1988

Learned Helplessness as a Function of Social Structure

William T. Oswald
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Oswald, William T., "Learned Helplessness as a Function of Social Structure" (1988). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1001.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1001

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

LEARNED HELPLESSNESS AS A FUNCTION
OF
SOCIAL STRUCTURE
BY
WILLIAM T. OSWALD

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1988

Abstract

The present study explored the development of learned helplessness. The major question examined whether learned helplessness and its related attributional style were global or situation specific. It was hypothesized that the more bureaucratically structured a situation was perceived to be the more learned helplessness would be manifested. It was argued that the relationship between organizational control and individual commitment could be explained by the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis.

Subjects in the study were 154 college freshmen and sophomores aged 18 to 24. All subjects completed a questionnaire which assessed individual characteristics (socioeconomic status, locus of control and previous experience in organizations), attributional style and the manifestation of learned helplessness. The latter two sets of variables were presented within group and societal contexts.

The hypothesized relationship among the sets of variables was tested using multivariate analysis with latent variables. The data were analyzed using LISREL IV. Four structural models were tested (interaction, situation, global attribution, non-attribution). While the results were generally inconclusive, the data was suggestive of the proposed hypothesis. The need for further research in this direction was demonstrated.

Acknowledgment

This acknowledgment gratefully recognizes the contributions of my dissertation committee and my family in completing this project. I would like to especially thank John Stevenson, Ph.D. without whose unfailing openness and enthusiastic support from beginning to end this project would never have been completed; Lisa Harlow, Ph.D. for encouragement and thoughtful assistance in the interpretation of the data; Paul Florin, Ph.D. for his faith in my work; and Arthur Stein, Ph.D. for his willingness to serve on my committee.

I would also like to offer special thanks to my wife, Diane Marques, Ph.D. She not only gave me inspiration and encouragement, but she was also a role model who provided support and guidance throughout the process. I also wish to acknowledge my daughter, Elena, whose arrival in the midst of this project gave both light and an extra push, and my parents for the values they've instilled in me that gave me direction.

Finally, I would like to thank Wayne Velicer, Ph.D. for his guidance in the development of the design of the dissertation, and Joe Fava for his help in analyzing the data.

Preface

The idea behind this dissertation has its origins back in the fall of 1980. At that time I had just begun working as a welfare rights organizer in a housing project in Providence, Rhode Island. As I began the job of building a chapter of the state's welfare rights group I was struck by three things: 1) the level of deprivation at which the people in the project were forced to live; 2) the degree to which people seemed to accept the deprivation as inevitable and immutable; and 3) how difficult it was for people to become mobilized to confront the inequities of the system which lay at the root cause of the deprivation. While I understood the reasons for the inequities in the system, I found myself continually looking for reasons for the general acceptance of conditions and the immobility.

Reflection on my organizing efforts and investigation into the literature led me to focus on the very way our society is organized. As the group became larger and we repeatedly confronted the system several things began to become clear. The state bureaucracy was bound up in rules and largely unresponsive to the needs of the individual. The workers in the system had little or no flexibility. Even the most caring case workers were bound by a set of rules they had no say in setting. The lack of responsiveness by the system was a major reason for the people's acceptance of their conditions. The seeming

immutability of the system also contributed to the difficulty in mobilizing for change.

Seeing the effect of an unresponsive organization on individuals led me to examine this process further. A hypothesis began to evolve. I began to investigate the importance of control over one's surroundings in shaping future actions. It became clear that this process of disempowerment was not unique to the state bureaucracy. It seemed that any organization that contained the elements of a bureaucracy tended to have the same impact on individuals, even social change organizations. It appeared that the more difficult it was for a member of an organization to have control over the organization's actions, the less the membership seemed to have a sense of ownership in it.

The research that follows examines this relationship in greater detail. It attempts to establish the existence of a relationship between an individual's control over the actions of an organization and his/her willingness to make a personal investment in it. Starting with the hypothesis that the social structure of the organization is the key variable in controlling this relationship, I explore how the bureaucratic nature of complex social systems has a disempowering effect on the individuals with whom it interacts.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgment.....	iii
Preface.....	iv
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	x
Introduction.....	1
Learned Helplessness.....	8
Person Variables.....	12
The Relationship Between Control and Commitment.....	14
Bureaucratic Control.....	40
Statement of the Problem.....	49
Structural Models.....	52
Interaction Model.....	52
Global Non-attribution Model.....	55
Global Attribution Model.....	57
Situation Model.....	57
Measurement Models.....	59
Person Variables.....	59
Attributional Style Variables.....	61
Behavior Variables.....	61
Method.....	66
Subjects.....	66

Assessment Measures.....	66
Locus of Control.....	66
Socio-Economic Status.....	67
Institutional Experience.....	68
Attributional Style.....	69
Behavioral Variables (Motivational Assessment).....	72
Behavioral Variables (Cognitive Assessment).....	74
Procedure.....	75
Results	77
Principle Components Analysis.....	77
Person Variables.....	80
Attributional Style Variables.....	80
Behavior Variables.....	83
Model Analysis.....	87
Measurement Models.....	88
Person Variables.....	89
Attributional Style Variables.....	92
Behavior Variables.....	95
Structural Models.....	98
Interaction Model (A).....	98
Situation Model (B).....	100
Attribution Model (C).....	102
Non-Attribution Model (D).....	102

Discussion.....	107
Measurement Models.....	112
Structural Models.....	113
Interaction Model (A).....	114
Situation Model (B).....	115
Attribution Model (C).....	115
Non-Attribution Model (D).....	116
Implications for Further Research.....	120
Conclusions.....	121
References.....	124
Appendices.....	134
I. Informed Consent.....	134
II. Questionnaire.....	135
III. Summary of Research.....	157
IV. Principle Components Analysis Rotated Factor Loadings.....	159

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for the Observed Variables.....	78
2. Principle Components Analysis of Observed Variables.....	81
3. Summary Indices of Model Fit for Measurement Models.....	89
4. Standardized Factor Loadings, t Values, Squared Multiple Correlations for Person Variables.....	90
5. Standardized Factor Loadings, t Values, Squared Multiple Correlations for Attributional Style Variables.....	93
6. Standardized Factor Loadings, t Values, Squared Multiple Correlations for Behavior Variables.....	96
7. Summary Indices of Model Fit for Structural Models.....	98
8. Difference Chi Square Tests Between the Models.....	102

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Structural Model: Interaction.....	53
2	Structural Model: Non-Attribution.....	56
3	Structural Model: Attribution.....	58
4	Structural Model: Situation.....	60
5	Measurement Model: Person Variables.....	62
6	Measurement Model: Attributional Style Variables.....	63
7	Measurement Model: Behavior Variables.....	64
8	Measurement Model: Person Variables.....	91
9	Modified Measurement Model: Attributional Style Variables.....	94
10	Modified Measurement Model: Behavior Variables.....	97
11	Structural Model: Interaction (A).....	99
12	Structural Model: Situation (B).....	101
13	Structural Model: Attribution (C).....	103
14	Structural Model: Non-Attribution.....	104

In the Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848/1977), Marx and Engles made some important and sweeping predictions concerning the organization and development of society. They predicted that society would advance through several states; evolving from a feudal structure through a capitalist to a socialist arrangement until it eventually came to rest in a genuinely communistic society.

These predictions were based on the primary assumption that society was organized around production. "In production, men do not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by cooperating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities ... The relations of production in their totality constitute what are called the social relations, society..." (Marx 1849/1977, p. 256). It was further assumed that two classes of people would develop based on their relationship to the means of production, and that they would develop differing motivations "arising from differing positions in the mode of production" (Albert & Hannel, 1978, p. 19). Eventually these differences would generate a class consciousness that would lead to the development of collective activities aimed at radically altering the power relationship between the two classes.

This evolution of society was to occur on both a material and social level. While both levels are related they do not necessarily evolve simultaneously. Material development refers to the evolution of capital itself.

Braverman (1974) has shown how capital has developed as Marx and Engles have predicted. Ownership of the means of production is totally removed from those who operate the means of production. In Marxist terms, the separation of capital from production has developed the working class into a "class-in-itself."

Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich (1976) have pointed out that while society has developed materially as predicted, it has not developed socially. According to Marx and Engles, material development should lead automatically to the development of a class consciousness. The working class should have evolved simultaneously into a "class-for itself," and begin acting for their interests as a class. In their article, they question why the working class, having developed materially, has failed to develop socially.

This dissertation addresses that question albeit in a necessarily limited way. Drawing from a broad range of previous research, it develops the case that this failure can be attributed to the very way our society is structured. Important evidence supporting this assertion lies in two trends that have occurred simultaneously over the past five decades. There has been a decline in individual participation in civic activities occurring simultaneously with an increase in the dominance of the corporate organizational structure.

Over the past 50 years there has been a steady decline in individual involvement in formal volunteer groups (Smith, 1975). In more recent times union membership has declined

and new organizing drives are facing increased difficulty (Riffin & Barber, 1978; Wrenn, 1985). Involvement in churches and the electoral process has also declined significantly during that time (Department of Commerce Bureau of Census, 1985; Abramson & Alderich, 1982). Essentially, people seem to be less and less involved in the formal, social networks that were once the heart of the community.

McKnight and Kretzman (1983), in outlining a strategy for community organizers in the 1980's, base their entire approach on the fact that people are no longer involved in formal social groups. When modern community organizing began in the "back of the yards" of Chicago with Saul Alinski in the 1930's professional organizers worked almost exclusively with indigenous leaders of neighborhood organizations and churches. The professional organizer of the 1980's, on the other hand, must focus his/her activities on building or re-building these social networks. The community institutions that provided the backbone of Alinski's organizing efforts in the 1930's are now only peripherally experienced by most people.

At the same time that community-based social institutions are declining in significance, corporations have been steadily increasing in importance. Owner-run industry has given away to national and multi-national corporations (Montgomery, 1979). As this process has evolved, individuals have become more and more separated

from the controls over production. The rise of large corporations as the dominant organizational form in the U.S. has significantly increased the use of bureaucratic control. Bureaucratic control is that which "grows out of the formal structure of the firm, rather than simply emanating from the personal relationships between workers and bosses...and... establishes the impersonal force of 'company rules' or 'company policy' as the basis of control" (Edwards, 1979, p. 131). The rise of bureaucratic control appears to be matched in time with overall decline of individual involvement in civic activities. Where the material conditions of employment were to be the very force that moved the working class to develop into a "class-for-itself," they have, instead become the major force hindering that development as predicted by Marx.

While there have been periods of great social upheaval and the sharing of class consciousness throughout the nation's history, these movements have always been prevented from developing the mass-base necessary to engage in prolonged revolutionary struggle. Present day is no exception. There is little evidence that the working class in the U.S. is developing into a "conscious agent of socialist revolution." It is argued here that the dominance of bureaucratic control has significantly altered the way in which people relate to each other. Mutual aid is no longer considered as a means of overcoming difficult situations. While the "YUPPIE" (Young urban professional) of the 1980's may share the fierce striving for independence with the

immigrant farmer of the 1870's, the communal nature of social relations are fading. The definition of independent is quickly evolving toward being mutually exclusive from cooperative.

Evidence for the role of the corporate model in altering social relations can be found in many disciplines. Economic analyses have shown how the expansion of capital and industrialization has moved to absorb most of the duties of the family, thus breaking down the most basic collective unit of our society (Braverman, 1974; Laslett, 1978, Skolnick & Currie, 1986). Historians and unionists have shown how the development of technology and the changing financial and political infrastructures have aided in the development of alienation (Montgomery, 1979; Edwards, 1979, Goodwyn, 1981). Educators and educational theorists have shown how the structure and process of education have also aided this breakdown of collectivity by training our children to respond to bureaucratic control (Spring, 1972; Levin, 1982; Browne, 1981).

While these approaches have provided important insights, there has been no systematic study of the psychological variables involved. The primary focus of research and theory has been on the larger social forces that have hindered the development of comradery and support among workers and community residents. A gap exists in that there has been no systematic examination of the psychological processes occurring for the individual at the point of interaction with these larger social

forces. There is a great deal of work indentifying the conditions that lead to alienation described above, but there is little on how and why these conditions have this effect.

Since any sociological phenomenon is the collective behavior of individuals, it is important to understand the process by which these forces are translated into individual behavior. The purpose of this dissertation is to apply psychological concepts to explain the process involved in the sociological phenomenon highlighted by the question, "Why didn't the U.S. working class became a 'class-for-itself' at the same time it developed as a 'class-in-itself" (Ehrenreich & Ehrenreich, 1976, p. 10)?

More specifically, this dissertation will attempt to show that the process outlined in the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis (Abramson, Seligman & Teasdale, 1978) can be useful in explaining the failure of Marx's prediction by providing insight into the psychological variables at the point of interaction between the individual and the larger social forces. It will be argued that 1) the hegemonic structure of social relationships creates a generalized state of learned helplessness; 2) the experience of learned helplessness and its manifested deficits vary primarily with the complexity of the social relationship with which the individual is involved, and; 3) that this state of learned helplessness is manifested in a) motivational deficits in that people are generally not

motivated to take collective action to serve their individual interests, and b) cognitive deficits in that it is difficult for people to understand how taking collective action can alter their individual quality of life, or to even consider collective activity as a means of problem solving.

The following pages will attempt to make connections among the drop in community involvement, the rise in the domination of bureaucratic control and the relations between control and commitment. Learned helplessness will be presented as the thread which ties these sociological phenomena together. It will be argued that bureaucratic control, by its very nature, removes control from the individual. It will be hypothesised that this loss of control reduces the individual's commitment to the product and process of the organization. This process is described in the formation of learned helplessness. The lack of control over contingencies brings about the lack of motivation seen in people's reduced commitment to those organizations that manifest bureaucratic control mechanisms. At the same time, the rise of the corporation as the dominant organizational form in society has increased the individual's experience in situations where he/she is essentially powerless.

In summary, this process of removing control over societal events is seen as a major contributor to the failure of the working class to develop into a "class for

itself." Use of bureaucratic control in school, work and government reduces an individual's willingness to engage in society in a proactive manner. This process is most evident in the relationship between control and commitment in organizational settings. It is argued that this relationship is due to learned helplessness. It is the manifestation of the motivational and cognitive deficits of learned helplessness that, in turn contributes to the breakdown of collectivity in our society. Without this collectivity a working class consciousness can not develop.

Learned Helplessness

The concept of learned helplessness first appeared in the literature in 1967 (Overmier & Seligman, 1967; Seligman & Maier, 1967). Since that time it has generated a great deal of interest and volumes of research have been written. Basically, the learned helplessness hypothesis states that,

...learning that outcomes are uncontrollable results in three deficits: motivational, cognitive, and emotional. The motivational deficits consists of retarded initiation of voluntary responses and is seen as a consequence of the expectation that responding is futile. The cognitive deficit consists of difficulty in learning responses that produce outcomes...Finally, the model...argues that depressed affect is a consequence of learning that outcomes are independent of responding (Abramson, Garber, & Seligman, 1980, p.4).

While the basic model has been repeatedly confirmed in animal research, the findings have been less consistent in studies involving human subjects.

In order to confront these inconsistencies Abramson, et al (1978) have reformulated the theory drawing on the attribution theory literature. Briefly stated, the reformulated hypothesis indicates that, when confronted with a situation that has an uncontrollable outcome, the individual asks himself/herself why she/he is helpless. In doing so the individual makes a causal attribution that plays a significant role in the development of helplessness. The original hypothesis was a cognitive model postulating that the organism must expect outcomes to be uncontrollable in order to exhibit helplessness. Exposure to uncontrollable events alone, however, is not enough to produce the predicted deficits. The reformulated hypothesis introduces attribution into the causal chain; "attribution... predicts the reoccurrence of expectations but the expectation determines the occurrence of the helplessness deficits" (Abramson, et al, 1978, p. 59).

In reformulating the hypothesis, Abramson and her colleagues have also identified three dimensions that describe the causal attribution made by individuals and the implications of those attributions a person makes "determines the generality of his helplessness deficits" (p. 50). The first dimension is when an individual determines the cause for the uncontrollability is internal or external. Is the uncontrollability due to some characteristic of the particular individual (internal) or is it due to greater systemic or environmental forces (external). A second dimension involves the determination of the cause as

personal or universal. Is the situation uncontrollable for all people in the situation (universal) or just the individual (personal)? Making an attribution to personal rather than universal impacts the individual's self-esteem and emotional state. The third dimension is stability. Will the uncontrollability continue indefinitely or is it bound in time for some particular reason?

This dissertation argues that interacting with the larger social system will, because of its very nature, creates a particular manifestation of learned helplessness. According to the dimensions outlined in Abramson, et al (1978), it is predicted that interactions with the larger social system will create causal attributions that are external, universal rather than personal, are stable over time, and are specific to large institutions and society in general. When interacting with a bureaucracy such as the University of Rhode Island, the state of Rhode Island, or a particular firm, the individual will confront a certain level of uncontrollability and will attribute it to universal causes. He/she will expect that no individual has control in such a situation. Because the causal attribution is universal it will have little or no impact on the individual's self-esteem, and as predicted (Wortman, Panciera, Shusterman & Hibscher, 1976), will have no direct impact on the individual's emotional state.

While this uncontrollability is seen as stable over time, it is also seen as specific to interactions with

institutions as described above. While it is indeed possible for a person to feel helpless in both his/her personal life and within the larger social system, these two are not necessarily connected. This dissertation asserts that the expectations of uncontrollability when dealing with the larger social system are generalized only to similar segments of the larger social systems, such as URI, industry, etc. Any sense of helplessness felt in one's personal life is likely to be due to a separate set of causal attributions. In other words, the causal attributions made by individuals are, to a large extent, situationally determined.

In understanding how the bureaucratic nature of the larger social system has a part in creating the expectancy of uncontrollability, it is helpful to examine the work of Miller and Norman (1979). Their expansion of the learned helplessness hypothesis included dividing environmental events into two categories; outcome cues and situational cues. "Outcome cues refer to the characteristics of the feedback concerning an individual's performance in a particular situation (p. 107). "Situational cues refer to the stimuli present in the situation itself that influence the individual's perception and interpretation of outcomes" (p. 107). As will be seen later in this dissertation, the nature of the bureaucratic structure is such that it places restrictions on the potential set of outcomes available in any one situation. Also, the constrained or controlled

nature of social relationships within a bureaucracy shape the response to individual actions in such a way as to powerfully color the person's perception of the situation and the possible outcomes. Weiner (1974) supports the role of the larger social system by hypothesizing the importance of environmental factors such as social norms and the observation of other's performance in the development of causal attributions.

This dissertation hypothesizes that the nature of bureaucratically structured social settings are such that single individuals can exert little control in such situations. Being placed in such settings, the individual quickly learns that he/she has little impact. This learning is generalized to the expectancy of uncontrollability that generates the cognitive and motivational deficits of learned helplessness within complex social systems. In organizational settings this process is reflected in the individual's lack of willingness to make a commitment to social systems that are bureaucratically structured.

Person Variables:

The major mediators of learned helplessness identified by Seligman and his colleagues have been previous response outcome expectations and the ability to discriminate among situations. The model presented here hypothesized that the process identified above is mediated by and individual's

previous experiences. How a person responds to any situation is partially dictated by the individual's personal history. This model attempts to capture the impact of people's history by including their socio-economic status, their experience in organizational settings and where they generally place the locus of control for events happening in their lives.

Socio-economic status is included because of its importance in determining an individual's base rate of experience. In addition, it has been found to be an important determinant of behavior in many studies across several disciplines. Experience in organizational settings is included in the model because it is assumed that an individual's ability to discriminate among situations will vary directly with his/her depth of experience within organizations. Lastly, the impact of personal history was also included by assessing an individual's locus of control. This concept was conceptualized in terms of generalized expectancy pertaining to the connection between personal characteristics and/or actions and experienced outcomes (Rotter, Chance, and Phares, 1972). It was also included because "given these descriptions, which have been derived from a large body of research, one could conclude that locus of control is an adequate personality equivalent of the state of learned helplessness " (Leftcourt, 1982, p. 248).

The Relationship Between Control and Commitment

A survey of the literature shows that, in general, there is a strong positive relationship between the control over the product and process of an organization and an individual's commitment to it. In his study of industrial democracy Blumberg (1973) concluded, "there is hardly a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced or that other generally acknowledged consequences accrue from a genuine increase in workers' decision-making power" (p. 123).

This relationship between control and commitment parallels the one described in the previous section. In learned helplessness a person who is placed in a response-independent situation ceases to engage the situation. In large organizations, the individual who has no control over the organization's product and process ceases to contribute to it. The one major exception is the workplace. There the individual is compelled, for economic reasons, to contribute regardless of his/her lack of control. However, in the work situation, the worker often provides the minimum amount of input acceptable. It has been demonstrated that organizations which emphasize the legalities of organizational control stifle creativity which "tends in practice to mean that the minimal standard for quantity and quality of performance becomes the maximal standard" (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 408). In the literature

reviewed, control is the independent variable against which changes in productivity, absenteeism, turnover, satisfaction, alienation, etc are measured.

Prior to documenting the relationship between control and commitment it is important to understand the concept of commitment. The literature provides no uniform or generally accepted definition of the term, either theoretically or operationally. The term commitment in this study is being used in a general way. Given that commitment is a hypothetical construct that cannot be measured directly, it will be viewed in terms of behaviors and attitudes. Some examples included a study by Houghland and Wood (1980) which defined commitment in terms of an individual's contributions to an organization. Alutto, Hrebinak, and Alonso (1973) attempted to operationalize the term using willingness to remain on a particular job or in a particular profession regardless of changes in salary, status, freedom, responsibility, etc. Becker (1960) measured commitment in terms of an individual's investments in the organization.

The early studies dealing with the importance of workers as thinking, feeling beings arose primarily from the failure of Taylor's Scientific Management approach. While not widely reported in the literature, the introduction of scientific management created more problems for industry than it solved. Almost without fail, the very hint of adopting its practices resulted in turbulent labor reactions. Edwards (1979, p.98) notes that "by the First World War its potential as a workplace panacea

had been destroyed by the intense labor opposition it generated. By the late 1920's it became clear that a different form of control over workers had to be developed. It was these conditions that led to the famous Hawthorne studies and the Human Relations school of organizational psychology (Bramel and Friend, 1981).

The experiments that began in Western Electric's Hawthorne plant in 1924 were to have a significant impact on industry. While suffering from several flaws in their experimental design (Carey, 1967; Rose, 1975; Franke, 1979), these studies have permanently changed management styles. The criticisms of the studies focused on the interpretation of the results as well as its design. The original reports claimed that supervisory style was the key variable in changing worker output (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939). Reanalyses of the data have led to different conclusions. Carey's (1967) analysis led to the conclusion that it was economic incentive not supervisory style that resulted in increased output.

For the purposes of this study, however, the most important finding of the Hawthorne studies was the identification of the "informal structure" of the organization. The experimental manipulations had created a greater sense of work-group solidarity which enabled "members to achieve a greater control of their conditions of employment than would otherwise be the case" (Clegg and Dunkerly, 1980, p. 133). To a small degree, the level of

worker control had been returned to a level that existed prior to the advent of the assembly line.

Since mainstream social scientists interpreted the results of the Hawthorne studies to be brought about by supervisory style, there was a burst of research on that topic. This research is important to this dissertation because it focuses on the relationship between how a worker is supervised (control) and the quality of his/her performance (commitment). The groundwork for much of that genre of research stemmed from Lewin and Lippit's classical leadership studies (1938) that identified the autocratic versus democratic styles of leadership. The consequences of the differing leadership styles were examined in several settings. Fiedler (1968) reviews several studies conducted in the 1950's involving diverse groups from high school basketball teams to B-29 bomber crews. The studies reviewed consistently showed that the more the supervisor was able to develop consensus within the group the greater his/her ability to demand group loyalty and the greater the productivity of the group. Studies done by the Survey Research Center involving an insurance company and a tractor manufacturing firm (Kahn and Katz, 1953) found that authoritarian styles of supervision lessened group satisfaction and productivity. A study of telephone workers showed that "workers allowed to work under informal supervision in small groups showed an increase in productivity over those operating under more rigid,

departmental supervision" (Blau and Scott, 1962, p. 150). Gouldner's research (1954) indicated that close supervision not only negatively effected production, but also generated aggressiveness toward supervisors. Morse (1953) had similar findings while researching this variable among female clerical workers. Day and Hamblin (1964) found that close supervision significantly reduced productivity and generated aggressive feelings toward supervisors and co-workers.

While not tested directly, the consistency of these findings lends support to the control-commitment relationship stated in the beginning of this section. The more closely the worker is supervised and the more rigid the work rules the less productive the worker.

As this type of research developed, many workers in the field extended the research into the area of job satisfaction. For a time job satisfaction dominated the field of organizational psychology. Locke (1976) estimated that as of 1972, over 3,000 articles had been published on the topic. While a review of the job satisfaction literature is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is important to note how the findings of this area support the generalizations stated concerning the relationship between control and commitment.

The early research on job satisfaction indicated that there are different levels of satisfaction for skilled workers than for unskilled workers (Hoppcock, 1935). Others found a strong relationship between occupational status and

job satisfaction (Thorndyke, 1935; Super, 1939). Gurin, Veroff and Field (1960) confirmed these early results in their study involving over 800 workers in eight different job classifications. They found a strong and steady decrease in the percentage of workers reporting themselves as "very satisfied" with their jobs as the level of control and complexity decreased. Forty-two percent of the professionals and technicians rated themselves as very satisfied as compared to only 13% of the unskilled workers surveyed. In her study of clerical workers, Morse (1953) reported satisfaction was directly related to decision making power. Only 24% of the workers surveyed were satisfied with the amount of decision making power they held. Hackman and Lawler (1971), in their study of telephone workers in 13 different jobs found significant correlations between job characteristics such as variety and autonomy and satisfaction. In a 1970-1971 survey of male, blue-collar workers found that less than 50% were satisfied with their jobs. Responses varied with the amount of variety, autonomy, and meaningful responsibility (Sheppard and Herrick, 1972).

Hertzberg (1973) did perhaps the most comprehensive work in the area of job satisfaction. His motivator-hygiene theory separated the job characteristics that merely saved a worker from being dissatisfied from those job characteristics that motivated the worker. The "satisfiers" were things that made the job bearable (working conditions,

salary, supervision, etc) while the motivators (responsibility, work itself, achievement, etc) predicted commitment and productivity. It is obvious from the list, that the things that most related to productivity and commitment are those items that best indicate worker control over his/her job.

The results found in the work on job satisfaction has been corroborated by the similar results found in the job enrichment/enlargement literature. A study commissioned by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (1975) reviews 34 studies that show that enriching jobs of workers has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction and productivity. Davis and Taylor (1972) and Davis and Cherns (1975) have also shown that job enrichment increases worker satisfaction. Herzberg (1968), however, has shown that job enrichment must include vertical enlargement to have a positive effect on satisfaction. Just giving an increase in tasks without an increase in control has a negative effect on satisfaction. Davis' findings (1966) in his review of several studies of job enlargement and enrichment concurs with Herzberg's findings. Jacobs (1975) and Jansen (1975) found similar results in studies involving technical field representatives and insurance workers.

Job satisfaction alone does not indicate commitment. However, the relationship between satisfaction and the indicators of commitment has been substantiated on several occasions. Porter and Steers (1973) found a negative

relationship between satisfaction and turnover and/or absenteeism in nine out of eleven studies reviewed. Katz and Kahn (1978) report similar findings in 15 out of 16 studies reviewed in their book, The Social Psychology of Organizations. In a more direct study of commitment, Shepard (1970) found a strong negative relationship between functional specialization on the job and commitment to organizational goals. Of the 34 studies reported in Work In America (1975) all but two found that increased job satisfaction and/or enrichment lead to increased productivity and decreased absenteeism and turnover.

Clearly this review lends a great deal of support for the premise that increased control over the work process positively affects a person's relationship to his/her work. Nord (1978), however, points out a major deficiency in the job satisfaction literature. Specifically, the attempts at increasing job satisfaction, productivity and reducing absenteeism and turnover do not address the central inequity in industry. They do not deal with the fact that the ultimate and final decision making power is in the hands of the management. If satisfaction is related to control over the work process then the degree of satisfaction that can be achieved by the worker is limited to the degree to which she/he has and feels control over the workplace.

Given the limits stated above, it is interesting to examine some of the work-related research that paralleled the research on supervisory style and job

satisfaction/enlargement. In particular, the following paragraphs review some of the literature that examines worker control more directly. Scanlon (1948) for example, reviews three case studies where workers were given control over the work process in addition to gaining a percentage of the profits. In these case studies only one of the three companies had success in introducing the profit sharing program. The company that succeeded differed from the other two in some important ways. One company introduced the plan unilaterally and gave the workers a yearly bonus if the company increased its productivity. The second company had previously used the program to defeat the CIO's organizing drives within the company. Neither company allowed the workers a say in the work process or involved them in the decision of whether or not to award bonuses. The third company worked through the union to develop the program, developed production committees that gave the workers a say in the work process, and developed an objective indicator of when a bonus should be paid. All these decisions were made in consensus with the union. The third company was successful in increasing worker productivity. The conclusion was that this success was reached because of the high level of worker involvement in decision making, including in areas typically considered solely in management's domain, like setting when and how much bonus should be paid and the official rate of profit for a given year.

Other studies during this time focused on the assembly line worker. Walker and Guest (1952) concluded in their study that the assembly line work is more disliked than any other major occupation and that the prime factor in this dissatisfaction was the lack of control over the pace of production. "Men with highly repetitive jobs, conveyor paced and so forth, were far more likely to take time off from work than those whose jobs did not contain such characteristics' (p. 120). Morse, Riener and Tannenbaum (1951) found that giving clerical workers control over the things that affected them increased productivity. Tannenbaum (1956) reports similar findings in several studies in his article on organizational control.

Trist, Susman, and Brown (1977) provide a detailed report on their attempts to increase the control coal miners had over their work. In their research program they attempted to break down the specialization and division of labor and foster a cooperative spirit among the work teams in the mines. In addition, they involved workers in setting production goals and means of approaching work.

From the beginning the project was seen as a cooperative venture between the union and management. Approval for the project was gotten by vote of the union and joint union-management committees were set up for decision making within the project. The initial results were extremely positive. Accidents and federal regulation violations among the autonomous crews were much lower than

the conventional crews and production was much higher among the experimental groups.

Interestingly, the project was a success during its experimental stages. However, after a while the earlier success began to break down. Part of the breakdown came as a result of the workers who were not in the experiment pushing to have the project extended to the entire mine. This premature push seemed to be motivated by a deep sense of suspicion among union members, especially those who had worked in the mine for many years. A common perception among the older group of workers was that the program was really an attempt to bust the union. This fear was based on actual union experiences: "the mine is located in a region ...where the percentage of unionized mines is low and where several local coal managers were known to have attempted to blunt union organizing efforts by paying wages above local contract levels" (p. 228). Payment above contract level was common practice among the experimental crew. In addition to general anti-union feelings in the region, the president of the company had "bitterly opposed" the union's organizing drive ten years earlier. The results seemed clear; one experiment taken out of context would not be successful in changing the prevailing attitudes of workers. When the project was being successful, it was because the workers had been given control over the work process. Its breakdown came, not from the workers in the project, but from other workers who had no reason to trust that this increase in worker power would serve their best interest in

the long term.

An experiment in a General Foods plant in Topeka, Kansas followed a similar pattern (Zwerlding, 1980). In this program, General Foods designed a plant that "...fully utilizes human potential..." The location of the plant and the type of employees were selected specifically for this experiment. The area was isolated from other General Foods plants and there was little union activity in the area. Many of the employees selected had had some supervisory experience in their previous jobs.

In this experiment, employees were given almost total control over the things that affected them directly. As with the experiment in the mines, the project was highly successful in the beginning. After five years the project began to break down. It became clear that "workers... enjoyed the power to make their own decisions, but only if they mimic what management would have decided upon on its own" (p. 27). It became obvious to many workers that the program was empowering workers to the point where it began to threaten middle managers and corporate executives. Frustrations of lower-level workers combined with sabotage of the program from above led to the final demise of the project. Final reports stated that the root cause of the project's failure was with middle and upper management being too threatened by the power being exercised by the workers themselves (Business Week, 1977).

An experiment at Harmon International Industries

attempted to avoid the problems highlighted in the experiments described above (Maccoby, 1975). Unlike the mining experiment, the project was developed by union and management together. It wasn't brought to the union as a completed proposal for their plebiscite-type vote. The goal of the project was "to create an American model for industrial democracy: a model that is acceptable to the unions and that might stimulate further union efforts" (Zwerdling, p. 42). This goal was significantly different from the goal of the General Food experiment, i.e., to provide the "lowest possible costs of goods with no sacrifice of product quality, service to the trade, or marketing flexibility" (p. 21).

The Harmon study moved slowly, attempting to work out the hostility between labor and management as the project developed. At first the workers tested the program by calling for changes in their immediate environments. Success at that level led to the escalation of demands around production issues. Each production related issue raised great debate within the factory. Worker confidence in the program increased with time. This process was reinforced by situations where workers actually overruled some management decisions around production. Within three years the project was expanded to the entire plant. While most workers were satisfied with the project, there was some discontent. As with General Foods, most of the discontent came from middle managers whose power was threatened by

worker control. Another source of discontent arose as the workers came to realize that they could control production but management controlled the fiscal aspects of the company. The consequence of that lack of control eventually lead to the death of the project as the company was sold to a five billion dollar multi-national conglomerate. This buy-out stripped the workers of their control by closing access to the top level management.

The case studies outlined above deal with the question of worker control directly, but not worker ownership. What is implied in the results of studies is that worker control without ownership, or control of the financial aspects, cannot be seen as a long-term success without much difficulty. On the other hand, studies of worker ownership indicate that such ownership does not necessarily mean greater worker participation in management. (Clarke, Fatchett, and Roberts; 1972).

Long (1978) showed that employee ownership increased employee performance. These results, however, were confounded by the fact that the employees studied also participated in management. Other research has failed to show consistent findings in the impact of worker ownership. An interesting example of ownership without control can be seen in the case study of the Vermont Asbestos Group of Northern Vermont (Zwerdling, 1980).

In a move to save their jobs, the workers organized and purchased the operation. However, to secure the necessary

loans from the banks, they had to agree to maintain the same management structure. Even without worker participation, the Vermont Asbestos Group prospered tremendously during its first years as a worker-owned business. It wasn't until the "honeymoon" was over that dissatisfaction began to emerge. The pride of ownership slowly gave way to frustration over lack of control. While the mine has remained profitable, worker dissatisfaction has led to slow and steady selling off of their holdings.

Long (1978) attempted to empirically separate ownership from control. Studying a trucking firm that has 70% of its stocks controlled by the workforce, he examined the roles of both ownership and participation in decision-making. His findings showed that "although share ownership does, in and of itself, appear to have beneficial effects on certain job attitudes, employee participation in decision-making appears to generally have strong effects" (p.761). Long's findings support the need to develop both ownership and control.

The relationship of control to commitment exists in voluntary organizations as well as in work organizations. Cloward and Piven laid out a theoretical framework for this relationship in their book, Poor People's Movements (1977). Using extensive data from the beginnings of the union movement, the civil rights movement and the welfare rights movement, they show that organizations emerge out of an unorganized push for social change. Typically this push leads to the development of an organization which, in turn, controls this push for change.

Eventually the development of an organization leads to the destruction of the movement that spawned it. The process by which this happens is complex. At first the leaders of the organization are reinforced by the members of the organization. As the organization matures the process of goal displacement begins. Over time, the maintenance of the organization becomes more important than maintaining a connection to the membership. In practical terms, the goals of the leadership of the organization slowly evolve into something different from the goals of the membership. As this happens the membership of the organization disperses and leaders are left without a constituency. An organization that has lost its base ceases to exist.

While the relationship of control to commitment is the same in voluntary organizations as it is in nonvoluntary, work organizations, the process is very different. As Cloward and Piven suggest, voluntary organizations begin with the membership in control and strongly committed to the organization and its goals. The decline of the organization comes after a formal structure has been institutionalized. The formalizing of the leadership tends to lead to their isolation from the membership. Once isolated, the leadership's goals cease to reflect the goals of the membership. This process of goal displacement has been supported by the works of several others (Michels, 1949; Zald and Ash, 1966; Edlestein, 1967; Hage & Aiken, 1967; Perry, Gillispie, & Parker, 1976) and has been shown to be fatal to many voluntary organizations.

The history of the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO) provides an excellent example of this process. This organization was formed by several smaller city and state-based welfare rights groups. At first the groups formed to increase the level of benefits available to recipients of Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). On the local level, tactics almost exclusively involved sit-ins at local welfare offices with demands being structured to meet the needs of individual members. As time went on, the leaders from these local organizations made contact with each other. As the leadership became more sophisticated, so did their demands. Eventually NWRO set up a national headquarters in Washington, D.C. and began to focus on lobbying for a guaranteed income for all Americans.

With this type of demand, the focus of the organization switched to lobbying and the needs of the individual members became secondary. Eventually the tactic of doing sit-ins became less acceptable to the leadership because it hampered their ability to lobby. Over time the membership began to lose interest. Either a lack of sophistication or the lack of faith in the ability to win such a large demand led to the dwindling of the local membership bases. Organizational resources were funneled to Washington and eventually the movement collapsed. While not the sole reason, clearly the loss of its active membership base in different states and cities played a major role in the demise of the organization. Local members who placed greater importance

on winning concrete benefits for individuals were no longer in control of the organization. Once control was lost, membership followed.

Perry and Perry (1978) show, through a case study, an organization that survives by resisting this tendency toward goal displacement. In their study they document the way in which a set of food banks weather a loss in federal funding. The initial response of the leadership to the threat was to cut back on the distribution of food and use the organizations resources to lobby for more money for food banks. In this instance the leadership did not prevail. Instead of consolidating its operation, the membership decided to disband the administrative branch of the organization and to decentralize the food banks into autonomous neighborhood operations. In this case the organization survived.

Fox and Arquitt (1981) find support for the control-commitment relationship in their case study of a VFW Post. While they did not find that members dropped out of the organization when feeling disempowered, they did find the such members related to the organization differently from the leadership. After three months of participant observation, they found that there were two kinds of members in the organization: "drinking members" and "working members." Interestingly, the working members were the people who held some formal leadership position. The drinking members had little knowledge of the operation of

the organization and leadership positions were passed around the working members. While the VFW Post did not lose its members, only those with power within the organization showed any commitment to it.

Schwartz, Rosenthal, and Schwartz (1981) document how the separation of the leaders from the membership base led to the demise of the Southern Farmers Alliance. Like the NWRO, as the organization grew focus its left the local level and moved to a national program. With this shift came a great deal of internal struggle among the members. The leadership ceased being directly accountable to its membership. After several turbulent years the organization folded. The goals of the leadership no longer reflected the needs and/or goals of the membership. Without control over the organization the commitment of the rank and file dissipated resulting in their exodus from the organization.

Houghland and Wood (1980) found that a sense of control was also important to church members. In their study commitment was defined as satisfaction and identification with as well as involvement in the church. Using Tannenbaum's control graphs (1968) it was found that amount of control was the most important predictor of an individual's commitment as defined by contributions to the church. While distribution of control was less important, it was interesting to see that distribution of control mattered substantially more to rank and file members than it did to officers of the church.

A few researchers have attempted to examine the collectivist organization; i.e. an organization that does not give the formal leaders control over the organization. Mansbridge (1973) found that groups without formal leadership have the tendency to develop informal leaders. These informal leaders, like their formal counterparts, also become isolated from the rank-and-file member and tend to develop goals that do not reflect the goals of the general membership. In her study she found that time available to contribute to the organization, amount of technical skill, and amount of emotion one is willing to invest in the organization are the three factors that separate the rank and file from the informal leaders. Regardless of whether a leader is formal or informal, once the leadership begins to act on goals that are different from the goals of the membership the group/organization begins to decay. Once the members feel out of control of the organizations' goals they discontinue their membership. Unlike work organizations, voluntary organizations do not have the economic forces to bind the member to the organization.

In an attempt to provide more empirical evidence, Rothchild-Whitt (1976) compared four alternative service organizations that had participatory decision-making structures. The organizations (a free high school, a free medical clinic, an alternative newspaper, and a food coop), were compared using observation over a 2 year period, structured interviews, and a questionnaire. In her study

Rothchild-Whitt found several factors leading to the survival of the alternative organization. The factors relevant to this study were: homogeneity of values among collective members, distribution of knowledge, and limits to size.

In all organizations examined there was consensus among members on the general direction of the organization and its place in the larger community. Tensions existed where there was an unequal distribution of information and/or skills. Members of the free medical clinic began to feel alienated. It was generally felt that the doctors had more control over the organization than non-doctors. This problem led to greater turnover of non-medical staff than medical staff. The alternative newspaper, on the other hand, insured the equality of information and skill by making all members rotate through every job. Turnover was not an issue at the paper. In the medical clinic, non-medical staff responded to their feelings of lack of control by leaving the collective unit thereby ending their commitment to it.

Another factor that contributed to the success of the organizations studied was the limit to their size. Rather than continue to grow with new membership, the organizations either spawned new organizations or expanded their base by coalescing with other organizations. For example, the free school joined forces with a local cultural organization to expand its curriculum instead of developing its own program. Size is important because the larger the organization the

less those involved can feel a part of the decision making process. In this study, commitment was shown by members' willingness to remain involved in an organization in spite of long hours and low pay. When individual members began to feel disempowered within the organization they broke off their commitment by leaving the collective.

Similar findings have also been found in less empirical reviews of social movements. Barkan (1979) found that the "affinity group" structure was vital to maintenance of the anti-nuclear movement. Affinity groups are small groups of 10 to 20 people who have joined together to take some form of political action. They operate on consensus. The anti-nuclear movement was organized as a federation of affinity groups. Each group had a spokesperson who would speak for them at larger meetings. The entire federation operated on consensus. As long as affinity groups felt connected to the larger federation the movement had a strong base. When that sense of connection was threatened or broken affinity groups began to disengage from the federation or disband entirely. Freeman (1975) and Carden (1974) report similar patterns within the women's movement.

While the sources of data offered to substantiate the strong, positive relationship between an individual's control over the product and process of an organization and his/her commitment to it are varied, the results are strikingly similar. In both voluntary and non-voluntary organizations the degree to which an individual will invest in an organization is positively related to

his/her sense of control over it. In work organizations where the member is bound to the organization by economic forces, he/she remains a member but limits his/her contribution to it. In voluntary organizations, members unable to control the direction of the organization "vote with their feet" by leaving the organization.

Continually confronted with a situation where a member has no control over the organization he/she is faced with two choices. One choice involves attempting to assert some level of control and the other is to disengage from the organization. The behaviors connected to each choice differ depending on the nature of the organization. In a work setting, the choice to assert control can take several forms. One obvious way to gain control is to join or form a union. Another method of asserting control would be to identify with the company and work toward a promotion into a more powerful position. The choice to disengage within a work setting can also take several forms. The most extreme form of disengaging is to quit. A less extreme form would involve engaging the organization at the lowest acceptable level.

While the basic choices of asserting control or disengaging are the same in voluntary organizations as they are in work organizations, how the choice is manifested is different. In a voluntary organization a choice to assert greater control would involve increasing one's level of involvement, e.g. running for office, joining a committee,

volunteering for important tasks, etc. Disengaging from an organization would involve quitting or remaining a peripheral or social member.

As shown in the previous review of the literature on control and commitment, the choice most frequently made when control over the organization is blocked is to disengage. Studies on work organizations show that workers with the least amount of control over their work are the workers with the greatest turnover rate. It has also been demonstrated that workers in general informally set a minimal acceptable level of productivity to which all workers adhere.

Workers are not only choosing to disengage, but they are also choosing not to engage in activities that might increase their control. A prime example of this failure is the previously cited statistics showing that unions are losing members and failing to win certification votes at unprecedented levels.

The pattern is similar in voluntary organizations. Studies of specific organizations show that individuals blocked from having control "vote with their feet" by leaving the organization. Data cited above also show that people in general are ceasing to join or remain members of voluntary organizations. The social and political clubs that were the foundation of the urban political machine no longer exists, involvement or identification with political parties has declined and church membership has dropped precipitously.

This pattern of behavior resembles the process of

learned helplessness outlined in the previous section. Continually confronted with a situation where the member has no control over the organization, he/she loses motivation and shapes his/her contribution accordingly thereby manifesting the motivational deficits of learned helplessness.

The cognitive deficits of learned helplessness are more difficult to demonstrate. There have been no studies examining this issue within an organizational context. In order to test for these effects within work organizations members would need to be offered real control over the company. This has not happened except where workers have bought out a plant that was being abandoned by management. However, the relatively little rank-and-file action taken by union members to fight cutbacks in salaries and benefits provides some anecdotal evidence that workers are having difficulty developing mechanisms for confronting the problems facing unions today.

Ray Rogers, who developed the corporate campaign approach to fighting cutbacks, supports this argument. The corporate campaign approach involves a union placing less emphasis on the strike and picket line and focusing on the financial community. While struggling for the right to unionize at J.P. Stevens, Rogers convinced the union to place pressure on the boards of directors of the companies that J.P. Stevens sat on. By coordinating withdrawals from

banks and placing pressure on insurance companies, the financial backers of J.P. Stevens finally threatened to remove the president of the company from their board of directors if he did not settle with the union.

This approach, while successful in the end, was very difficult to sell to the union. In an interview with Rogers (Hauser and Howard, 1982) he stated that union members had a hard time understanding the power they had in using the corporate campaign strategy; "I don't feel that all the negotiators for the union really recognized how much power they had." This lack of understanding and resistance to use the strategy certainly had the appearances of the cognitive deficits of learned helplessness.

The choice to disengage from organizations, to not engage in certain empowering activities, and to resist new strategies for confronting a lack of control are all behaviors that indicate learned helplessness. While there is no experimental data to confirm that the relationship between control and commitment is a function of learned helplessness, the behavioral responses to this lack of control are identical to the behavior predicted by the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. The model presented here addressed this issue by attempting to relate variance in manifestations of learned helplessness to changes in control within which the behavior occurs.

Bureaucratic Control

The concept of bureaucratic control is an important link pin in the theory being tested in this dissertation. Simply put, bureaucratic control refers to the embedding of control within a social system. The rules of the social system are, at least theoretically, objective criteria against which all behavior is judged and all members are held to equally. A basic tenet of this dissertation is that this removal of control from the individual fosters learned helplessness in those individuals involved in complex social systems.

There seems to be general agreement in the social sciences that the more complex the social system with which an individual is involved, the less he/she has control over that system. Skinner, in his essay Human Behavior And Democracy (1978), states that effective control is lost when we move beyond face-to-face groups. Society becomes more coercive when we abdicate our responsibility for face-to-face relationships and delegate the responsibility for social control to economic and political forces.

Seymour Sarason (1976) takes this point a bit further. He states that not only does our abdication of control to a central state create an entity that eventually becomes alien to our interests, more importantly, it robs people of their initiative. "The more powerful the state becomes, the more its people look to it as the fount of initiative

...the more the lives of people are the consequences of decisions made by...officialdom the more they are robbed of those communal bonds and responsibilities upon which the sense of rootedness is built" (p. 251).

Olsen (1971), in developing a theory of public goods, provides evidence that the size of the group is a major determinant of an individual's willingness to be committed to the collective. His theory of collective action states that an individual will not contribute to a large group without coercion or positive reward because a single person's contribution is not important. This dynamic is different, however, in small groups where one can see a direct relationship between contribution and personal gain.

Mayhew and Levinger (1976) provide a mathematical model to explain this process. Using probabilities, they show that as size of the group increases the amount of control exerted by an individual decreases; "while individuals may derive satisfaction not merely from participation in, but also from effecting a degree of control over, the interaction process, their opportunities to do so decrease with group size" (p. 1035). As the size of the group increases, the number of interactions increase and, given human limitations on receiving and processing input, each individual input has less impact. The natural consequences of this process is that an elite sub-group is formed which assumes control over the whole group's process. Mayhew and Levinger show that the greater the size of the group the greater the concentration of power.

The probabilistic model derived by Mayhew and Levinger supports the classic work of Michels (1949) where he lays out the "iron law of oligarchy." This "iron law" states that all large organizations move toward oligarchy. Organization precedes democracy, however, once formed organization stifles democracy because "Immanent oligarchical tendencies exist in every kind of human organization which strives for the attainment of definite end" (p. 32).

By and large, Michels "iron law" has weathered the test of time. While several researchers have challenged it (Gouldner, 1955; Lipset, Trow and Coleman, 1956; May, 1965; Edelstein, 1967), there has not been a great deal of success in disproving it. Michels' theory has been modified only to state that, while there is a tendency toward oligarchization in organizations, the process is not inevitable. Unless members of the organization take specific action to prevent the process, all large organizations will eventually form a ruling elite that will limit input from the general membership.

While size of a social system is obviously an important variable in determining the amount of input or control an individual can have, it is not the only variable. According to the theory presented here, the structure of the social system is the most important variable. The equal distribution of power within a large organization is clearly more difficult than in small face-to-face groups, however, successful examples do exist. In addition to the social

change movement organizations described above, there have been radical labor organizations like the Industrial Workers of the World (Dubofsky, 1969), the anarchist movement in Spain (Bookchin, 1977), the workers council in Northern Italy (Silard, 1981), and the highly successful Mondragon Coooperative network in the Basque region of Spain (Clamp, 1987a, Clamp, 1987b).

With the exception of the Mondragon Cooperatives the alternative models of organization cited have not persisted over time because of political reasons. Instead the organizational structure of bureaucracy has dominated society. Mainstream sociologists and organizational psychologists argue that this type of structure has endured because it is the most efficient. "The decisive reason for the advance of the bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization (Weber, 1948, p.214)." Others argue that bureaucracy is not the most efficient form of organization, but it does provide the greatest amount of control over its members. This issue is clearly laid out by David Gordon (1976) who draws a distinction between qualitative efficiency over quantitative efficiency. "A production process is quantitatively (most) efficient if it effects the greatest possible useful physical output from a given set of physical inputs" (p. 22). Qualitative efficiency exists when the process "best reproduces the class relations of a mode of production" (p. 22). In other words,

qualitative efficiency relates to the control of the workers and the labor process. Gordon argues that the capitalist firm, which is bureaucratically structured, favors qualitative efficiency over quantitative efficiency.

Reich and Devine (1981) develop an mathematical model that supports Gordon's position and shows that a collectively run business organization can and, in many instances, does yield a higher rate of profit than a more traditional bureaucratically structured organization. Bowles, Gordon and Weisskopf in their book Beyond the Wasteland (1983) provide substantial evidence to show that the capitalist firms in the United States waste as much as 49% of their resources by insisting on placing qualitative efficiency above quantitative efficiency.

Bureaucracy, as an organizational form, has its roots dating back to the pre-industrial period. As the industrial revolution developed and capitalism expanded, so did the need to create more efficient means for controlling the workforce. The methods used by the small, family owned business were not sufficient for the large scale firms that were developing. The entrepenuer of the late 19th century needed other methods of control. "Private enterprise in its most unrestricted period...tended to fall back on the only available models of large scale management, the military and bureaucratic" (Hobsbawm, 1975, p. 216).

Drawing from the structure of the Prussian army (Clegg and Dunkerly, 1980) Weber formalized the theory of

bureaucracy by developing the ideal form (1968). It is in reviewing this ideal that one sees how control is removed from the individual members of the organization.

The driving force behind bureaucratization is the need to rationalize the work process. Rationalization occurs when subjectivity and arbitrary rules are removed and all behavior is judged on an objective criteria. Based in his concept of legitimate authority, within a bureaucracy "obedience is not owed to anybody personally but to enacted rules and regulations...The person in authority, too, obeys a rule...namely, 'the law' or 'rules and regulations' which represent abstract norms" (Weber, 1969/1922, p.6).

While it is true that no pure bureaucracy operates, the existence of an ideal form does project a set of values and creates the myth that all people are governed by the same set of relatively immutable rules. Nothing underscores this myth more than the commonly heard bureaucratic responses, "I don't make the rules, I just follow them," and "the rules are the rules."

Over the years the concept of bureaucracy has been widely studied, and, while there have been modifications in the implementation of the theory, it has remained the basis of all mainstream organizational theory. Much of the early theorists (Mooney and Reily, 1931; Gulich and Urwick, 1937; Fayol, 1949) merely provided greater theoretical details for the implementation of administrative tasks within the bureaucratic organization. The Human Relations School of

Management simply attempted to integrate the emotional side of the worker into the rational organization without significantly altering the bureaucratic nature of the organizational structure. Mayo was clear in stressing that there needed to be equal emphasis on the development of the "social or collaborative skill" of the worker as, "these social skills will help us to gain the assent of members...to the orders of its executives" (1975, p. 45). Blau and Scott, in their classic book, Formal Organizations (1962), highlighted the importance of the informal social structure within the organization. Their work, however, focused on the means for keeping the goals of the informal group in line with the organization without sacrificing the formal, bureaucratic nature of the organization.

Some theorists did challenge the basic organizational model more than others. Burns and Stalker (1961) offered the "organic model" of organization. The basis of their model was that organizations needed more flexibility. Workers were to be organized around a particular task rather than within departments or bureaus. However, these writers did keep one of the most important elements in a bureaucracy; i.e., the embedding of rules, regulations, and norms within the social structure of the organization. While work may be organized differently within the organic organization than it would be within classic Weberian bureaucracy, the ultimate control over the process remains out of the hands of the individual members.

The application of systems theory to the study of organizations has also provided a fresh perspective. This approach, however, has focused primarily on the organizational process within a particular structure without challenging that structure. While a review of the applications of systems theory is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is instructive to consider some of the criticisms of that approach. Elger (1975) criticized systems theory for underplaying the role mechanisms of socialization and control play in producing role conformity. Socialization is the form of control that exists when the rules and regulations are embedded in the social structure. Allen (1975) points out the "equilibrium bias" in systems theory which over looks the forces that produce the status quo within organizations.

Perhaps the latest development in organizational theory is the attempt to apply Japanese management techniques to U.S. industries. This approach, known as theory Z (Ouchi, 1981), however, is best seen as an evolutionary step in the development of bureaucracy rather than a challenge to the bureaucratic model. The ultimate goal of this approach is to strengthen the adherence to the system's rules by involving all members in the enforcement of the rules. Peer pressure becomes the most powerful means of getting all members to work toward the organization's goals. The legal authority that was the primary building block in Webers bureaucracy is developed to its highest form in the Japanese firm. Even

though each member is involved in rule enforcement, he/she is still alienated from the control over the product and process of the organization. While this model of management has had some measure of success in Japan, it has been much less successful in the United States (Zeitz, 1984).

The intention of the above review was to make two points: 1) that the key element in a bureaucratically structured organization is the embedding of control into the very structure of the organization; and 2) regardless of the developments in organizational theory, the bureaucratic nature of mainstream organizations, i.e., the embedding of rules has remained functionally unchanged.

Statement of the Problem

The review of the literature presented above has shown that there is a strong, positive relationship between an individual's control over the product and process of an organization and his/her commitment to that organization. This review has also shown that, in bureaucratically structured organizations, control is removed from the individual and embedded into the very social structure of the organization. It is argued here, that this embedding of control fosters learned helplessness in the individual bringing on the motivational and cognitive deficits predicted by the model.

Specifically stated, this dissertation argues that:

- a. the bureaucratic form of control as defined above creates a situation of objective noncontingency for the individual interacting within a bureaucratically structured situation; and
- b. this objective noncontingency will lead people to perceive that the more bureaucratic the structure of the situation the less control they will have; and
- c. the above relationship will lead people to develop different attributional styles based on the level of bureaucratic structure perceived.
- d. the development of attributional style will also be shaped by the individual's previous experiences.

- e. the situational cues and the resulting attributions will lead the individuals to not expect to have control in bureaucratically structured situations; and
- f. the expectancy of noncontingency will lead to the manifestation of motivational and cognitive deficits predicted in the learned helplessness model.

Focusing on three sets of variables (person, attributional style, and behavior) this dissertation attempts to show how the above process unfolds. More specifically, it attempts to show that the symptoms of learned helplessness manifested in the behavior variables are a result of the attributions formed from the individual's perception of the situations. It is further argued that the individual does not develop a global attributional style that remains constant across all situations. Rather, the individual develops attributional styles to match the situations within which they are involved. It is also argued that the situation alone does not determine the development of the attribution of noncontingency, but that prior experiences conceptualized as person variables also contribute to the development of such attributions.

In addition to establishing the process outlined above, this dissertation address three questions: 1) the importance of attributional style in the development of

learned helplessness; 2) the degree of situational specificity of attributional style; and 3) the relative contributions to behavior of person variables, situational variables, and an interaction of the two.

In order to test the questions raised above, this dissertation employed the model-testing methodology recently developed by Joreskog (1969) and others, i.e., multivariate analysis with latent variables. "Multivariate analysis with latent variables is employed to simultaneously estimate the parameters of a causal model and a measurement model. The causal model specifies the linear influences hypothesized to be present in a group of latent constructs" (Bentler & Speckart, 1979, p. 456). In this method, the variables of interest (latent) consist of hypothetical constructs which cannot be measured directly. Instead, these latent variables are inferred from a set of observable or measured variables. "The measurement model denotes the linear relationships of these latent factors to the obtained observable variables" (p. 456). Each latent variable is represented by a set of observable indicators. Essentially, multivariate analysis with latent variables examines the total variance created by the latent variables and assesses the relationship among these variables. The value of the model is judged by the strength of the relationships and by its ability to explain the variance in the system relative to other possible models.

The above analysis requires that the measurement models

be identified first followed by the identification of the structural models. However, for the purposes of conceptual clarity, the structural models will be reviewed first here.

Structural Models

There are several ways in which the three types of latent variables (person, attributional style, behavior) can relate to each other. In order to identify the relationship among the latent variables which best explains the data, this dissertation tested four structural models.

Interaction Model: The Interaction Model, shown in figure 1, best represents the theoretical arguments presented in the previous section. It states that the development of learned helplessness is the consequence of the interaction between a person and the situation. Basically, the model states that an individual develops different attributional styles for different types of situations. The general hypothesis is that the more complex the social structure of the situation the more the individual's attributional style will lead to the learned helplessness deficits as predicted by the reformulated hypothesis.

More specifically stated, "the interaction of outcome and situational cues with individual differences results in an attribution to explain learned helplessness outcomes, this cause then determines the expectancy that influences future behavior" (Miller & Norman, 1979, p. 108). It also

Figure 1. Structural Model: Interaction

states that the situational and outcome cues vary according to the complexity of the social structure. An individual's ability to control the outcome of a situation varies with the complexity of the situation. This variability of control is reflected in the person's attributional style. All things being equal, an individual will expect to have greater control in a group than in an organization. Because of decreased expectancy of control the individual will manifest increased amounts of learned helplessness behavior as the social structure of the situation becomes more complex. Since the individual is expected to develop different attributional styles for each level of the situation presented it is expected that the attributional style variables will be relatively independent of each other.

The predicted relationships among the latent variables are indicated by the straight lines while the curved lines indicate the expected correlations among the variables. It is expected that the relationships indicated will have reasonably high path coefficients.

The above statements might best be prefaced with the phrase "all things being equal." The equality of things is limited by certain person variables. The strength of the above stated relationship is limited by individual differences as represented in the person variables. Together, those variables (locus of control, socio-economic status, institutional experience) have a direct impact on the development of an individual's

attributional style. The model predicts that the person variables are interrelated. The differing attributional styles lead to different levels of learned helplessness. Again, it was expected that individuals develop different behavior patterns according to the situation; therefore, the helplessness variables are expected to be relatively independent of each other.

Global Nonattribution Model: Two general hypotheses put forth in this dissertation are: (1) that the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis is correct in stating that attributions rather than objective reality are the key variable in explaining learned helplessness, and (2) that the context within which a situation is embedded is an important variable in creating the attributions that lead to learned helplessness. The Global Nonattribution Model, shown in figure 2 challenges both these hypotheses. This model states that the individual develops global styles and the person variables are at least as important as the situation variables in predicting the symptoms of learned helplessness, regardless of the individual's attributional style.

Reviewing figure 2, it can be seen that this model indicates that both global attributional style and individual variables contribute to a generalized learned helplessness. In addition, the figure indicates that the complexity of the situation does not affect the outcome.

This model repudiates the two general hypotheses stated above. Person variables are the source of

Figure 2. Structural Model: Non-Attribution

helplessness, with attribution style in a secondary role.

Global Attribution Model: With the volumes of research and theoretical papers published concerning learned helplessness theory, little has been said as to whether the individual develops a global or specific attributional style. The model shown in figure 3 predicts that the individual develops a global attributional style which is manifested across all situations. According to this model, social structure does not impact on the development of one's attributional style, thereby directly challenging one of the major arguments presented here. If social structure is irrelevant then learned helplessness cannot explain the relationship between control and commitment as stated in the previous section.

This global model emphasizes the person variables outlined in the Interaction model while removing the situational variables. The global model implies that individuals do not discriminate among situations, rather they have a personal style which is manifested across all situations. Statistically, this model would be supported if there were strong interrelationships across all levels of complexity within the attributional style and behavior variables. This model differs from the nonattribution model by hypothesizing that while influenced by person variables it is attribution that causes the learned helplessness.

Situation Model: This model, shown in figure 4, represents a strict situationalist perspective. Person

Figure 3. Structural Model: Attribution

variables are considered irrelevant and the individual is seen as developing an attributional style according to the situation only. This relationship is indicated by the lack of connecting arrows from the person to the situation variables.

The Situation model eliminates the interactional dimension included in the previous model. It does, however, provide support for the argument that the relationship between control and commitment in organizations can be explained by the reformulated learned helplessness. There is a direct, positive relationship between level of complexity and form of learned helplessness.

Measurement Models

While the major questions addressed in this dissertation were tested using the structural models, the validity of the structural models is dependent upon the quality of the measurement models. The measurement model specifies the relationship between the observed variables, represented by rectangles, and the latent variables, represented by circles. The structural models described above involve three sets of latent variables. How these variables were assessed is described in the following section.

Person Variables: The basic measurement model underlying the person variables is represented in figure 5.

Figure 4. Structural Model: Situation

It involves three sets of observed variables, i.e., locus of control, socio-economic status, and institutional experience. How these variables relate to each other are presented in this figure. As indicated by the curved lines, it is expected that the three latent variables will be intercorrelated.

Attributional Style Variables: This measurement model is shown in figure 6. Attributional style is categorized into three levels of social system being examined. The different levels presented are predicted to be relatively independent of each other. It is expected, however, that there would be a minimal statistical relationship among the latent variables due to the nature of the measures.

Behavior Variables: The symptoms of helplessness have been defined as depression, cognitive and motivational deficits. The reformulated hypothesis predicts that depression only occurs in certain response-outcome independent situations. Cognitive and motivational deficits, however, occur across all response-outcome independent situations. In order for depression to be accompanied with learned helplessness, the situations must impact on the individual's self-esteem. Since the predicted model states that the learned helplessness is universal, it should not affect an individual's self-esteem.

The predicted relationship among the latent variables are shown in figure 7. As can be seen, the different levels of helplessness vary with the level of complexity of the

Figure 5. Measurement Model: Person Variables

Figure 6. Measurement Model: Attributional Style Variables

Figure 7. Measurement Model: Behavior Variables

situation and that the set of variables are relatively independent across levels of complexity.

Method

Subjects

The subjects in this study consisted of 154 college students. Subjects were volunteers from Introductory Psychology courses at two colleges in Rhode Island. All volunteers were offered extra credit for participating in the study. Of the 154 subjects, 93 were female and 61 were male. All subjects were freshman and sophomores between the ages of 18 and 24 years old.

Assessment Measures

The data used to test the models outlined above were collected through the use of a questionnaire which was developed for this study. The first part of the questionnaire pertained to demographic information. In addition to gathering information about sex and age, subjects were asked to provide information about parent's education, occupation and income. The demographic data were followed by a series of measures (described below). The order of presentation was: Institutional Experience, Locus of Control, Attributinal Style, Motivational Deficits, Cognitive Deficits.

Locus of Control. Based on the work of Rotter, Chance, and Phares (1972), locus of control was conceptualized as a

generalized expectancy pertaining to the connection between personal characteristics and/or actions and experienced outcomes. It was included in this study because "given these descriptions, which have been derived from a large body of research, one could conclude that locus of control is an adequate personality equivalent to the state of learned helplessness" (Lefcourt, 1980, p. 248).

Locus of control was assessed using the multidimensional measure developed by Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) with a slight modification. While the original scale had four factors, only three were used in this study, specifically: Factor I (Control Ideology); Factor II (Personal Control); Factor III (System Modifiability). Factor IV (Race Ideology) was eliminated as it was not relevant to the study. A multidimensional scale was chosen because it has been demonstrated that Rotter's concept is not unidimensional (MacDonald, 1978). This scale was chosen because it is considered the best among the many locus of control scales available (MacDonald, 1978; Crook, 1983). While no reliability data have been reported on the scale, convergent validity has been demonstrated. Several studies have compared this scale with Rotter's original scale (MacDonald, 1978).

Socio-Economic Status: Socio-economic status (SES) was measured using three variables: occupation, education and income. Since the subjects were college-aged freshman

and sophomores, their SES was based on their parents' standing on each of those variables. Income was based on combined family income and was rated on a five point scale ranging from 1 (below \$10,000) to 5 (Greater than \$40,000). Subjects were asked to report their father's and mother's level of education. Their response was rated on a scale ranging from 1 (less than high school) to 5 (advanced degree). The highest rating of the two parents was used in this study. Respondents reported their mother's and father's occupation. The occupations were rated on a scale from 1 to 7 based on the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (1968). Like education, the highest rated occupation of the two parents were used in this study.

Institutional Experience: The major mediators of learned helplessness identified by Seligman and his colleagues have been previous response-outcome expectancies and the ability to discriminate among situations. To include these variables, the present study assessed institutional experience. It was assumed that such a measure would tap into the individual's previous response outcome experience. It was also assumed that an individual's ability to discriminate among situations would vary with his/her experiences both socially and organizationally.

To assess institutional experience the activity checklist developed by McDill and Rigsby (1973) was used.

This checklist provided subjects with a list of several activities and asked them to check those in which they had engaged, any office they might have held, and to estimate the amount of time per week they spent on those activities. The checklist provided a list of activities typically available to high school students. Three measures were obtained from this checklist: the total number of activities, the total number of offices held, and the average number of hours spent in those activities.

This checklist was chosen because of its demonstrated reliability. The test-retest reliability over a three week period was reported at .95 for number of activities, .84 for average hours per week, and .86 for offices held (Nover, 1981).

Attributional Style: The central variable in the model tested was attributional style as defined by Abramson, et.al. (1978). "Once people perceive noncontingency, they attribute their helplessness to a cause" (p. 49). It is the patterns of attribution that make up one's attributional style. This concept was measured using a modified form of the Attributional Style Scale developed by Seligman and his colleagues (Seligman, et.al., 1979). The original scale presented the subjects with twelve situations and instructed them to "write down one major cause" of the situation. Once the cause was identified, the subject rated the cause on four dimensions, i.e., personal-universal, global-specific, stable-unstable, and degree of importance. The modified

scale presented the subject with nine situations. Six of the situations were part of Seligman's original scale and three were added for the purposes of this study. All positive outcome items were dropped from the original scale because of the confusion in the literature on the relationship between learned helplessness and positive outcomes. In addition to the scale-type items, subjects were asked to generate a list of actions that might be taken to prevent the negative outcome in the situation presented.

A major question raised in this dissertation concerned the importance of the context or social structure within which a situation occurred. While there is an infinite number of ways to classify situations, the complexity of the situation was considered the key classification variable. Social structure was defined as the established network of social relations and shared orientations (Blau & Scott, 1962). Complexity was defined in terms of the number of echelons in the decision making component of those established social relations. Echelons are like steps in a chain of command (Miller, 1975).

Using Miller's Living Systems Theory, situations were classified into three levels of complexity, i.e., group, organization, and society. A group was defined as a social system that has no formal echelons in its decision making component. An organization was defined as a social system which has two or more echelons in its decision making component. A society was defined as a social system which is nearly totipotential, i.e., self-sufficient, and

typically has organizations serving as its critical subsystems. The three new items were added to the scale in order to balance the number of items representing each level of complexity.

The situations presented in the study were divided into the three levels of social system. The face validity of this division was tested by having three objective judges divide the situations according to definitions given above. Their judgements were unanimous. The situations were presented as follows:

<u>Group:</u>	A date goes badly
	A friend is hostile to you
	You refuse to help a friend
<u>Organization:</u>	An important presentation gets a bad reaction
	*Fraternity/Sorority rejects your recommendation
	You can't complete the work expected of you
<u>Society:</u>	You are unsuccessful in your job search
	*You lose your financial aid
	*Person you voted for was not elected

The items with astericks (*) are the items that were developed for this study.

The Attributional Style Scale was used because it was designed specifically for the testing of hypotheses

involving learned helplessness. In addition, the scale has shown reasonable test-retest reliability. These reliability coefficients ranged from .57 to .69 for negative outcome items (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982). The same study reported respectable internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .72 for negative outcome items. The validity of the scale was assessed by correlating it with two other measures of depression, i.e., the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) and the Multiple Affect Adjective Checklist (MAACL). For the full subject pool, the correlations were significant but moderate. The relationship was higher for subjects scoring on the extreme end of the BDI and the MAACL (Seligman, Abramson, Semmel, and Baeyer, 1979).

Behavioral Variables (Motivational Assessment):

Motivational deficits were defined by Abramson, et. al (1978) as "retarded initiation of voluntary responses" (p. 50). Given the nature of the study, it was not possible to assess motivational deficits directly. Instead, assessment was made of the individual's willingness to take action to deal with a particular situation. It was assumed that the subject's willingness to act would be indicative of the presence or absence of a motivational deficit. Two measures were employed to assess motivation to take action. The first measure was Perceived Involvement. In this measure subjects were asked to consider the social life

around them, the school they were attending and world events. Using three sets of five concentric circles, they were asked to rate how close they were to the center of things within each of those situations. The center circle was given a value of one and the outer most circle was given a value of five. This type of measure has been used successfully in several psychological and sociological studies (Coleman, 1961; Huritz, 1968; McDill and Rigsby, 1973; Nover, 1981). A test-retest reliability coefficient of .77 was reported in Nover's study.

A second measure is also used to assess motivation to act. Future Involvement asked subjects to rate how likely they were to engage in certain activities in the future. The likelihood of performing these behaviors was rated on a five point Likert scale ranging from "highly likely" to "highly unlikely." Subjects were presented with six sets of behaviors, two for each level of social system. The behaviors presented are as follows:

<u>Group:</u>	Join fellow students in arranging a dorm
or house party
	Organize friends to become involved in a
school sponsored event
<u>Organization:</u>	Vote in the next school election
	Become involved in a formal
extracurricular activity
<u>Society:</u>	Vote in the next presidential election
	Become involved in non-school related
civic organization

Behavioral Variables (Cognitive Assessment): Learned helplessness theory predicts that once it is learned that an outcome is uncontrollable it is difficult to learn that a particular response could control or produce a particular outcome in the future. Three measures were used to assess the subject's ability to produce an appropriate response. The first measure, Idea Initiation, was embedded in the Attributional Style Scale. It involved asking the subjects to generate a list of actions they believed could alter the negative outcomes of the situations presented.

The second measure, Perceived Influence, used a five point Likert scale which asked subjects to rate how much influence they thought they had over each situation. The rating ranged from 1 (none at all) to 5 (a lot). Two situations were presented for each level of social system. The situations were:

<u>Group:</u>	A friend's choice of an evening's entertainment
	A friend's choice of who to invite to a party
<u>Organization:</u>	The school's decision to raise tuition
	The student senate's decision on how to spend the student activities fee
<u>Society:</u>	The state's decision to raise the drinking age to 21 years old
	The federal government's decision to invade Grenada

The third measure, Action Initiation, called for the subjects to generate a list of actions they might take to increase their influence over the situations listed above. This measure was scored by simply adding the number of actions listed by the subject at each level. It was an attempt at getting a direct behavioral measure of the amount of ideas a subject could generate.

Procedure

Commencement of this study was approved by the University of Rhode Island's Institutional Review Board which protects the rights of human subjects. After approval was obtained the Psychology Departments of two colleges in Rhode Island, in addition to the University of Rhode Island were contacted. The University of Rhode Island and one other college agreed to allow access to their students.

Students were given a brief description of the study and an explanation of what participation would entail. At one college, students signed up to be subjects and came to a testing session outside of class. At the other college students participated in the study during class time. Subjects were presented a questionnaire with an informed consent form attached (see Appendices I and II). The informed consent form gave a brief description of the study and made the subjects aware of their rights as subjects.

Once the informed consent form was signed and collected, subjects began filling out the questionnaire. It took between 45 and 75 minutes to complete the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, subjects who wished it were given a more detailed explanation of the study and the concepts being used in the theory. All students were given a one page sheet that gave a similar, more detailed overview of the study (see Appendix III).

Results

In order to test the hypotheses presented in this dissertation a model had to be constructed that showed the complex relationship among the key variables. In addition, alternative models also needed to be constructed to be contrasted with the hypothesized model. This process took several steps.

The first step involved the development of three measurement models which showed the relationship between the observed variables and the latent variables. Once these were constructed, four competing structural models which showed the relationship among the latent variables were constructed. Testing the hypotheses presented involved comparison of the competing structural models.

The measurement models were developed through the use of Principle Components Analysis and the structural models were analyzed using Multivariate Analysis with Latent Variables with the LISREL (Joreskog & Sorborm, 1983) complex program. Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations and ranges for the observed variables used in the models presented.

Principal Components Analysis

Many of the variables used to test the models presented were developed for this dissertation. Given that these measures were previously untried, a Principal Components

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for the Observed Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Range</u>
<u>Socioeconomic Status:</u>			
Occupation	3.26	1.45	1-7
Education	2.16	1.05	1-5
Income	4.12	1.09	1-5
<u>Institutional Experience:</u>			
Number of Activities	8.43	6.20	0-31
Average Hours Spent	6.63	5.04	0-28.7
Number of Offices Held	0.62	0.87	0-4
<u>Locus of Control:</u>			
Control Ideology	5.27	2.23	0-13
Personal Control	2.14	1.41	0-5
System Modifiability	2.43	1.22	0-4
<u>Attributional Style - Society:</u>			
Congressional Election	3.86	0.87	1.8-7.0
Finding a Job	4.84	0.95	2.0-7.0
Financial Aid Cut	4.61	1.00	2.0-7.0

(table continues)

Attributional Style - Organization:

Fraternity/Sorority Membership	3.85	0.82	1.8-5.8
Can't get expected work done	5.05	0.98	2.3-6.8
Poor Audience Reaction	4.60	0.90	2.3-6.8

Attributional Style - Group:

Date goes badly	4.12	1.02	1.5-6.5
Friend with problem	4.51	1.08	1.3-7.0
Hostile Friend	4.44	0.92	1.8-7.0

Behavioral Variables - Group:

Perceived Involvement	3.07	1.02	1-5
Future Involvement	7.32	2.09	2-10
Perceived Influence	7.23	1.29	4-10
Idea Initiation	2.72	1.72	0-9
Action Initiation	1.29	1.15	0-6

Behavioral Variables - Organization:

Perceived Involvement	4.23	0.99	1-5
Future Involvement	7.10	2.00	2-10
Perceived Influence	3.90	1.47	2-8
Idea Initiation	3.08	1.88	0-9
Action Initiation	1.34	1.34	0-6

Behavioral Variables - Society:

Perceived Involvement	3.94	0.96	2-5
Future Involvement	6.62	1.72	2-10
Perceived Influence	3.03	1.49	2-9
Idea Initiation	2.86	1.99	0-9
Action Initiation	1.02	1.28	0-6

Analysis (PCA) was conducted to assess the factorial structure of the variables. Since the model involved nine sets of variables, the PCA fit the data into nine factors using the MAP-200 program developed by Velicer and Zwick (1979). The nine factors, presented in Table 2, accounted for 55.89% of the variance. A variable was considered to load on a factor if its loading was .4 or greater. The pattern matrix for the PCA can be found in Appendix IV.

Person Variables: The factor structure of the Person Variables was excellent. As can be seen in Table 2; Occupation, Education, and Income held together (Factor 4), clearly identifying Socio-Economic Status as one factor. Locus of Control (factor 6) also held together well with Control Ideology, Personal Control, and System Modifiability loading on one factor (Factor 6). There was, however, an additional variable that loaded on this factor. The extra variable (Attributional Style-Group) loaded on two factors. The variables predicted to measure Institutional Experience (Number of Activities, Average Hours Spent on Activities, Number of Offices Held) held together in one factor (Factor 2) as well. However, four other variables also loaded on this factor. Two of the four additional variables loaded on more than one factor.

Attributional Style Variables: The factor structure of the Attributional Style Variables did not hold up as well as it did for the Person Variables. Two out of three variables

Table 2

Principal Components Analysis of Observed VariablesFACTOR 1 - Action Initiation

0.743	Action Initiation (Group)
0.821	Action Initiation (Organization)
0.805	Action Initiation (Society)

FACTOR 2 - Institutional Experience/Helplessness (Group)

0.655	Number of Activities
0.440	Average Hours Spent On Activity
0.537	Number of Offices Held
0.443	Perceived Involvement (Group) (8)*
0.617	Future Involvement (Group)
0.494	Perceived Influence (Group)
0.480	Future Involvement (Organization) (8)

FACTOR 3 - Attributional Style (Group)

0.739	Attributional Style (Organization)
	"You give a talk...audience reacts negatively"
0.575	Attributional Style (Group)
	"You go out on a date and it goes badly"
0.709	Attributional Style (Group)
	"A friend comes to you with a problem..."

FACTOR 4 - Socio-Economic Status

0.809	Parent's Occupation
0.752	Parent's Education
0.719	Parent's Combined Income

(table continues)

FACTOR 5 - Helplessness (Society)

0.743 Perceived Influence (Organization)
 0.431 Future Involvement (Society)
 0.761 Perceived Influence (Society)

FACTOR 6 - Locus of Control

0.516 Control Ideology
 0.638 Personal Control
 0.452 System Modifiability
 0.581 Attributional Style (Group) (9)
 "You meet a friend who acts hostilely towards
 you"

FACTOR 7 - Idea Initiation

0.737 Idea Initiation (Group)
 0.814 Idea Initiation (Organization)
 0.624 Idea Initiation (Society)

FACTOR 8 - Perceived Involvement

0.587 Perceived Involvement (Group) (2)
 0.699 Perceived Involvement (Organization)
 0.532 Future Involvement (Organization) (2)
 0.518 Perceived Involvement (Society)

FACTOR 9 - Attributional Style (Society)

0.623 Attributional Style (Society)
 "The person you voted for... was not elected"
 0.728 Attributional Style (Society)
 "You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully"
 0.432 Attributional Style (Group)
 "You meet a friend who acts hostilely toward you"

Note: The number in parentheses indicates the other factor on which the variable has loaded.

predicted to measure Attributional Style-Group held together in one factor (Factor 3). The third Attributional Style - Group variable loaded on two factors, Factor 6 (Locus of Control) and Factor 9 (Attributional Style - Society). The variables predicted to measure Attributional Style - Organization did not hold together at all. Two of the three variables did not load on any of the nine factors and the third variable loaded on the Attributional Style-Group factor (Factor 3). The predicted factor of Attributional Style - Society, on the other hand, held together fairly well. Two variables held together on one factor (Factor 9) while the third Attributional Style - Society variable did not load on any factor. An extra variable, however, did load on this factor. The extra variable was an Attributional Style - Group variable that loaded on two factors.

Behavior Variables: The Behavior Variables were all developed for this dissertation. As might be expected with new variables, there were several problems in how their structure was reflected in the PCA. The models presented predicted three factors in this set of variables, and each factor was to have five variables (Perceived Influence, Perceived Involvement, Future Involvement, Action Initiation, Idea Initiation). However, two unexpected factors appeared (Factors 1 and 7) which combined similar variables across the three predicted factors. The variables in these two factors, Idea Initiation and Action Initiation, were very similar to each other in form and very different from all the other variables in the questionnaire. Both

sets of variables asked the subject to make a list. Idea Initiation asked subjects to list all things they might do to change the outcome of a particular situation. Action Initiation asked subjects to list all things they might do to increase their influence over a particular situation. These were the only items in the questionnaire that asked subjects to produce a list. In all other items subjects were asked to rate something on a Likert type scale or to report something by checking off a category. Given the nature of these two sets of variables it is impossible to tell if the factors held together because of what they measured or because of method variance. It is also impossible to tell if the factors measured a subject's ability to initiate ideas and/or actions or their ability to produce a list.

A third unexpected factor also appeared. This factor (Factor 8) was made up of four variables, i.e., Perceived Involvement across all three levels and Future Involvement. Of those variables, Future Involvement and Perceived Involvement - Group, loaded on two factors. Because this factor combined Perceived Involvement across all levels, it created difficulty in interpretation. A major tenet of the models being tested is that there are differing attributional styles for different situations. In order to test the model, the variables in the measurement model should differentiate among the various types of situations. These variables were not able to do that.

After excluding Idea Initiation, Action Initiation, and Perceived Involvement (Factors 1, 7 and 8), the remaining two variables in the predicted factor of Helplessness - Group held together on one factor (Factor 2). However, these variables loaded on the same factor as the variables making up the Institutional Experience factor (Factor 2). The predicted factor of Helplessness-Organization did not hold together at all. Of the two variables remaining after the Action, Idea Initiation and Perceived Involvement variables are removed, one (Future Involvement) loaded on two factors and the other loaded on the Helplessness-Society factor (Factor 5). The two remaining variables in the predicted Helplessness - Society factor did hold together (Factor 5).

On the basis results reported above, several post hoc changes were made in order to test the models presented. The weakest of the observed variables were removed and the measurement models were adjusted to reflect those changes. All variables that failed to load on any factor or loaded on more than one factor were dropped. The variables in the Idea, Action Initiation and Perceived Involvement Factors were also dropped for the reasons stated above.

Once these changes were made it seemed that the organization factors in both the Attributional Style Variables and Behavior Variables did not measure what they were intended to measure. After using the criteria for removing variables stated above, only one Attributional Style -Organization variable remained and it loaded on the Attributional Style-Group factor. Applying the above

criteria to the variables predicted to measure Helplessness - Organization also left only one variable and it loaded on the Helplessness-Society factor.

In retrospect it seemed reasonable to question the use of a student's interaction with a college as a valid measure of a person's interaction with an organization as described in the theory presented in the previous section. The theory stated that the impersonal nature of a bureaucracy is key to creating learned helplessness. The way in which colleges deal with students differs greatly from how most organizations deal with their members. The manner in which colleges treat students is quasi-parental. Students are not just a part of the means of production for the college, but are considered the product of the college themselves.

Given the reasons stated above, the variables intended to measure the organization factors were dropped from the models. After these changes were made, the factors used in testing the models were as follows:

Person Variables:

Socio-Economic Status - Factor 4

Occupation

Education

Income

Locus of Control - Factor 6

Control Ideology

Personal Control

System Modifiability

Institutional Experience - Factor 2

Number of Activities

Average Hours Spent on Activities

Number of Offices Held

Attributional Style Variables:

Attributional Style (Group) - Factor 3

A date goes badly

You don't help a friend with a problem

Attributional Style (Society) - Factor 9

Person you voted for not elected

Unsuccessful job search

Behavior Variables:

Helplessness (Group) - Factor 2

Perceived Influence (Group)

Future Involvement (Group)

Helplessness (Society) - Factor 5

Perceived Influence (Society)

Future Involvement (Society)

Model Analysis:

The models presented were tested using the computer program developed by Joreskog and Sorbum (1983) entitled Analysis of Linear Structural Relationships by Maximum Likelihood and Least Squares Method (LISREL VI).

The data were analyzed in two steps. The first was to determine the best possible measurement models. The

observed data was tested to see how it best fit the latent variables. The structural models were then modified so that the best available measurement models could be used. Once the measurement models were established, the four competing structural models were run. The results of those analyses are described below.

Measurement Models:

The quality of the models presented was assessed using three measures: Chi Square, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), and Root Mean Square Residuals (RMS). Each of these measures provides information concerning how well the data fit the models. The GFI measures the amount of variances and covariances accounted for by the model. Its value ranges from 0 to 1. The higher the value the better the data is assumed to fit the model. The RMS, on the other hand, is a measure of the average residual variance and covariance. In this case, the lower the RMS the better the model is assumed to fit the data (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1983). The Chi Square is not a direct test of the model but a test of the null hypothesis. Failure to reject the null hypothesis is an indication that the model is consistent with the data (Pedhazur, 1982). Given that failure to reject the null hypothesis is the preferred outcome, the higher the probability value the better the data is assumed to fit the model.

As can be seen in Table 3, the summary indices of model fit for the measurement models show relatively good fit between the observed and latent variables. In all cases the goodness of fit indices are over .9, the residual mean squares are .06 or below, and the chi squares are relatively low, yielding nonsignificant probability levels.

Table 3

Summary Indices of Model Fit for Measurement Models

<u>Indices</u>	<u>Person (Model 1)</u>	<u>Attributional Style (Model 2)</u>	<u>Behavior (Model 3)</u>
Goodness of Fit	0.983	0.993	0.978
Adjusted Goodness of Fit	0.969	0.925	0.928
Residual Mean Square	0.04	0.029	0.06
Chi Square	11.46	2.33	7.32
Degrees of Freedom	24	1	3
Probability Level	0.985	0.127	0.062

Person Variables: The measurement model for the person variables, shown in figure 8, was the strongest of the three models. As reported in Table 3, the indices of fit indicate an almost perfect fit between the data and the hypothesized measurement model. Table 4 shows the standardized factor loadings, t values, and squared multiple correlations for each of the observed variables. It also reports the total coefficient of determination. As can be seen, with the exception of the average hours spent on an activity, all other variables have moderate to high loadings. The observed variables loading on the latent

Table 4

Standardized Factor Loadings, t Values, Squared Multiple Correlations for Person Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Standardized Factor Loadings</u>	<u>t Values</u>	<u>Sq Multiple Correlation</u>
Occupation	0.816	8.406***	.666
Education	0.618	6.821***	.382
Income	-0.592	6.588***	.350
Number of Activities	0.454	2.510*	.206
Average Hours on Activities	0.176	1.547	.031
Number of Offices Held	0.696	2.679*	.484
Control Ideology	0.488	2.963**	.238
Person Control	0.453	2.890**	.206
System Modifiability	0.304	2.326*	.092

TOTAL COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION = .929

- * p < .05
 ** p < .01
 *** p < .001

Figure 8. Measurement Model: Person Variables

variable socio-economic status are the strongest, ranging from .592 to .816. The remaining variables, although not as strong, were also within acceptable levels.

The squared multiple correlations provide estimates of the reliability and stability of the observed variables. For the individual variables, values range from .031 to .666 indicating that some of the observed variables are highly unstable. Average Hours Spent (.031) and System Modifiability (.092) were particularly unstable. Occupation (.666) and Number of Offices Held (.484) were moderately stable, yielding the highest squared multiple correlations in the measurement model. While the individual observed variables are only moderately stable at best, the Person Variable Model, on the whole, seemed quite stable. The total coefficient of determination was quite high (.929) indicating a high degree of internal consistency and reliability for the overall model.

The measurement model for person variables presented earlier predicted that the latent variables would be correlated. However the intercorrelations among the latent variables ranged from .13 to .17 and were not significant.

Attributional Style Variables: Based on the outcome of the PCA, as reported above, the measurement model for the Attributional Style variables was modified. The modified measurement model is represented in figure 9. As can be seen in Table 3, the indices of fit indicate that there was

a reasonably good fit between the observed variables and the latent variables. Table 5 shows the standardized factor loadings and related t values indicating that the observed variables load reasonably high on the latent variables. The factor loadings range from .40 to .67 which were all significant at the .05 level or better. Also reported in Table 5 are the multiple squared correlations for the observed variables. The values range from .451 for Attributional Style - Group(B) to .157 for Attributional Style - Group(A) indicating that no variable was particularly stable or internally consistent. The whole Attributional Style Variables measurement model was only moderately stable with a total coefficient of determination of .715.

Table 5

Standardized Factor Loadings, t values, Squared Multiple Correlation for Attributional Style Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Standardized Factor Loadings</u>	<u>t Values</u>	<u>Sq Multiple Correlation</u>
Group A	0.486	2.94**	.157
Group B	0.407	2.87**	.451
Society A	0.489	2.35*	.336
Society B	0.396	2.55**	.252

TOTAL COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION = .715

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Figure 9. Modified Measurement Model: Attributional Style Variables

The measurement model presented in figure 9 predicted that the two latent variables would be correlated. This prediction was supported. As can be seen in the figure, the two variables have a correlation of .41 which is significant at the .05 level.

Behavior Variables: Based on the outcome of the PCA, as reported above, the measurement model for the Behavior variables was modified. The modified model is presented in figure 10. Table 3 shows that the observed data fit the latent variables relatively well. However, it was problematic getting the analysis to run and it could only be done by setting the error terms for each of the latent variables equal to one another. While there may be theoretical reasons for setting these values as equal, the decision was primarily a statistical one. This post hoc decision was made because the model would not run without this constraint, making it necessary in order to test the structural models presented. With these constraints in mind, the standardized factor loadings and resulting t values presented in Table 6 show reasonable loadings. The loadings range from .40 to .49 with probability levels of .01 or better. The squared multiple correlations indicated that the individual observed variables had low internal consistency and were highly unstable with values ranging from .198 to .201. In addition, the total coefficient of determination (.517) indicated that the model, even when taken as a whole, was only moderately stable. The Behavior Variables measurement model was the weakest of all

measurement models and introduced a great deal of error into the system.

Table 6

Standardized Factor Loadings, t values, Squared Multiple Correlations for Behavior Variables

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Standardized Factor Loadings</u>	<u>t Values</u>	<u>Sq Multiple Correlation</u>
Future Involvement (Group)	0.486	3.90**	.201
Perceived Influence (Group)	0.407	3.33**	.201
Future Involvement (Society)	0.489	3.89**	.198
Perceived Influence (Society)	0.396	3.21*	.198

TOTAL COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION = .517

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

As with the above measurement model, the latent Behavior variables were predicted to be correlated. This prediction was supported. As can be seen in figure 10, the correlation between the factors was .55 which was significant at the .05 level.

Figure 10. Modified Measurement Model: Behavior Variables

Structural Models

As can be seen in Table 7, all of the structural models presented fit the data reasonably well. The goodness of fit indices were above 0.89 for all models and the Chi Squares were low relative to the degrees of freedom. In addition, the residual mean square for each of the models was relatively low ranging from 0.057 to 0.069.

Table 7

Summary Indices of Model Fit for Structural Models

<u>Indices</u>	(A) <u>Interaction</u>	(B) <u>Situation</u>	(C) <u>Attrib</u>	(D) <u>Non-Attrib</u>
Goodness of Fit	0.923	0.924	0.918	0.932
Adj Goodness of Fit	0.895	0.899	0.891	0.905
Residual Mean Square	0.067	0.066	0.069	0.057
Chi Square	114.46	110.27	123.50	100.93
Degrees of Freedom	112	114	116	109
Probability Level	0.42	0.581	0.299	0.697

Interaction Model (Model A): Figure 11 shows the path coefficients for the Interaction Model. Interestingly, while the overall model seemed to fit the data, none of the path coefficients were significant. A closer look at the results, however, indicate that some of the paths are stronger than others. Figure 11 shows the t values for the path coefficients. As can be seen, the path from

Figure 11. Structural Model: Interaction (A)

Locus of Control to Attributional Style - Society is non-zero. The path from Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style - Group also appears stronger than most others. In addition, the modification index generated by the LISREL program indicated that there may be a path from Institutional Experience to Helplessness - Group. However, this path was not included in this model for theoretical reasons.

This model also predicted correlations among the person variables. However, as the phi coefficients indicated and was shown in the measurement model, these correlations were not significant.

Situation Model (Model B): Figure 12 shows the path coefficients for the Situation Model. As with the Interaction model, the overall model appeared to fit the data but none of the path coefficients were significant. However, as can be seen in the figure, the path coefficients between the Attributional Style variables and the Helplessness variables do show some strength. As was predicted and indicated in the measurement model for Attributional Style, the correlation between Attributional Style - Group and Attributional Style-Society was significant at the .05 level. The modification index produced by the LISREL program indicated that there may be a significant path between Institutional Experience and Helplessness - Group. The possible presence of this path was indicated in both Model A and Model B.

Figure 12. Structural Model: Situation (B)

Table 8 shows the difference Chi Squares between the nested models. As can be seen, the extra paths that exist in Model A did not add enough information to create a difference between the models.

Table 8

Difference Chi Square Tests Between the Models

<u>Model</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Chi Sq</u>	<u>Probability Level</u>
Model A - B	2	4.09	ns
Model C - D	7	22.57	.001
Model 1 - A	88	102.90	ns
Model 1 - B	90	98.81	ns
Model 1 - C	85	89.47	ns
Model 1 - D	92	112.04	ns

Attribution Model (Model C): Figure 13 shows the path coefficients for the Attribution Model. Again, the summary indices in Table 7 show a good fit between the data and the latent variables without any path coefficients being significant. As with the models reviewed above, the modification index indicated the possibility of a significant path between Institutional Experience and Helplessness.

Non-Attribution Model (Model D): Figure 14 shows the path coefficients for the Non-Attribution Model. As indicated, the path from Institutional Experience to

Figure 13. Structural Model: Attribution (C)

Figure 14. Structural Model: Non-Attribution (D)

Helplessness was significant at the .01 level.

Interestingly, this was the only model which tested for the presence of this path, yet in all the other models the modification index indicated that there might be a significant path between those two latent variables. It should be noted, however, that the observed variables in the latent variable Institutional Experience and Helplessness - Group loaded together on the same factor (Factor 2) in the PCA reported in Table 1. In addition to the one significant path, two other paths (Locus of Control to Helplessness and Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style) appear stronger than most others.

Reviewing Table 8 it can be seen that the additional paths in Model D did add a significant amount of information. Since the only significant path in the model was the path between Institutional Experience and Helplessness it was likely that that path added the important new information.

The summary indices reported in Table 7 show the models presented to fit the data reasonably well. However, the fact that only one path was significant presented some contradictory evidence. In reviewing both the measurement and structural models it was clear that the data for the measurement model for the person variables fit exceptionally well. Given the possibility that the level of fit for that model resulted in the overall structural models appearing to fit the data, difference Chi Squares were done between the

measurement model for the person variables and all the structural models. As can be seen in Table 8, none of the Chi Squares comparing the measurement model for the person variables to the other measurement models were significant indicating that none of the additional paths in the structural models added a significant amount of information for explaining the data.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to present and test a theoretical model which linked two phenomena together. These phenomena were the decrease in the level of active involvement of individuals in formal organizations and the increase in the role large, complex organizations play in our lives. A key linkpin in this theory was the direct relationship that has been shown to exist between the control a person has over the process and product of an organization and his/her commitment to that organization. It was further argued that large, complex organizations, because of their bureaucratic nature, prevented individuals from having this control, thereby leading individuals to disengage or to minimally engage the organization. This lack of willingness to engage in an organization is thought to generalize to all situations that occur within a similar bureaucratic context. The greater the bureaucratization, the less the individual control and the greater the individual will disengage.

The final piece of this theory stated that the process involved in the relationship between control and commitment can be explained using the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. This hypothesis states that when an individual views a situation he/she makes a judgement. The judgment involves the expectation of control over the outcome. The individual's expectation leads him/her to attribute control over the outcome to himself/herself or to an external cause.

If control is attributed to an external cause the individual then manifests the symptoms of learned helplessness. The theory presented here states that situations that occur within a bureaucratic context lead the individual to attribute control over the outcome to an external cause. This attribution is then generalized to all situations within bureaucratic contexts because of the lack of control that actually exists within that type of setting. In other words, the lack of control would be seen as specific to the situation as opposed to global. In addition, the lack of control would be seen as stable and not peculiar to any one person, but a condition faced by all people in the situation. The externality of the cause indicates that none of the emotional symptoms of learned helplessness would be expected.

To test this theory a model was presented which hypothesized that helplessness resulted from attributions of cause and that attributions were a result of both individual characteristics and the context of the situation. This model was contrasted with three other models that varied different aspects of the theory.

All four models tested were shown to fit the data relatively well. The most perplexing finding was that, while the data fit the models in all cases, only one path coefficient was significant. The path from Institutional Experience to Helplessness was the only significant path. This path was tested in only one of the models, yet the modification index in the other three models did suggest

that this very same path existed. In addition, the four models were presented as two sets of nested models. This arrangement allowed for the comparison of models within each set. The comparison between the Non-Attribution Model and the Attribution Model indicated that the path described above did add a significant amount of information.

On the surface, these results would indicate that the latent variables within the models were relatively well measured and, with the one noted exception, independent of each other. The link between Institutional Experience and Helplessness is somewhat supportive of the learned helplessness hypothesis. Seligman and his colleagues have argued that previous experience does have an effect on the development of helplessness. However, the path going directly from Institutional Experience to Helplessness without being mediated by Attributional Style fails to support the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. In reformulating the hypothesis Abramson, et al (1978) have asserted that the actual situation is not enough to create helplessness in humans. There needs to be some cognitive process involved where the individual makes an attribution of helplessness. The findings here exclude that step and seem to suggest that whether or not the individual manifests helplessness will depend on his/her experience in institutional or organizational settings.

There are several reasons for questioning the interpretation of the results presented above. First, the

link between Helplessness and Institutional Experience is foretold by the fact that these two latent variables are highly correlated as indicated by the fact that they both load on the same factor. In reviewing the factor structure of the seven latent variables, it can be seen that most of these variables are independent of each other. The only exception is Helplessness - Group and Institutional Experience. It is likely that it is this connection that caused the path coefficient to be significant. It is not possible to tell whether the relationship between the two variables is causal, based on a shared method variance, or is due to some third, unknown factor which correlates with both. The argument that the link between Helplessness and Institutional Experience is due to the variables loading on the same factor is strengthened by the fact that in the two structural models where a path is suggested by the modification index, it is the path between Institutional Experience and Helplessness - Group. There is no indication that a path exists between Institutional Experience and Helplessness Society. This finding suggests that it is the relationship between Institutional Experience and Helplessness - Group that results in a significant path when both Helplessness - Group and Helplessness - Society are combined.

In addition to questioning the link described above, there are also reasons to question the interpretation that the latent variables are well measured and independent of

each other. As indicated in the previous section, the reliability of the measures is questionable. While the Person Variable measurement model appears to be quite stable with a high degree of internal consistency, the Attributional Style and Behavior Variables measurement models were much less so. The low reliability of these two sets of variables makes the above stated interpretation questionable. While it is possible that the measures are independent of each other, some of them are clearly not well measured.

A more plausible explanation for all the structural models fitting the data was related to the quality of the measurement model for the Person Variable. The indices of model fit showed an almost perfect fit between the data and the measurement model. In addition, the Coefficient of Determination indicated a high degree of internal consistency. Given the strength of this model and the weakness of the other measurement models, it is possible that the fit of the measurement model for the Person Variables was so strong that it carried the structural models. This interpretation is supported by the difference Chi Squares that showed that there was no difference between the measurement model for the Person Variables and all four of the structural models. Since the rest of the paths beyond the Person Variables do not add a significant amount of information it is reasonable to assume that the concepts assessed were not measured well enough to truly test the models presented.

Measurement Models:

In reviewing the measurement tools used in this dissertation, it is clear that the questionnaire used needs a great deal of development before the models presented can be truly tested. The measurement model for the Person Variables was tested using highly developed measures. Hollingshead's scale of social status has been used several times and has shown its reliability and validity. The locus of control scale developed by Gurin et al was also well established. It had been used on several populations and factor analyzed and has always held up well. Even the weakest of the measures used for this model, the activity checklist, has shown itself to be reliable and has proven useful in several studies.

The Attributional Style scale held up moderately well for the study. There was, however, much room for improvement. This study used that scale differently than it had ever been used before. In addition, while the format of the scale was not changed, its content was slightly altered for the purposes of this study. These changes combined with the fact that the scale is still undergoing development by its authors may have contributed to the weakness of the Attributional Style measurement model and the lack of clarity in the structural models.

The weakest of the measurement models was the

Behavioral Variables model. The measures used in this model were all untested. The problems with the fit of this model to the data were apparent in several places. First, a questionable assumption regarding the error terms for the observed variables had to be made before the data would converge with the model. The assumption was made that the error terms of the observed variables would be equal. While the similarity of format of these variables might support the assumption, no such provisions were made in the construction of the scales to generate equal error terms. Also, the decision to add the constraint of equal error terms was made post hoc. Without this constraint the model would not hold together as the method would produce improper solutions (e.g. negative variance estimates).

Even greater indications of the weakness of the variables in this measurement model can be found in the squared multiple correlations for the individual items and the total coefficient of determination for the entire model. Both of these statistics indicated poor reliability and weak internal consistency.

Structural Models:

The problems with the measures stated above make further interpretation of the data risky. However, it is possible to speculate on some of the relationships among the variables. In addition to the one path that was significant

(Institutional Experience to Helplessness), there were some paths that showed some potential because of their strength relative to the other paths. These are highlighted in the review of each specific model.

Interaction Model (Model A): The theoretical formulation proposed in this dissertation was represented by this model. The data provided partial support for this model. While no path coefficient was significant, three paths did appear stronger than the others. These paths (Locus of Control to Attributional Style - Society; Institutional Experience and Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style - Group) indicate the importance of previous experience in the development of attributional style. These relationships do support the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis by indicating the importance of past experiences to attributional style. While the relationship between the Person Variables and the Attributional Style Variables was not as strong as predicted, the results do not contradict the model presented. The theory presented states that one develops different attributional styles for different situations and that this development is affected by one's past experience. The results suggest that the relationship does follow the expected trend. The fact that the full model did not get support may be accounted for by the weaknesses in the measures outlined above. In addition, the particular weakness of the Behavior Variables Model may have accounted

for the lack of significant paths from the Attributional Style Variables to the Behavior Variable.

Situation Model (Model B): While there were no significant path coefficients in this model, the two predicted paths did show some strength. This model partially supports both the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis and the hypotheses presented in this dissertation. The paths going directly between the group variables and directly between the societal variables is suggestive of the thesis that attributional style is situation specific. The model presented in the dissertation states that an individual's attributional style varies according to the social structure of the situation. Learned helplessness within a complex system does not mean that an individual will manifest learned helplessness in a group or face to face setting. The paths running from the Attributional Style Variables to the Behavior Variables support the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis by highlighting the importance of the cognitive process of attribution in the development of the behaviors described as learned helplessness.

Attribution Model (Model C): The Attribution Model is supportive of the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis but contradicts the hypotheses presented in this dissertation. The model states that attributional style is global and not specific to the situation. While there were no significant path coefficients, several paths

did show some relative strength. The paths from Locus of Control and Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style as well as the path from Attributional Style to Helplessness were stronger than others. These results suggest support for the learned helplessness hypothesis and contradict the model presented here. The paths indicated that previous experience shapes an individual's global attributional style which leads to cross-situation behaviors described as learned helplessness.

Non-Attribution Model (Model D): This model challenges both the model presented in the dissertation and the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. The latter is challenged by having the Person Variables and Attributional Style Variables contribute equally to the Behavior Variables. While not completely contradictory to the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis, it does show that attributions alone are not the key factor in creating learned helplessness.

The Non-Attribution Model was the only model tested that had a significant path coefficient, i.e. the path from Institutional Experience to Helplessness. While reasons have been previously stated for doubting the importance of this path, it does indicate that previous experience in organizations does impact on the development of behaviors described as learned helplessness. In addition to this path, two other paths showed some strength (Locus of Control to Helplessness and Socioeconomic Status to Attributional

Style). Including these paths strengthens the model even more. Several aspects of the data on this model present a strong challenge to the reformulated learned helplessness model. The fact that the one significant path and one of the paths approaching significance go directly from the Person Variables to the Helplessness Variable raises a question about the importance of the cognitive process of attribution. This challenge is further strengthened by the lack of even a hint of a path from Attributional Style to Helplessness. However, it is important to remember that poor measurement properties for the constructs does not allow a fair test.

As stated in the previous section, the four models presented can be categorized into two sets. The Interaction Model and the Situation Model both support the hypotheses that attributional style is situational, while the Attribution and Non-Attribution Models hypothesize that attributional style is global. The interpretations of the results presented above are contradictory. The interpretations in the first set of models show tentative support for the situation specific hypothesis, while the interpretations in the second set of models show tentative support for the global hypothesis.

The seemingly contradictory interpretations are indicative of the problems with the data stated earlier. It is reasonable to assume that the large amount of variability and the problems of low internal consistency for both the

Attributional Style variables and the Helplessness variables have contributed to the contradictory interpretations. This argument is supported by the fact that none of the path coefficients account for large amounts of the variance. Even the highly significant path connecting Institutional Experience to Helplessness in the Non-Attribution model only accounted for approximately 29% of the variance. It is also important to note that the small sample size relative to the number of variables could have contributed to the poor results. There was only 17 subjects per variable in the study. If the ratio of subjects to variables were better, it might have been possible that the variability would have stabilized allowing for some of the paths to be significant.

Regardless of the shortcomings stated above, the general pattern of the results lends tentative support for the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. This support can be seen by the fact that given the weakness of the measures all models except the Situation Model had paths from one or more of the Person Variables to the Attributional Style Variables that showed some potential. The only exception is also the only model that did not test for the paths connecting those sets of variables. Also, in two (B and C) out of four models, the paths from the attribution to behavior variables appear relatively strong. Taken together, the data suggest the possibility that helplessness stems from attributions based partially on the situation and partially on previous experience.

In every one of the other three models, the path from Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style was stronger than the other paths. In addition, in the Interaction Model the paths from Locus of Control to Attributional Style - Society and from Institutional Experience to Attributional Style - Group also appeared to have strength relative to the other paths. In the Attribution Model the paths from Locus of Control and Socioeconomic Status to Attributional Style both showed some promise.

Even though these paths are not significant, the fact that they appear to have relatively greater strength than the other paths in all models tends to highlight the importance of the cognitive process of attribution. The absence of paths from Attributional Style Variables to Helplessness Variables in two of the four models challenges the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis. However, their absence is easily attributed to the extreme unreliability of the Helplessness Variables.

In addition to providing tentative support for the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis, the data encourage further examination of the question of global versus situationally determined attributional styles. Again, while not significant, paths in two of four of the models are suggestive of the situational hypothesis. Clearly the general weakness of the measures and the Measurement Models clouds any interpretation of the data. However, enough of a question remains on the issue to warrant further research.

Implications for Further Research:

Before further research into the model presented can be conducted, however, much work must be done to better develop the instruments. With the exception of the variables used in the Measurement Model for the Person Variables, all other scales need further development. In improving the instruments, it would be important to change the subject population. In order for the organizational level variables to be developed it is important to have the subjects use their place of work as the context for responding to those items. Also, it would be important that the place of work be within a complex organization. It was clear that the college student population was inappropriate for the organizational variables because of their unique relationship to the college.

A useful approach to further scale development would involve a two step process. The first step would be to conduct indepth interviews with three different groups of people. One group would include people who were currently active in some form of volunteer organization, union or church. The second group would include people who have never been active in any such group. The third group would include people who had been involved in such organizations but have discontinued their involvement.

After the indepth interviews, the data would be content

analyzed in an attempt to identify the process whereby people choose to become or not become active. Interviewing the third group would give some insight into the issues for people who, after being involved, have chosen to cease such involvement. The purpose of these interviews would be to identify items for a questionnaire that would be more successful in tapping into the process of involvement than the one used in this dissertation. The goal would be to identify a large number of items to be placed in a questionnaire that would then be given to a large population of adults. The data collected in this pilot study would be used to reconstruct the scales used in the Attributional Style and Helplessness Measurement Models.

Conclusions:

This dissertation argued that 1) the hegemonic structure of social relationships creates a generalized state of learned helplessness; 2) the experience of learned helplessness and its manifested deficits vary primarily with the complexity of the social relationship with which the individual is involved, and; 3) this state of learned helplessness is manifested in a) motivational deficits in that people are not generally motivated to take collective action to serve their individual interests, and b) cognitive deficits in that it is difficult for people to understand how taking collective action can alter their individual

quality of life, or even consider collective action as a means of problem solving.

While the literature review was strongly supportive of these positions, the data were, at best, only tentatively supportive. A major reason for this limitation lies with the weakness and unreliability of the measures used. However, the fact that tentative support was found in the face of the problems with the measures indicates the potential validity of the theoretical formulation put forth here and the need for further research in this direction.

In general the data showed that previous organizational experience does influence the development of learned helplessness. Also, while the results were somewhat contradictory, some evidence suggested the importance of both attributional style and the structure of the situation in the development of learned helplessness. Overall the data were not conclusive. However, the results suggest that with improved measurement tools stronger support might be found for the hypothesis that attributional style is a cognitive process which is situation specific and that bureaucratically structured situations tend to foster learned helplessness.

Establishing the existence of the above relationship would answer the question raised at the beginning of the dissertation regarding the failure of the working class in the United States to develop into a "class-for-itself." If the answer is to be found in the structure of social

relationships as suggested here, then strategies for breaking the apparent stagnation in the development of working class consciousness can be brought forth based on the reformulated learned helplessness hypothesis.

References

- Abramson, L.Y., Garber, J., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1980). Learned helplessness in humans: An attributional analysis. In J. Garber & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), Human helplessness: theory and applications. (pp. 3-35). New York: Academic Press.
- Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M.E.P. & Teasdale, J.D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 49-72.
- Abramson, P.R., & Alderich, J.H. (1982). The decline of electoral participation in america. The American Political Science Review, 76, 502-521.
- Albert, M., & Hahnel, R. (1978). Unorthodox marxism. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Allen, V.L. (1975). Social Analysis. London: Longman.
- Alutto, J.A., Hrebinak, L.G., & Alonso, R.C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. Social Forces, 51, 448-454.
- Barkin, S.E. (1979). Strategic, tactical and organizational delemas of the protest movement against nuclear power. Social Problems, 27, 19-49.
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32-40.
- Bentler, P.M. & Speckart, G. (1979). Models of Attitude-Behavior Relations. Psychological Review, 86, 452-464.
- Blau, P.M., & Scott, W.R. (1962). Formal Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Blumberg, P. (1973). Industrial democracy, the sociology of participation. New York: Schocken.
- Bookchin, M. (1977). The spanish anarchists. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Bowles, S., Gordon, D. & Weisskopf, T. (1983). Beyond the wastland. New York: Doubleday.
- Bramel, D., & Friend, R. (1981). Hawthorne, the myth of the docile worker, and class bias in psychology. American Psychologist, 36, 867-878.

- Braverman, H. (1974). Labor and monopoly capital. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Browne, K. (1981) Schooling, capitalism and mental/manual division of labour. Sociological Review, 29, 445-473.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. (1961). The management of inovation. London: Tavistock.
- Carden, M.C. (1974) The new feminist movement. New York: Russell Sage.
- Carey, A. (1967). The hawthorne studies: A radical criticism. American Sociological Review, 32, 403-416.
- Clamp, C. (1987a). History and structure of Mondragon system of workers cooperatives. In E.M. Bennet (ed.). Social intervention: Theory and practice. (pp. 349-370). Lewiston, Canada: The Edwin Mellan Press.
- Clamp, C. (1987b). Managing cooperatives at Mondragon: Persistance and change. In E.M. Bennet (ed.). Social Intervention: Theory and practice. (pp. 371-392). Lewiston, Canada: The Edwin Mellan Press.
- Clarke, R.O., Fatchett, D.J & Roberts, B.C. (1972) Workers participation in mangement in Britain. London: Heinemann.
- Clegg, S., & Dunkerly, D. (1980). Organization, class and control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Cloward, R.A. & Piven, F. (1977). Poor peoples movements: Why they succeed and how they fail. New York: Pantheon.
- Coleman, J.S. (1961). The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education. New York: The Free Press.
- Crook, J.E. (1983) Locus of control: A survey of recent instruments. Unpublished manuscript.
- Davis, L.E. (1966). The design of jobs. Industrial Relations, 6, 21-45.
- Davis, L.E. & Cherns, A.B. (1975). The quality of working life, Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Free Press.
- Davis, L.E. & Taylor, J.C. (Eds.) (1972). Design of jobs: selected readings. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.

- Day, R.C., & Hamblin, R.L. (1964). Some effects of close and punitive supervision. Journal of Sociology, 69, 499-510.
- Department of Commerce Bureau of Census (1985). Historical statistics of the U.S. colonial times to 1970.
- Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (1975). Work in america. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dubofsky, M. (1969). We shall be all. New York: New York Times Book Company.
- Edelstein, J.D. (1967). An organizational theory of union democracy. American Sociological Review, 32, 19-31.
- Edwards, R. (1979). Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the twentieth century. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Ehrenreich, J., & Ehrenreich, B. (1976). Work and consciousness. Monthly Review, 28, 10-18.
- Elger, A.J. (1975). Industrial organizations, a processual perspective. In J.B. McKinely (ed.) Processing People: Cases in organizational behavior. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 91-149.
- Fayol, H. (1949). General and industrial management. London: Pitman.
- Fiedler, F. (1968). Personality and situational determinants of leadership effectiveness. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.). Group Dynamics. (pp. 362-380). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Fox, E. & Arquitt, G.E. (1981). The vfw: A case study in the "iron law of oligarchy" and goal displacement. Qualitative Sociology, 4, 198-216.
- Franke, R.H. (1979). The hawthorne experiments: Re-view. American Sociological Review, 4, 861-867.
- Freeman, J. (1975) The politics of women's liberation. New York: D. McKay.
- Goodwyn, L. (1981) Organizing democracy: the limits of theory and practice. Democracy, Jan, 41-60.
- Gordon, D.M. (1976). Capitalist efficiency and socialist efficiency. Monthly Review, 28, 19-39.

- Gouldner, A.W. (1954). Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1955). Metaphysical pathos and the theory of bureaucracy. American Political Science Review, 49, 3-41.
- Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (1937). Papers on the science of administration. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J. & Feld, S. (1960). Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books.
- Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R.C. & Beattie, M. (1969). Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 29-53.
- Hackman, J.R. & Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 259-286.
- Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1967). Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12, 72-92.
- Hauser, D. & Howard, R. (1982). An interview with Ray Rogers. Working Papers, 9, 24-26.
- Hertzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, 46, 53-62.
- Hertzberg, F. (1973). Work and the nature of man. New York: New American Library, Inc.
- Hobsbawn, E.J. (1975). The age of capital, 1848-1875. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hoppcock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper.
- Houghland Jr., J.G., & Wood, J.R. (1980). Control in organizations and commitment of members. Social Forces, 59, 85-105.
- Hurwitz, J. (1968). Some effects of power on relationships among group members. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (eds.), Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jacobs, C.D. (1975). Job enrichment of field technical representatives - Xerox Corporation. In L.E. Davis & A.B. Cherns (Eds.). The quality of working life (pp. 285-299). New York: Free Press.

- Janson, R. (1975) A job enrichment trial in data processing in an insurance organization. In L.E. Davis & A.B. Cherns (Eds.). The quality of working life (pp. 300-315). New York: Free Press.
- Joreskog, K.G. (1969). A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis. Psychometrika, 34, 183-202.
- Joreskog, K.G. & Sorbom, D. (1983). LISREL V and LISREL VI: Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood and least squares methods (2nd ed.). Uppsala, Sweden, University of Uppsala, Department of Statistics.
- Kahn, R.L., & Katz, D. (1953). Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.) Group Dynamics. (pp. 612-628) Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Laslett, P. (1978). The family and the collectivity. Sociology and Social Research, 63, 432-442.
- Lefcourt, H.M. (1980). Personality and locus of control. In J. Garber & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.). Human Helplessness: Theory and applications. New York: Academic Press.
- Levin, H.M. (1982). Education and organizational democracy. In F.A. Heller & C. Crouch (Eds.), International yearbook of organizational democracy. (pp. 1-35). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. Sociometry, 1, 292-300.
- Lipset, S.M., Trow, M.A. & Coleman, J.S. (1956). Union Democracy. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and cause of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnett (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Long, R. (1978). The relative effects of shared ownership vs. control on job attitudes in an employee owned company. Human Relations, 31, 753-763.

- Maccoby, M. (1975) Changing work - the Bolivar project. Working Papers for a New Society, Summer.
- MacDonald, A.P. (1978). Internal-external locus of control. In J.P. Robinson and P.R. Shaver (Eds.) Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Mansbridge, J.J. (1973). Time, emotion and inequality: Three problems of participatory groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 9, 351-368.
- Marx, K. (1977). Wage-labour and capital. In D. McLellan (Ed.), Karl Marx: Selected Writings (p. 256). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1848).
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1977). The manifesto of the communist party. In D. McLellan (Ed.) Karl Marx: Selected Writings (pp. 220-246). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1848).
- May, J.D. (1965). Democracy, Organization, Michels. American Political Science Review. 59, 417-429.
- Mayhew, B.H. & Levinger, R.L. (1976). On the emergence of oligarchy in human interaction. American Journal of Sociology, 81, 1017-1049.
- Mayo, E. (1975) The social problems of an industrial civilization. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- McDill, E.L. & Rigsby, L.C. (1973). Structure and process in secondary schools: The academic impact of educational climates. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McKnight, J., & Kretzmann, J. (1983). Community organizing in the 80's: Towards a post-alinsky agenda. Social Policy, Winer, 15-17.
- Michels, R. (1949). Political Parties. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Miller, J.G. (1975). The nature of living systems. Behavioral Science, 20, 343-366.
- Miller, I. W. III, & Norman, N.H. (1979). Learned helplessness in human: A review and attribution-theory model. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 93-118.

- Mooney, J.D. & Reilly, A.C. (1931). Onward industry! New York: Harper.
- Montgomery D. (1979). Workers' Control in America. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morse, N. (1953). Satisfactions with white collar jobs. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.
- Morse, N., Reimer, E., & Tannenbaum, A. (1951). Regulation and control in hierarchical organizations. Journal of Social Issues, 7, 41-48.
- Nord, W.R. (1978). Job satisfaction reconsidered. American Psychologist, 32, 1026-1035.
- Nover, M.L. (1981). Adolescent involvement: A psychological study of high school experience and performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rhode Island, Kingston.
- Olson, M. Jr. (1971). The logic of collective action. NY: Schocken Books.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. NY: Avon.
- Overmier, J.B., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1967). Effects of inescapable shock upon subsequent escape and avoidance learning. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 63, 28-33.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavior research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Perry, R., Gillespie, D. & Parker, H. (1976). Social movements and the local community. Beverly, CA: Sage.
- Perry, R.W, & Perry, P.P. (1978). A community action organization under stress. American Journal of Community Psychology, 6, 519-529.
- Peterson, C., Semmel, A., vonBaeyer, C., Abramson, L.Y., Metalsky, & Seligman, M.E.P. (1982). The attributional style questionnaire. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6, 287-300.
- Porter, L.W. & Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151-176.

- Reich, M. & Devine, J. (1981). The microeconomics of conflict and hierarchy in capitalist production. The Review of Radical Political Economics, 12, 27-45.
- Rifkin, J., & Barber, R. (1978) The north shall rise again: Pensions, Politics and Power in the 1980's. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. (1939). Management and the worker. New York: Wiley.
- Rose, M. (1975). Industrial Behavior: Theoretical developments since taylor. London: Allen Lane.
- Rothchild-Whitt, J. (1976). Conditions facilitating participatory democratic organizations. Social Inquiry, 46, 75-86.
- Rotter, J.B., Chance, J.E. & Phares, E.J. (1972). Applications of social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Sarason, S. (1976). Community psychology and the anarchist insight. American Psychologist, 4, 246-259.
- Scanlon, J. (1948). Profit sharing under collective bargaining: Three case studies. Industrial and Labor Relations, 2, 58-75.
- Schwartz, M., Rosenthal, N. & Schwartz, L. (1981) Leader-member conflict in protest organizations: The case of the Southern Farmer's Alliance. Social Problems, 29, 22-36.
- Seligman, M.E.P., Abramson, L.Y., Semmel, A., & Baeyer, C. (1979) Depressive attitude scale. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88, 242-247.
- Seligman, M.E.P., & Maier, S.F. (1967). Failure to escape traumatic shock. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 74, 1-9.
- Shepard, J.M. (1970). Functional specialization, alienation, and job satisfaction. Industrial and Labor Relations, 23, 207-219.
- Sheppard, H.L. & Herrick, N. (1972). Where have all the robots gone? New York: Free Press.
- Silard, A. (1981). On the history of worker's councils. Telos, 48, 49-64.

- Skinner, B.F. (1978). Human behavior and democracy. In Reflections on behavior and society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Skolnick, J.H. & Currie, E. (eds.). (1986). Crisis in American Institutions (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Little & Brown Comapny.
- Smith, D.H. (1975) Voluntary action and voluntary groups. Annual Review of Sociology, 1, 247-270.
- Spring, J.H. (1972). Education and the rise of the corporate state. Boston, MA: Beacon Pres.
- Stonewalling plant democracy. (1977, March). Business Week.
- Super, D. (1939). Occupational level and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 23, 547-564.
- Tannenbaum, A. (1956). The concept of organizational control. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 56-60.
- Tannenbaum, A. (1968). Control in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1935). Workers satisfactions: Likes and dislikes of young people for their jobs. Occupations, 13, 704-706.
- Trist, E.L., Susman, G.I. & Brown, G.R. (1977). An experiment in autonomous working groups in an American coal mine. Human Relations, 30, 201-236.
- Walker, C.R., & Guest, H.R. (1952) Man on the assembly line. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, M. (1948). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. (H.H. Gerth & C.W. Mills Trans., Eds.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Weber, M. (1969). Three types of legitimate rule. A. Etzioni (Ed.). A sociological reader on complex organizations, (pp. 6-15). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (Original work published in 1922).
- Weber, M. (1969). Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology. NY: Bedminster Press.
- Weiner, B. (Ed.) (1974) Achievement motivation and attribution theory. Morristown, NJ: General learning Press.

- Wortman, C.B., Panciera, L., Shusterman, L., & Hibscher, J. (1976). Attributions of causality and reactions to uncontrollable outcomes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 301-316.
- Wrenn, R. (1985). The decline of american labor. Socialist Review, 15, 89-118.
- Zald, M. & Ash, R. (1966) Social movements: Growth and decay. Social Forces, 44, 327-340.
- Zeitz, G. (1984). Bureaucratic role characteristics and members affective response to organizations. The Sociological Quarterly, 25, 301-318.
- Zwerlding, D. (1980). Work place democracy. New York: Harper & Roe Publishers.

Appendix I

Informed Consent

I am presently completing my Ph.D. in Psychology at the University of Rhode Island. You are being asked to serve as a subject in the research for my dissertation.

The purpose of this study is to examine ways in which the structure of our organizations affects the way we behave. While it is not possible to outline the specific hypotheses involved in this study, I will be available to discuss the topic in detail with any subject upon completion of the study.

Participation in this project will consist of completing the attached questionnaire which should take approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Your responses will only be used for the purposes of this study and will be kept strictly confidential. The data will be analyzed in the aggregate only; no individual responses will be reviewed. All questionnaires are numbered so that each person's responses will be anonymous. In any written or published reports of the data there will be no information identifying individuals.

The questions included in this research have not been associated with any detrimental effects on the participants. It is understood that cooperation in this project is completely voluntary and that you may withdraw your participation at any time. Subjects choosing to withdraw will not be penalized in any way.

(Date)

(Signature)

Please remove this form from the package and follow the instructions throughout the questionnaire. Thank you.

Appendix II

Student Information Sheet

Age: _____ Class: _____ Sex: Male Female
(circle one)

Father's Occupation

Mother's Occupation

Father's Education

Check One

☐ Less than HS ☐ High School ☐ Some College
☐ College graduate ☐ Advanced degree

Mother's Education

Check One

☐ Less than HS ☐ High School ☐ Some College
☐ College graduate ☐ Advanced degree

Check off the category which best represents your parents combined yearly income:

☐ Below \$10,000 ☐ \$10-\$20,000 ☐ \$20-\$30,000
☐ \$30-\$40,000 ☐ Greater than \$40,000

Listed below are various clubs, organizations and teams that may have been available at your high school. Select the activities which you were involved in and circle the year(s) you participated in that activity. In the next column estimate the approximate or average hours per week you spent in that activity during your senior year only. In the final column list the name of any office or special leadership position you held in the activity during your senior year.

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Each Year of Involvement</u>				<u>Average Hours per Week</u>	<u>Office Held</u>
	9	10	11	12		

Academic Clubs:

1. Nat'l Honor Society	1	2	3	4		
2. Math Club	1	2	3	4		
3. Science Club	1	2	3	4		
4. Literature Club	1	2	3	4		
5. Language Club	1	2	3	4		
6. History Club	1	2	3	4		

Future Professions Clubs:

7. Future Teachers Club	1	2	3	4		
8. Future Physicians	1	2	3	4		
9. Future Lawyers Club	1	2	3	4		

Hobby Clubs:

10. Stamp Club	1	2	3	4		
11. Coin Club	1	2	3	4		
12. Photography Club	1	2	3	4		
13. Radio Club	1	2	3	4		
14. Chess Club	1	2	3	4		
15. Crafts Club	1	2	3	4		

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Each Year of Involvement</u>				<u>Average Hours per Week</u>	<u>Office Held</u>
	9	10	11	12		

Music:

16. Marching Band	1	2	3	4		
17. School Orchestra	1	2	3	4		
18. Choir/Chorus	1	2	3	4		

Political Clubs:

19. Student Government	1	2	3	4		
20. Young Democrats	1	2	3	4		
21. Young Republicans	1	2	3	4		

School Publications:

22. Newspaper	1	2	3	4		
23. Magazine	1	2	3	4		
24. Yearbook	1	2	3	4		

Service/Social Clubs:

25. Key Club	1	2	3	4		
26. Red Cross	1	2	3	4		
27. 4-H	1	2	3	4		
28. Fraternity	1	2	3	4		
29. Sorority	1	2	3	4		

Speech and Performing Arts:

30. Debating Society	1	2	3	4		
31. Drama Society	1	2	3	4		
32. Dance Club	1	2	3	4		

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Each Year of Involvement</u>				<u>Average Hours per Week</u>	<u>Office Held</u>
	9	10	11	12		

33. Cheerleaders_____	1	2	3	4		
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

34. Twirlers_____	1	2	3	4		
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

Sports: (Teams, clubs, intra-mural, etc.)

35. Basketball_____	1	2	3	4		
---------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

36. Football_____	1	2	3	4		
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

37. Track & Field_____	1	2	3	4		
------------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

38. Cross Country_____	1	2	3	4		
------------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

39. Golf_____	1	2	3	4		
---------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

40. Baseball_____	1	2	3	4		
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

41. Softball_____	1	2	3	4		
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

42. Wrestling_____	1	2	3	4		
--------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

43. Swimming_____	1	2	3	4		
-------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

44. Lacross_____	1	2	3	4		
------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

45. Tennis_____	1	2	3	4		
-----------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

46. Field Hockey_____	1	2	3	4		
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

47. Ice Hockey_____	1	2	3	4		
---------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

48. Soccer_____	1	2	3	4		
-----------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

49. Gymnastics_____	1	2	3	4		
---------------------	---	---	---	---	--	--

Other: (Please list)

_____	1	2	3	4		
-------	---	---	---	---	--	--

_____	1	2	3	4		
-------	---	---	---	---	--	--

_____	1	2	3	4		
-------	---	---	---	---	--	--

In this section of the questionnaire you are asked to read the following sets of statements. From each pair choose the statement you feel is most true. Circle the letter of each statement you choose as being the most true.

1. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
 b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

2. a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
 b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

3. a. In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
 b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

4. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
 b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

5. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
 b. Who gets to be the boss depends on who has the skill and ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

6. a. Its hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
 b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

7. a. Without breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
 b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

8. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
- b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
-
9. a. Knowing the right people is important in deciding whether a person will get ahead.
- b. People will get ahead in life if they have the goods and do a good job; knowing the right people has nothing to do with it.
-
10. a. Leadership positions tend to go to the capable people who deserve to be chosen.
- b. It is hard to know why some people get leadership positions and others don't; ability doesn't seem to be the important factor.
-
11. a. People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.
- b. Some people just use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do so well it's their own fault.
-
12. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
- b. There really is no such thing as luck.
-
13. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
- b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you - they like you.
-
14. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
- b. Trusting fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

15. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
- b. Sometimes I feel like I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
-
16. a. When I make plans, I almost certain that I can make them work.
- b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a mater of good or bad fortune.
-
17. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
- b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
-
18. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
- b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck play a role in my life.
-
19. a. As far as world affairs are concerned most of us are the victim of forces we can neither understand nor control.
- b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
-
20. a. Racial discrimination is here to stay.
- b. People may be prejudiced but its possible for American society to completely rid itself of open discrimination.

21. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.

b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

22. a. The racial situation in America may be very complex, but with enough money and effort, it is possible to get rid of racial discrimination.

b. We will never completely get rid of discrimination. It is part of human nature.

Please try to vividly imagine yourself in the situations that follow. If such a situation happened to you, what would feel would have caused it? While events may have many causes, please pick only one - the MAJOR CAUSE if this ever happened to YOU. Please write this cause in the blank provided after each event. Next, please answer some questions about the CAUSE and the final question about the SITUATION. To summarize, please:

- 1) Read each situation and vividly imagine it is happening to you.
- 2) Decide what you feel would be the MAJOR CAUSE of the situation if it happened to you.
- 3) Write the cause in the blank provided.
- 4) Answer three questions about the CAUSE.
- 5) Answer one question about the SITUATION.
- 6) Answer one question about how to prevent the OUTCOME of the situation.
- 7) Go to the next situation.

THE PERSON YOU VOTED FOR FOR CONGRESS WAS NOT ELECTED

1. Write down one major cause_____.
2. Is the cause of your candidate not being elected due to something about you or something about the candidate or the circumstance?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future, if your candidate is not elected, will this cause be present again?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just influences the outcome of political races or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent your candidate from losing the election (List all possible courses of action)

YOU HAVE BEEN LOOKING FOR A JOB UNSUCCESSFULLY FOR
SOME TIME.

1. Write down one major cause _____
2. Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or something about other people and circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future, when looking for a job, will this cause be present again?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job or does it influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent not getting the job?
(List all possible courses of action)

<p>FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS HAVE TAKEN AWAY ALL YOUR FINANCIAL AID</p>

1. Write down one major cause_____.

2. Is the cause of the budget cuts due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future, if budget cuts eliminate your financial aid, will this cause be present again?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause of the budget cuts something that just influences financial aid or does it influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
in my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent the budget cuts?
(List all possible courses of action)

YOUR SORORITY/FRATERNITY REFUSED MEMBERSHIP TO SOMEONE
YOU STRONGLY RECOMMEND THEY ACCEPT

1. Write down one major cause_____.
2. Is the cause of them not accepting your choice due to something about you or due to something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when your recommendations are not accepted, will this cause be present again?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just affects the acceptance of your recommendations or does it affect other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
in my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent the outcome of this situation? (List all possible courses of action)

YOU CAN'T GET ALL THE WORK DONE THAT OTHERS EXPECT OF YOU

1. Write down one major cause_____.

2. Is the cause of your not getting the work done due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when doing the work others expect, will the cause be present?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just affects doing work that others expect of you or does it influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent the outcome of this situation? (List all possible courses of action)

YOU GO OUT ON A DATE AND IT GOES BADLY
--

1. Write down one major cause_____.
2. Is the cause of the date going badly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when dating, will this cause again be present?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just influences dating or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

A FRIEND COMES TO YOU WITH A PROBLEM AND YOU DON'T TRY TO HELP

1. Write down one major cause_____
2. Is the cause of your not helping your friend due to something about you or something about other people and circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when a friend comes to you with a problem, will this cause still be present?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just affects what happens when a friend comes to you with a problem or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent the outcome of this situation (List all possible courses of action)

YOU GIVE AN IMPORTANT TALK IN FRONT OF A GROUP AND THE AUDIENCE REACTS NEGATIVELY

1. Write down one major cause_____.
2. Is the cause of the audience reacting negatively due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when giving talks, will this cause still be present?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is this cause something that just influences giving talks or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might you have done to prevent the talk from going badly (List all possible courses of action)

YOU MEET A FRIEND WHO ACTS HOSTILELY TOWARDS YOU
--

1. Write down one major cause_____.
2. Is the cause of your friend treating you hostilely due to something about you or due to other people or circumstances?

Totally due to
other people or
circumstances

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Totally due
to me

3. In the future when interacting with friends, will this cause again be present?

Will never again
be present

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Will always
be present

4. Is the cause something that just influences your interactions with friends or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just
this particular
situation

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Influences all
situations in
my life

5. How important would this situation be if it happened to you?

Not at all
important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
important

6. What might have you done to prevent the outcome of this situation? (List all possible courses of action)

SUPPOSE THE CIRCLE BELOW REPRESENTED THE SOCIAL LIFE HERE AT SCHOOL. HOW FAR FROM THE CENTER OF THINGS ARE YOU? (THE CENTER OF THE CIRCLE REPRESENTS THE CENTER OF THINGS IN SCHOOL.) PLACE A CHECK MARK WHERE YOU THINK YOU ARE.

SUPPOSE THE CIRCLE BELOW REPRESENTS THE POLICY MAKING ACTIVITIES HERE AT SCHOOL. HOW FAR OUT FROM THE CENTER OF THINGS ARE YOU? THE CENTER OF THE CIRCLE REPRESENTS THE CENTER OF THINGS AT SCHOOL. PLACE A MARK WHERE YOU THINK YOU ARE.

SUPPOSE THE CIRCLE REPRESENTED WORLD EVENTS. HOW FAR OUT FROM THE CENTER OF THINGS ARE YOU? THE CENTER OF THE CIRCLE REPRESENTS THE CENTER OF THINGS IN THE STATE. PLACE A MARK WHERE YOU THINK YOU ARE.

On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being "highly unlikely" and 5 being "highly likely," how likely are you to engage in the following actions.

	Highly Unlikely			Highly Likely	
Join Fellow Students in arranging a dorm/house party	1	2	3	4	5
Vote in next school election	1	2	3	4	5
Vote in the next presidential election	1	2	3	4	5
Organize friends to become involved in a school-sponsored social event	1	2	3	4	5
Become involved in a formal extra- curricular activity (e.g. a club, sport, student government)	1	2	3	4	5
Become involved in a non-school related civic organization (e.g. Lions Club, political party, anti- nuclear/disarmament organization)	1	2	3	4	5

On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being "none at all" and 5 being "a lot," how much influence do you think you have over the following situations?

	None at all	Very little	some	Quite a bit	A lot
A group of friends choice of an evening's entertainment	1	2	3	4	5
The school's decision to raise tuition	1	2	3	4	5
The state's decision to raise the drinking age to 21	1	2	3	4	5
A friend's choice of who to invite to a party	1	2	3	4	5
The Student Senate's decision on how to spend student activities fees	1	2	3	4	5
The government's decision to invade Grenada	1	2	3	4	5

Considering the amount of influence you judged yourself as having, what are some things you can do to increase the amount of influence you have. Below please list all things you can think of to increase the amount of influence you have in each situation stated above.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

THIS COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE - THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME
AND PATIENCE.

Appendix III

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH BEING CONDUCTED BY BILL OSWALD

This research is different much research being done in psychology. Where most studies test a particular question or hypothesis, this study is testing a theory or set of questions. Rather than having a specific dependent variable which is measured under the varied conditions of the independent variable, this research is measuring the degree of interrelationship among sets of variables.

The starting point for this research is found in two established facts: 1) there has been a steady decline in the number of people who are involved in civic activities over the past five decades; and 2) during that same period of time there has been a steady increase in the role corporations have played in people's lives. the major task of this dissertation is to show that there is a connection between those two trends; that the drop in people's involvement in clubs, churches, political parties, etc, is a direct result of the increased domination of modern life by national and multi-national corporations.

In drawing the connection, this research will draw from two well developed theories. The first of these theories states that there is direct connection between a person's commitment to an organization and the amount of control he/she has over the process and product of that organization. In other words, the more control a person has over how an organization is run and what it does, the more a person is willing to commit themselves to it. The second theory used in this research is LEARNED HELPLESSNESS. The learned helplessness hypothesis states that if a person is placed in a situation where he/she has no control over what happens to hem/her, that person will learn to become helpless. When placed in a situation where one is punished regardless of their behavior, one will eventually lose all motivation to change the circumstances. It will also become difficult for the person in that situation to learn new behaviors that might change the circumstances. The person develops motivational and cognitive deficits.

These two theories are well documented. Volumes of research have been conducted to establish their validity.

The main premis of this research is that the corporations that dominate modern life are generally bureaucratically structured. The nature of a bureaucracy is such that no single individual has control over the product

or process. control is embedded in the structure via a set of objective rules and regulations. in theory, no one is above the rules. This lack of control places the individual in a learned helplessness situation. Because they have no control they have no commitment to the organization (motivational deficits) and are unable to develop ways of overcoming that lack of control (cognitive deficits). This learned helplessness is then generalized to the greater society resulting in a decline in people's involvement in institutionalized society. This lack of commitment is seen in the fact that only approximately 25% of all eligible adults vote in presidential elections, only about 25% of the workforce is unionized, and less people participate in organized religion than any time in our history.

Appendix IV

Rotated Factor Loadings

Variables	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>Socioeconomic Status:</u>									
1. Occupation	.08	.08	.10	.81	.02	.08	.02	.06	.00
2. Education	.11	.00	.09	.75	.00	.07	.11	.09	.08
3. Income	.17	.03	.18	.72	.02	.04	.08	.21	.13
<u>Institutional Experience:</u>									
4. No. Act	.06	.66	.07	.08	.04	.02	.05	.05	.02
5. Hrs Act	.11	.44	.08	.06	.03	.21	.21	.11	.01
6. Ofc Held	.27	.54	.08	.04	.12	.00	.04	.11	.11
<u>Locus of Control:</u>									
7. Ctl Ideo	.07	.19	.20	.11	.16	.52	.33	.11	.08
8. Personal Ctl	.00	.06	.11	.07	.09	.64	.11	.05	.09
9. System Mod	.06	.14	.13	.20	.15	.45	.07	.02	.23
<u>Attributional Style - Society</u>									
10. Cong Elect.	.07	.04	.01	.03	.18	.03	.23	.14	.62
11. Finding Job	.14	.06	.16	.04	.03	.17	.13	.05	.73
12. Fin Aid cut	.13	.05	.39	.39	.08	.18	.33	.14	.21
<u>Attributional Style - Organization:</u>									
13. Frat Member	.01	.07	.26	.09	.31	.18	.10	.12	.19
14. Work done	.07	.17	.28	.07	.32	.22	.15	.30	.37
15. Audience	.08	.04	.74	.10	.02	.13	.10	.01	.03
<u>Attributional Style - Group:</u>									
16. Bad date	.18	.05	.58	.16	.12	.03	.01	.01	.23
17. Friend Prob	.10	.08	.71	.00	.07	.10	.08	.08	.02
18. Hostile Fr'd	.03	.09	.29	.03	.17	.58	.06	.05	.43
<u>Behavioral Variables - Group:</u>									
19. Perceive Inv	.08	.44	.14	.1	.14	.24	.07	.59	.05
20. Future Inv	.06	.62	.02	.04	.12	.25	.07	.26	.06
21. Perceive Inf	.18	.49	.01	.05	.24	.04	.21	.19	.04
22. Idea Init	.24	.01	.14	.07	.12	.07	.74	.21	.05
23. Action Init	.74	.03	.10	.02	.07	.12	.16	.09	.05

Variables	Factors								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Behavioral Variables - Organization:

24. Perceive Inv	.08	.06	.12	.14	.13	.05	.00	.70	.13
25. Future Inv	.02	.48	.00	.09	.05	.25	.05	.53	.00
26. Perceive Inf	.05	.02	.04	.04	.74	.07	.14	.25	.28
27. Idea Init	.14	.04	.11	.07	.04	.05	.81	.06	.02
28. Action Init	.82	.14	.06	.01	.01	.08	.22	.01	.03

Behavioral Variables - Society:

29. Perceive Inv	.16	.08	.28	.11	.05	.20	.13	.52	.18
30. Future Inv	.34	.22	.06	.01	.43	.39	.06	.07	.29
31. Perceive Inf	.05	.04	.04	.01	.76	.03	.02	.00	.02
32. Idea Init	.20	.16	.05	.13	.16	.20	.62	.33	.04
33. Action Init	.80	.01	.14	.07	.02	.07	.05	.14	.09