' behavior are ignored, while boys get most of the attention of parents and teachers. While girls are encouraged for passivity and dependence, boys are trained for self-reliance and activity. As adults, women find themselves in a culture which devalues the role of wife and mother and depreciates their achievements (Seligman 1990).

Resocialization offers bright prospects for a creating a more conducive environment for women to develop self-efficacy. The importance of resocialization cannot be overemphasized in the case of the Bicolana respondents in view of their conservative streak which, in turn, has been shown to depress their perceptions of self-efficacy. In the home, parents can start rewarding their female children's competence and setting challenging demands for their accomplishments, actions which are presently more applicable to boys than girls (Frieze 1987). A greater caretaking role on the part of fathers can give girls more exposure to situations which require analytic thinking (Giele 1978).

In schools, teachers should be assisted in enhancing their awareness of their attitudes about appropriate sex-role behaviors and then to sensitize their students and colleagues to bias and stereotyping. Teachers will need training on skills to analyze and eliminate sexist practices in their interactions with students, in view of the findings that elementary school teachers pay greater attention to boys and interact far more with boys than with girls and give greater attention to boys (Bornstein 1979). More training is also required to help teachers identify gender bias in curricular materials which reflect a disproportionately small number of girls or women, portray women as lacking in competence, and generally ignore women's contributions to culture and history.
Female students, teachers, and administrators should be encouraged, supported, and trained for nontraditional professions. This can be achieved only through concerted efforts on all levels of the educational system. On the elementary school level, teachers should discard their stereotypical beliefs that girls are incompetent in science and mathematics. On the high school level, teachers should inspire female students to pursue studies in science, engineering, and technology. On the professional level, the "old boys' clubs" need to open their doors to women (Howe 1975).

Beyond direct reinforcement of parents and teachers, modeling adult behaviors is another important mode of socialization. Many successful career women had mothers who encouraged their girls to pursue nontraditional roles (Frieze 1987) and mentors who were influential in their professional development as well (Almquist & Angrist 1971).

Aside from changes in socialization experiences, Parsons et al. (1976) contended that changes in current situation factors, cultural norms, and economic-political realities are necessary to promote change in personal attitudes and beliefs. An uphill climb, however, still awaits women as they cope with the norm that achievement is unfeminine (Hoffman 1972), and that work is not a financial necessity for women (Frieze, 1987). Employer beliefs also hold that women only work for nonessential money, hence their jobs are not essential. Men, therefore, not women, should be hired or promoted (Chafetz 1974).

Negative stereotypes do not end once women are hired. Male managers believe that female characteristics are more appropriate for low-level clerical jobs than high-level managerial jobs (O'Leary 1974). Given similar job performances, women are less likely to be promoted than men (Rosen & Jerdee 1974). This is not surprising in view of the
evidence that women's performances are not rated as highly as those of men (Deaux & Taynor 1973).

The picture need not be entirely bleak, however. Much progress has been made by numerous feminist organizations in removing external or situational barriers (Sherman 1979). On the individual level, credit must be given to women who have managed to rise to positions of leadership in spite of overwhelming odds. Using their "legitimate power" as a result of possessing status (Osborn & Harris 1975), women leaders are situated strategically to effect a change of ethos in organizations. By "selling" the feminine leadership style which emphasizes sharing of information, cooperation, and communication, female managers are in a position to uproot the prevailing male-centered value system which thrives on subordination and compliance. In place of the latter, women can spread the "ethics of care and concern" which envisions the treatment of men and women as of equal worth (Heyzer 1986).

In response to the litany of disadvantages faced by the women discussed earlier, the cynical reader may ask: Why bother with all these efficacy-enhancing strategies if the odds are stacked up against women? This study's results and the literature offer compelling justifications for continued efforts. On the individual level, women stand to gain better mental health, greater life satisfaction, greater self-esteem, and a stronger drive to become everything they are capable of becoming. Beyond the personal realm, women with a sense of mastery constitute the personality type which Soedjatmoko (1965) envisions to be an "effective agent of social change and development."

The daunting tasks faced by developing countries urgently requires the inputs of every citizen, women included. Parenthetically, Filipinas constitute over half of the Philippine population (Licuanan 1991) of 64.6 million as of mid-1993 (Johnson 1994). The sheer strength of women in numbers as a social category and women's
accomplishments throughout history are compelling reasons for continued efforts in creating social arrangements conducive to women's development. Structural changes, however, need be complemented by efforts initiated by women themselves. Women have to start casting aside destructive self-images and crippling ideation spawned and maintained by a patriarchal ideology. Cognitive reconstruction, however, demands commitment, motivation, and self-discipline. These demands, in addition to institutional obstacles, will make a woman's flight from personal powerlessness to the liberative regions of self-efficacy painfully slow and frustrating. However, the rewards of emancipation make it worth the plodding effort.
CHAPTER VIII

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The failure to reject the models proposed in this investigation does not imply that these models are the definitive models of personal powerlessness. There will be some other models which will always be consistent with the same set of data (Duncan 1975). Arguing similarly, Cliff (1983) stated that the failure to disconfirm a model implies that there are many other models that are not disconfirmed either.

The reader must bear in mind that the formulation of models is motivated by a desire to capture some underlying causal process that explains the intercorrelations among the variables. Whether a particular model truly reflects a causal process cannot be determined from the empirical results, generally speaking. The researcher will need to couch his or her arguments and conclusions within a theoretical framework which must, at the minimum, include key variables of relevance (Bentler 1992). Using the same variables in the models presented by this researcher, investigators can, therefore, hypothesize different causal relationships supported by alternative theoretical perspectives. They must, however, be guided by the caveat that correlational data do not establish causal relations. Until various lines of converging evidence solidify propositions of causal relations, one should hold in abeyance the inference of causality (Cliff 1983). At most, they can say that their data are suggestive of causal relations.

Contributing to a greater mass of converging evidence requires the further refinement of the models proposed in this study. For instance, samples of Filipino men
and upper-class women may be obtained to compare their cognitive schemata with that observed among the predominantly poor women who participated in this investigation. Moreover, researchers can construct variants of personal powerlessness by focusing on other dimensions of attributions other than locus and controllability such as globality and stability. Self-esteem in the models presented by this researcher can be replaced by measures of life satisfaction such as the Index of Well-Being (Campbell et al. 1976) or the Life Satisfaction Scales (Neugarten et al. 1961). Congruent with Atkinson's model (1964, 1966), researchers can also extend the causal chain posited by this writer by including an evaluation of respondents' achievements as a further outcome of the propensity for self-improvement.

Guided by the existing literature, future models can incorporate the influence of the early socialization process. The impact of birth order (Northcutt 1991), parenting styles, parental imposition of standards of excellence, parental training for independence and achievement, the proportion of male members in women's social networks (Denmark et al. 1978), and the effects of role models (Frieze 1987) might prove interesting. Moreover, the impact of personality traits, history of successes and failures, and childhood experiences are worth exploring. How does optimism or pessimism affect the sense of mastery? Does a record of success guarantee self-efficacy? Can one's need for power (Veroff 1983), defined as the disposition to influence others, predict self-efficacy?

Methodologically, researchers who will be using surveys will have to constantly strive to improve their measuring instruments' (e.g. scales) internal consistency, validity, and reliability in view of the typical large measurement errors which, in turn, may produce biased estimates. Social desirability bias should likewise be a concern for survey researchers especially because many of the constructs in cognitive research
tend to elicit socially desirable responses. In this regard, researchers may be well-advised to incorporate a social desirability scale such as the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (Edwards 1957) or the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crown & Marlowe 1960). A high correlation between the scores of the researcher's scale and a social desirability scale could be indicative of a substantial social desirability bias.

As an alternative to the survey, researchers can embark on ethnographic analysis that ensures a relatively greater validity of constructs. These studies will be able to present women's voices, concrete experiences, and intersubjective views not captured in surveys. Consequently, the precise mechanisms behind the skeletal relationships suggested by quantitative analysis will be revealed in richly textured discourse. The outcome of these synergistic efforts will be a compelling story of struggle and triumph. As the Filipino women in this study had demonstrated, the "perpetually numbing experience" of powerlessness can be mastered.
APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL SCALES USED IN THE STUDY

Culture-Sensitive Personal Powerlessness Scale (CSPPS)**

1. Most of my achievements have been the result of hard work.

2. My present situation will improve if I work hard.

3. People succeed because of hard work, not because of luck.

4. Pag may tiyaga, may nilaga. (A popular Filipino proverb which means, roughly translated, that persistence brings results.)

5. It is important to set goals in life.

6. To become successful, people must be persistent.

7. My life on earth is determined by fate. ***

8. Success is 90% hard work and 10% luck.

9. Working hard will improve my present situation.

10. I believe I have the power to change my life for the better.

SELF-ESTEEM SCALE (SES)

1. I feel that I am competent in most of the things I do.

2. I feel that I have more strengths than weaknesses.

3. I believe I can contribute something valuable to society.

4. I believe that my being born into this world has a purpose.
5. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

6. Few people can match my accomplishments in the things I do best.

7. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

8. On the whole, I feel satisfied with myself.

9. I am satisfied with what I have done in my life so far.

10. I believe I deserve an award for the good things I have done.

11. I feel that the world is a better place with me living in it.

**VALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT SCALE (VAS)**

1. I would rather work than remain idle.

2. It is important for a person to have ambitions in life.

3. I feel bad if I have not accomplished anything in any given day.

4. Life has no meaning without any accomplishments.

5. I want people to remember me for my accomplishments not for my position in life.

6. I feel good after accomplishing something.

7. I enjoy relaxation fully only after I had accomplished something important.

8. Accomplishing something increases my self-respect.

9. I work very hard at something until I am satisfied with the results.

10. Life becomes meaningless when a person loses interest in improving his/her situation.

**SUCCESS EXPECTANCIES INDEX (SCXI)**

1. What do you think will your situation be in the next 3 years compared to the present?

   _____ Worse          _____ Average improvement

   _____ Same as the present/no change   _____ Much improvement

   _____ Little improvement
2. Suppose you are given a chance to enroll in a skills training program, what do you think are your chances of completing this program?

___ No chance of completing this program
___ Small chance of completing this program
___ An average chance of completing this program
___ A strong chance of completing this program

3. Suppose you are able to learn a new skill, how much improvement do you think will this new skill bring to your present situation?

___ No improvement
___ A little improvement
___ Average or moderate improvement
___ Much improvement

4. Suppose a government agency or private organization helps you make a plan to improve your situation, what do you think are the chances that this plan will be successfully implemented?

___ No chance of success
___ A small chance of success
___ An average chance of success
___ A great chance of success

5. How frequently do you experience the fear of failing in the things you do?

___ Always
___ Frequently
___ Sometimes
___ Never
6. In general, how confident are you about succeeding in the things you do?

_____ Very confident
_____ Moderately confident
_____ Little confidence
_____ Not confident at all

PROPENSITY FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT SCALE (PSIS)

1. I need to improve myself in order to have a better future.
2. I have a strong desire to improve my present situation.
3. I am willing to put time and effort in improving my situation.
4. Improving my present situation is my most important goal at the moment.
5. I owe it to myself to improve my present situation.
6. I am willing to begin improving my present situation at the earliest possible time.

FAITH-IN-GOD SCALE (FIGS)

1. One must not worry about what to eat or drink because God knows our needs.
2. All things eventually turn out well for those who love God.
3. When you believe that you will receive things you ask for, these things will be yours.
4. In times of trouble, God will protect me.
5. We should trust God and not depend on our knowledge.
6. God supplies all our needs.
7. We will survive by trusting in God.
OTHER-WORLDLY ORIENTATION SCALE (OWOS)

1. Riches on earth will eventually perish.
2. Spiritual concerns are more important than material concerns.
3. It is very difficult for a rich person to go to heaven.
4. One should not store treasures here on earth but should store treasures in heaven.
5. The poor on this earth will receive their reward in heaven.
6. The meek shall inherit the earth.
7. We should associate with the humble.
8. It is better to lose all material possessions than to lose one's soul.
9. Man does not live by bread alone.
10. I believe that a person should be remembered for his/her good deeds rather than his/her material wealth.

SEX-ROLE ATTITUDES SCALE (SRAS)

1. An obedient wife is essential to a happy marriage.
2. It is to the entire family's advantage that the wife should stay at home.
3. The husband should be the decision-maker of the family.
4. The wife must support her husband's decisions regarding family matters.
5. The wife must be obey her husband.
6. The proper place for the wife is the home.
7. The responsibility of the husband is to earn money for the family; the responsibility of the wife is to take care of the children.
8. Families will be more stable if the father makes the decisions in the family.
Notes on Scales

**Except for the Success Expectancies Index, all scales had the following response categories: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Not Sure (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5).

***Scoring for this item was reversed, i.e., Strongly Disagree (5), Disagree (4), Not Sure (3), Agree (2), and Strongly Agree (1).
### Appendix B

Zero-order correlations, Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.592**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>.171**</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
<td>-.370**</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.203**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>-.218**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>.617**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.325**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>-.177**</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.138*</td>
<td>.132*</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01; *p < .05
Appendix B (continued)

Legend:

V = variables
1 = Personal powerlessnes
2 = Achievement valuation
3 = Propensity for self-improvement
4 = Self-esteem
5 = Success expectancies
6 = Socioeconomic status
7 = Educational attainment
8 = Possession of marketable skills
9 = Knowledge of government agencies
10 = Gender-role attitudes
11 = Type of organizations joined (political vs. clubhouse)
12 = Participation in meetings
13 = Faith in God
14 = Spiritual orientation
15 = Religious denomination
16 = Social support
APPENDIX C

OPERATIONALIZATION OF VARIABLES

1. Age (in years)

2. Marital status: Single=0; Married=1; Separated=0; Widowed=0

3. Educational Attainment:
   - Elementary School Dropout=0
   - Grade 6 Graduate=1
   - High School Dropout=2
   - High School Graduate=3
   - College Dropout=4
   - College Graduate=5
   - Master's degree/Doctorate/Law=6

4. What is your present occupation?
   - Domestic=0
   - Unemployed=0
   - Housewife=1
   - Part-time employee (hired hand, job-to-job basis)=1
   - Government employee=2
   - Private corporation employee=2
   - Business owner (self-employed)=3
   - Independent practitioner=3

5. Do you or your family own any of the following? Please check as applicable.
   - House=3
   - Lot where house stands=3
   - Land aside from the lot where your house stands=3
   - Car or truck or jeepney=3
   - Air conditioner=3
   - Personal computer=3
   - Expensive jewelry=3
   - Investments in securities/money market=3
Motorcycle=2
Videocassette recorder=2
Washing machine=2
Refrigerator=2
Stereo system=2
Compact disc player=2
Savings account=2
Checking account=2
Microwave=2
Electric stove=2
Electric fan=1
Transistor radio=1
Toaster=1
Electric iron=1
Other properties of significant value (please name)=2

6. Religion:

Roman Catholic=1
Others=0

7. How often do you attend religious services?

Never=5
Once or twice a year=4
About once a month=3
Two or three times a month=2
Nearly every week=1
Several times a week=0

8. How many of your friends can you count on for help in times of need?

None=0
1 to 2=1
3 to 4=2
More than 4=3
9. How many of your relatives can you count on for help in times of need?

None=0
1 to 2=1
3 to 4=2
More than 4=3

10. Which of the following can you do well? (Sum obtained)

Sewing=1  Managing=1
Crocheting=1  Word processing=1
Weaving=1  Typing/Stenography=1
Basketry=1  Playing a musical instrument=1
Carving=1  Computer programming=1
Cooking/Baking=1  Food preservation=1
Drawing=1  Others=1 each
Designing=1  None=0

11. Which of the following organizations have you heard or read about? Please check as applicable. (Number of check marks counted)

Department of Agriculture  Department of Social Welfare
Bureau of Agricultural Extension  Department of Local Government
Bureau of Plant Industry  Rural bank
Bureau of Animal Industry  Land Bank
Bureau of Mines  Department of Agrarian Reform
PAGASA (Weather Bureau)  LWUA
"Samahang Nayon"  Department of Cooperative union
Department of Health  BIR
Department of Justice  NEDA
RECOM 5  ALECO
PC  Others, please list:
AFP
COMELEC
Bureau of Lands
Bicol University

12. Which of the organizations enumerated in #12 have you approached for assistance to solve some of your problems? (Number of check marks counted)

13. (a) Have you ever been elected to public office?

Yes=1
No=0
13. (b) If yes, what public office was this?

- None=0
- "barangay" captain=1
- "barangay" councilwoman=1
- Municipal councilor=2
- Mayor=3
- Vice-Mayor=3
- Provincial board member=4
- Vice-governor=4
- Governor=5
- Constitutional Convention delegate=5
- Senator=6

14. (a) Have you ever been a supervisor or a team leader or club adviser or a manager?

- Yes=1
- No=0

14. (b) If yes, approximately how many times have you been in this position?

- None=0
- 1 to 2=1
- 3 to 4=2
- 5 to 6=3
- More than 6=4

15. (a) Have you heard or read about the women's movement?

- Yes=1
- No=0

15. (b) If yes, how much do you know about the goals of the women's movement?

- None=0
- A little=1
- Average=2
- A lot=3
16. (a). Have you heard or read about GABRIELA?
   Yes=1
   No=0

16. (b). If yes, how much do you know about the goals of GABRIELA?
   None=0
   A little=1
   Average=2
   A lot=3

16. (c). Are you a member of GABRIELA?
   Yes=1
   No=0

17. (a) Are you a member of an organization whose main goal is to fight for women's rights?
   Yes=1
   No=0

17. (b) If yes, please name the organizations. (List summed up)

18. How interested will you be in organizing an association whose main goal is to fight for women's rights?
   Very interested=3
   Moderately interested=2
   Little interest=1
   No interest at all=0

19. How interested will you be in becoming a member of an association whose main goal is to fight for women's rights?
   Very interested=3
   Moderately interested=2
   Little interest=1
   No interest at all=0
20. (a) All in all, how many clubs, organizations, or associations are you a member of?

None=0
1 to 2=1
3 to 4=2
More than 4=3

20. (b) If you are a member of at least one organization, please check or list down the organization(s). (Summed up)

Mr. & Mrs. Club=0
Catholic Women's League=0
Legion of Mary=0
4-H Club=1
Homemakers Club=1
GABRIELA=1
Zonta International=1
Red Cross=1
"Samahang Nayon"=1
Credit Union=1
Others, please list: a code of 0 for "clubhouse"-type organizations;
a code of 1 for humanitarian, service-oriented, or political renewal-type organizations.

21. In general, how often do you attend meetings of these clubs or organizations?

Never=0
Seldom=1
Sometimes=2
Frequently=3

22. How often do you speak up or participate actively in the discussion during these meetings?

Never=0
Seldom=1
Sometimes=2
Frequently=3
23. How interested are you in attending seminars, training programs or other educational opportunities offered to you?

   Very interested=3
   Moderately interested=2
   Little interest=1
   No interest at all=0

24. Are you willing to find time to attend seminars, training programs or other self-improvement courses?

   Yes=2
   Not sure=1
   No=0

25. How many seminars, training programs, or self-improvement courses have you attended within the last year?

   None=0
   1 to 2=1
   3 to 4=2
   More than 4=3

26. How often do you tune in to radio or TV programs or view tapes which provide information on self-improvement?

   Never=0
   Seldom=1
   Sometimes=2
   Frequently=3

27. How often do you read for information on self-improvement?

   Never=0
   Seldom=1
   Sometimes=2
   Frequently=3
28. How interested are you in furthering your education?

Very interested=3
Moderately interested=2
Little interest=1
No interest at all=0

29. How important is it for you to learn new skills?

Not important=0
Somewhat Important=1
Important=2
Very important=3
### APPENDIX D

Decomposition of Effects: Core Model

#### Table 1. Independent Variable: Personal Powerlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2. Independent Variable: Valuation of Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3. Independent Variable: Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4. Independent Variable: Success Expectancies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D (continued)

Decomposition of Effects: Expanded Model

Table 5. Exogenous Variable: Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Exogenous Variable: Number of Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Exogenous Variable: Knowledge of Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Exogenous Variable: Faith in God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Exogenous Variable: Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Exogenous Variable: Religious Denomination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Exogenous Variable: Socioeconomic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12. Exogenous Variable: Awareness of the Women's Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13. Exogenous Variable: Type of Organizations Joined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14. Exogenous Variable: Participation in Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15. Exogenous Variable: Social Support System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Exogenous Variable: Gender-Role Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Achievement</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Expectancies</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
SCHEMATIC DIAGRAMS OF THE MODELS

Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies

Figure 3. Standardized Coefficients: Core Model;
Chi-Square = 0.253, df = 1, Probability (p) = 0.615
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Social Class

Figure 4. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Socioeconomic Status as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 1.238, df = 3, p = 0.744
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Faith in God

Figure 5. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Faith in God as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 1.285, df = 1, p = 0.257
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation

Figure 6. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.727, df = 1, p = 0.394
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Religious Denomination

Figure 7. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Religious Denomination as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 4.783, df = 5, p = 0.443
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Educational Attainment

Figure 8. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Educational Attainment as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.256, df = 1, p = 0.613
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Number of Skills

Figure 9. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Number of Skills as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.345, df = 1, p=0.557
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Awareness of Agencies

Figure 10. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Awareness of Agencies as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.427, df = 2, p = 0.808
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Awareness of the Women's Movement

Figure 11. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Awareness of the Women's Movement as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.265, df = 1, p = 0.607
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Type of Organizations Joined

Figure 12. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Type of Organizations Joined as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 1.214, df = 4, p = 0.876
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Participation in Meetings

Figure 13. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Participation in Meetings Meetings as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.955, df = 4, p = 0.917
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Social Support System

Figure 14. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model
(Social Support System as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 0.239, df = 2, p = 0.887
Legend:

V1 = Personal Powerlessness
V2 = Valuation of Achievement
V3 = Propensity for Self-Improvement
V4 = Self-Esteem
V5 = Success Expectancies
V6 = Gender-Role Attitudes

Figure 15. Standardized Coefficients: Expanded Model (Gender-Role Attitudes as Exogenous Variable);
Chi-Square = 7.444, df = 3, p = 0.60
APPENDIX F

CORRELATION MATRICES AND MEASUREMENT EQUATIONS
Table 17. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations (N=620):
Core Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 39.134 | 42.239 | 25.481 | 42.574 | 12.155 |

Legend:
** Significant at the .01 level
* Significant at the .05 level

Table 18. Measurement Equations: Basic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.198</td>
<td>3.980</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030) b</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.755 c</td>
<td>7.982</td>
<td>8.990</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.039)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square | .29 | .30 | .23 | .14 |     |

Legend:
a: Unstandardized regression coefficient
b: standard error
c: t-value (cut-off for significance is 1.96)
Table 20. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations: Expanded Model: Socioeconomic Status Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Class</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>.120**</td>
<td>.096*</td>
<td>.167**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                      | 39.134 | 42.239 | 25.481 | 42.574 | 12.155 | 10.490 |

Table 21. Measurement Equations: Expanded Model: Socioeconomic Status Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.039)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.755</td>
<td>6.911</td>
<td>3.642</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.988</td>
<td>8.937</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Class</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.017)</td>
<td>(.021)</td>
<td>(.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>6.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square | .03 | .29 | .30 | .24 | .18 |
### Table 21. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
*Expanded Model: Faith In God Introduced*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faith in God</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 39.134 42.239 25.481 42.574 12.155 29.011


### Table 22. Measurement Equations
*Expanded Model: Faith In God Introduced*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.257 (0.38) 6.721 .181 (0.56) 3.242 .196 (0.42) 4.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.425 (0.32) 13.162 .239 (0.34) 6.995 .328 (0.51) 6.457 .010 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>1.39 (0.30) 4.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.056 (0.35) 1.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.056 (0.35) 1.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faith in God</td>
<td>.104 (0.036) .470 (0.041) .068 (0.034) .394 (0.050) .028 (0.039) 2.885 11.581 1.995 7.844 .702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square: .30 .18 .31 .30 .14
### Table 23. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations: Expanded Model; Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | 1.00               | 1.00               |                    |                    |                    |                    |
| Mean           | 39.134             | 42.239             | 25.481             | 42.574             | 12.155             | 35.731             |

### Table 24. Measurement Equations: Expanded Model; Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spiritual vs. Materialistic Orientation</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 25. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
**Expanded Model: Religious Denomination Introduced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious Denomination</td>
<td>.079*</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>39.134</td>
<td>42.239</td>
<td>25.481</td>
<td>42.574</td>
<td>12.155</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td>4.673</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td>3.809</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 26. Measurement Equations
**Expanded Model: Religious Denomination Introduced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious Denomination</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.550)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R-square</strong></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations: Expanded Model: Educational Attainment Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educational Attainment</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.142**</td>
<td>.170**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean
- 1. Personal Powerlessness: 39.134
- 2. Achievement Valuation: 42.239
- 3. Improvement Propensity: 25.481
- 4. Self-Esteem: 42.574
- 5. Success Expectancies: 12.155
- 6. Educational Attainment: 2.890

Standard Deviation
- 1. Personal Powerlessness: 4.065
- 2. Achievement Valuation: 4.673
- 3. Improvement Propensity: 3.814
- 4. Self-Esteem: 5.665
- 5. Success Expectancies: 3.809
- 6. Educational Attainment: 2.069

Table 28. Measurement Equations
Expanded Model: Educational Attainment Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.909</td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.200</td>
<td>7.691</td>
<td>8.829</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.026)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.039)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educational Attainment</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.057)</td>
<td>(.089)</td>
<td>(.070)</td>
<td>(.097)</td>
<td>(.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>2.343</td>
<td>11.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square
- 1: .30
- 2: .03
- 3: .30
- 4: .24
- 5: .29
Table 29. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
Expanded Model: Number Of Skills Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of skills</td>
<td>.135**</td>
<td>.086*</td>
<td>.131**</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 39.134 42.239 25.481 42.574 12.155 2.090

Table 30. Measurement Equations
Expanded Model: Number of Skills Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of skills</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.083)</td>
<td>(.120)</td>
<td>(.084)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.645</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>3.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations  
Expanded Model: Knowledge Of Agencies Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of organizations</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean
2.026
4.673
3.814
5.665
3.809
8.642

Standard Deviation
4.065
4.873
3.814
5.665
3.809
8.642

Table 32: Measurement Equations  
Expanded Model: Knowledge Of Agencies Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square
.31  .01  .31  .24  .15
Table 33. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
Expanded Model: Awareness Of The Women's Movement Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness of the</td>
<td>.109**</td>
<td>.102*</td>
<td>.090*</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women's movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 39.134 42.239 25.481 42.574 12.155 .424

Table 34. Measurement Equations
Expanded Model: Awareness Of The Women's Movement Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.038</td>
<td>(.058</td>
<td>(.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>3.829</td>
<td>4.548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.033</td>
<td>(.050</td>
<td>(.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.541</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.972</td>
<td>8.693</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>2.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.275</td>
<td>(.408</td>
<td>(.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>2.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>7.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness of the</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>2.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women's movement</td>
<td>(.233</td>
<td>(.381</td>
<td>(.275</td>
<td>(.408</td>
<td>(.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>7.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square: .29 .01 .30 .24 .20
Table 35. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
Expanded Model: Type of Organizations Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of organizations joined by respondents</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 39.134 | 42.239 | 25.481 | 42.574 | 12.155 | .968 |

Table 36. Measurement Equations
Expanded Model: Type of Organizations Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.059)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of organizations joined by respondents</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>(.089)</td>
<td>(.407)</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.160)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations: Expanded Model: Participation in Meetings Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participation in Meetings</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean
Standard Deviation

Table 38. Measurement Equations Expanded Model: Participation in Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.736</td>
<td>7.992</td>
<td>8.998</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participation in Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.073)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 39. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations:
**Expanded Model: Social Support System Introduced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Support System</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.085*</td>
<td>.093*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.087*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 39.134  42.239  25.481  42.574  12.155  2.227

### Table 40. Measurement Equations
**Expanded Model: Social Support System Introduced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.925</td>
<td>3.980</td>
<td>4.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.664</td>
<td>7.906</td>
<td>8.990</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Support System</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.152)</td>
<td>(.125)</td>
<td>(.139)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>1.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square: .29  .01  .30  .24  .14
### Table 41. Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations: Expanded Model: Gender-Role Attitudes Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement Valuation</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improvement Propensity</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sex-Role Attitudes</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td>-.147**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 39.134 42.239 25.481 42.574 12.155 26.350
Standard Deviation 4.065 4.673 3.814 5.665 3.809 5.197

### Table 42. Measurement Equations Expanded Model: Gender-Role Attitudes Introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Powerlessness</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.057)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.941</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.755</td>
<td>7.975</td>
<td>8.503</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propensity for Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Success Expectancies</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sex-Role Attitudes</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.038)</td>
<td>(.027)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.526</td>
<td>4.159</td>
<td>-5.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-square .29 .01 .30 .26 .16
APPENDIX G

COMPENSATORY EFFECTS ON SUCCESS EXPECTANCIES AND PROPENSITY FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT

TABLE 43

VARIABLES COMPENSATING FOR THE DEPRESSIVE EFFECTS OF POVERTY ON SELF-EFFICACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement valuation</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faith in God</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of gov't. agencies</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational attainment</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44

CORRELATES OF DEPRESSED SUCCESS EXPECTANCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational attainment</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness of feminism</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender-role attitudes</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Type of clubs joined</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participation in meetings</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Success expectancies</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal powerlessness</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement valuation</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faith</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spirituality</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educational attainment</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Skills</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Knowledge of government agencies</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social support system</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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