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Abstract

Background: The factors underlying the gradual decline in the participation in the elections and the devocalization of the political movements that are being observed during the last decades in Greece have not been previously studied through the looking glass of psychological processes, such as the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness first put forward by Maier and Seligman in 1976. The latter phenomenon postulates that when a belief that events are independent of behaviour and thus uncontrollable is established, it results in affective, motivational and cognitive deficits e.g. a tendency to be a passive learner who depends on others for decisions and guidance, unwilling to try and influence his/her environment. The objective of the present study is to explore the presence of the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness amongst Greek students as well as its possible correlation with their negative perception of the quality of democracy in Greece. Method: Questionnaires were administered to 220 Greek Students attending the Kappodistrian University and the Panteion University, both located in Athens. Results: The data revealed that 18 students (8.1%) were subject to the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness, 174 (79%) fulfilled one or more of the three criteria, while only 28 (12.7%) students did not fulfil any of the criteria. A correlation was found to exist between the presence of Learned Helplessness and the perception of the quality of democracy. (Pearson’s r = -0.300, a = 0.05). Conclusion: The present study was the first piece of research to explore the possible correlation between the subjective perception of the quality of democracy in Greece and the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness in Greek students. The findings were consistent with the notion that a negative perception of the quality of democracy would positively correlate with the presence of Learned Helplessness and thus its
effects i.e. that the person becomes an apathetic receiver of the events that affect his/her life, unwilling to act in order to change the status quo. That correlation was rather weak due to the strict methodological manipulations employed and the small sample size.
Introduction

Humans as well as many other species seem to have a psychological need to control the environment in which they function (Levine 1977). This need is considered to be amongst the basic needs, since only by feeling that one can control one’s own environment can one feel safe in an unsafe and adverse world and be motivated for action. This theoretical view is a point of convergence between the different approaches that investigate the matter ((Adler 1929); (Fiedler, O’Brien et al. 1969); (Winter 1973)), even though the explanatory factors they propose in respect to the development and onset of the need for control may be different. Experimental evidence has also been provided by studies that have shown in a systematic way that the loss of control over one’s environment can be instabilitating for an individual and can even prove to be fatal ((Schulz and Aderman 1973)). Therefore, even a minimum feeling of control is crucial in order for humans to feel healthy.

A number of experiments designed to test the need for control started taking place back in the ‘60s and were conducted by Seligman and colleagues in the USA ((Maier and Seligman 1976); (Mikulincer 1994); (Seligman, Maier et al. 1971); (Seligman 1975)). Indeed Seligman et al. observed that living organisms that systematically failed to control their environment turned into passive and maladjusted organisms that quit any subsequent attempt to survive.

A characteristic example of the findings of the animal studies undertaken by Seligman et al. is the finding that even though under normal
circumstances dogs learned quickly how to avoid electric shocks by jumping over a barrier, dogs that were first given inescapable shocks subsequently failed to escape shocks in a shuttle box. Even if they made an occasional response that turned off the shocks, they failed to learn the association between this behaviour and its outcome. In contrast, dogs given escapable shocks or no prior shocks at all learned to escape quickly (Overmier and Seligman 1967; Seligman and Maier 1967). This interference and the process underlying it have been called “Learned Helplessness” ((Maier, Seligman et al. 1969) (Seligman, Maier et al. 1971)). According to Seligman (1975), Learned Helplessness is the result of lack of control and predictability and is a process through which the learning of response-outcome independence leads to subsequent changes in behaviour. Learned Helplessness occurs in a variety of situations, with a variety of uncontrollable events, and across a number of species, including rats ((Maier, Albin et al. 1973); (Maier and Testa 1975); (Seligman and Beagley 1975); (Seligman, Rosellini et al. 1975)), cats ((Masserman 1971); (Seward and Humphrey 1967); (Thomas and Dewald 1977)), fish ((Frumkin and Brookshire 1969; Padilla, Padilla et al. 1970)) and mice ((Klein and Seligman 1976)) (but also see (Seligman 1975) for a comprehensive review).

Once Learned Helplessness was demonstrated in animals, the next step was to attempt to produce similar effects in human experiments ((Fosco and Geer 1971); (Glass and Singer 1972); (Gatchel and Proctor 1976); (Hiroto and Seligman 1975), (Krantz, Glass et al. 1974); (Klein, Fencil-Morse et al. 1976); (Klein and Seligman 1976); (Miller and Seligman 1975); (Racinskas 1972); (Roth and Kubal 1975)). The experiment of Hiroto (1974) was one of the earliest of this research trend and yet one of the most representative. Hiroto used a “triadic design” with three training conditions, following the design of animal experiments: no training, training with outcomes that were
beyond control and training with outcomes that were under control. The subjects in the escape group were exposed to 50 trials of unsignaled loud noise which they could terminate by pressing a button four times. The subjects in the helplessness-training group were exposed to the same unsignaled loud noise, which was terminated independently of their responses—in fact it was terminated as a result of the responses by a subject in the escape group, in order for the two groups to receive the same amount, duration and pattern of noise. A third group, the no training group, was not exposed to any noise. In the test phase all subjects were exposed to 20 trials of loud noise which they were told they could stop by moving the handle of a finger shuttle box from one end of the box to the other. All of the subjects could control the end of the noise. The results of the experiment were parallel to those of the animal studies: the subjects in the escape group as well as the subjects in the no training group learned quickly how to escape the noise, whereas the subjects in the helplessness-training group were less likely to learn to escape the noise than subjects in the other two groups. Subsequent research has shown that human Learned Helplessness effects are to be found not only in noise escape learning, but in a wide variety of cognitive problem-solving tasks as well, such as anagrams, intelligence tests, block designs, digit-letter substitution etc. (see (Miller and Norman 1979), for a review).

Although a number of alternative hypotheses have been proposed in order to account for the debilitating effects of experience with uncontrollability (see (Maier and Seligman 1976) and (Mikulincer 1994), for a review of the hypotheses), only the Learned Helplessness hypothesis provides a unified theoretical framework integrating both animal and human data. ((Abramson, Seligman et al. 1978), (Maier and Seligman 1976), (Seligman 1975)). According to the Learned Helplessness hypothesis,
perceived noncontingency between response and outcome results in three deficits: motivational, cognitive and emotional. More specifically, the motivational deficit is manifested as a reduced incentive towards instrumental responding and is seen as a consequence of the expectation that the environment cannot be controlled. Moreover, the Learned Helplessness hypothesis postulates that learning that the environment is uncontrollable results in a cognitive deficit. Such learning makes it difficult to later learn that responses produce an outcome, since a cognitive interference takes place in learning new associations of response to outcome. Further, the Learned Helplessness hypothesis argues that depressed affect is the emotional consequence of learning that outcomes are uncontrollable. The Learned Helplessness hypothesis is cognitive in that it postulates that the mere exposure to uncontrollability is not sufficient to render an organism helpless. Instead, in order for the organism to exhibit helplessness, it must come to expect that outcomes are uncontrollable.

In 1978, Abramson, Seligman & Teasdale in their classical paper “Learned Helplessness in Humans: Critique and Reformulation” criticized the Learned Helplessness theory and attempted a reformulation by focusing on the causal attributions a person makes after having perceived the personal-environment mismatch created by uncontrollable failure. In their reformulated account, Abramson et al. argued that when a person finds he is helpless he asks *why* he is helpless. The causal attribution he makes then determines the generality and chronicity of his helplessness deficits as well as his later levels of self-esteem. This reformulation was necessary in order to differentiate between animal and human research findings. Animal research attempts to delineate the environmental boundaries of the phenomenon whereas the human Learned Helplessness research attempts to delineate the contribution of both the environment and the person to the
Learned Helplessness effects, and is guided mainly by a cognitive orientation that emphasizes the subjective experience of uncontrollability.

The first distinction in the way a person attributes his feelings of helplessness is the self/other dichotomy which is the criterion of internality. When people believe that outcomes are more likely or less likely to happen to themselves than to relevant others, they attribute these outcomes to internal factors. Similarly, persons make external attributions for outcomes that they believe are as likely to happen to themselves as to others. For example, a father of a child with leukemia attributes the fact that he cannot control the course of the disease to external factors e.g. the fact that leukemia is an incurable disease. This situation is termed universal helplessness. Alternatively, a student who despite his hard work fails in school will attribute his failure to internal factors e.g. that he is not intelligent enough. This situation is termed personal helplessness. It should be noted that comparisons are made with the “relevant other” as opposed to “random other” or “any other”. No student would question his/her intellectual ability when failing to solve mathematical problems that only professional mathematicians can solve. But he would question his ability if his peers had succeeded in solving the same problems in which he failed.

The second distinction in the explanation that the person gives to the noncontingency between his actions and their outcomes is the dimension “global-specific” which is orthogonal to “internal-external” and distinguishes between the Learned Helplessness deficits that occur in a broad range of situations and the deficits that occur in a narrow range of situations. In the case of specific helplessness the person attributes his failure to factors that are short-lived or intermittent e.g. if a student that failed a math’s test attributes his failure to the fact that his is not good in mathematics, he will not do poorly if he is examined on a different subject
(specific helplessness deficits). On the other hand, if the person attributes his helplessness to more global factors, it is likely that the helplessness deficits will generalize to other situations as well. Following the example of the student, if he attributes his failure to his lack of ability, then he is very likely to expect to fail an English exam as well and thus he will quit even trying to pass it. This is a case of global helplessness.

Finally, the third explanatory dimension is the “stable-unstable” dimension which is orthogonal to the previous two dimensions and affects the time course of helplessness. Stable explanatory factors are those that the person believes are either long-lived or recurrent e.g. the student failed his exam because he suffers from insomnia, and unstable factors are those that are transient or short-lived, e.g. the student failed the exam because his parents were having a party and he didn’t get enough sleep the previous night. Hence, according to the causal attributions the person makes, some helplessness deficits may last only minutes and others may last years. In the former case helplessness is called transient and in the latter chronic.

Learned Helplessness theory is therefore based on the following three premises:

(a) Contingency, which refers to the objective relationship between the individual’s actions and to the expected results. More specifically, contingency refers to the lack of control over the outcome i.e. responses and outcomes are independent of each other.

(b) Cognition, which refers to how uncontrollability is perceived and explained. This process involves a number of steps. Firstly, noncontingency must be perceived and this perception might as well be right or wrong, i.e. the lack of control can be perceived as control and vice versa. Then, an attribution of this noncontingency to a cause takes place. For example, a failure can be attributed to bad luck or to the lack of intellectual ability.
Lastly, the attribution chosen influences the expectation of future failure. Hence, if the individual had attributed his failure to lack of intellectual ability, then he is likely to expect to fail again once faced with situations that require high intelligence.

(c) Behaviour, which refers to the visible consequences of contingency and cognition. The Learned Helplessness theory predicts that passivity as well as other deficits will follow the expectation of future helplessness such as sadness, low self-esteem, low levels of aggression, physical illness etc.

Learned Helplessness is therefore developed through three concurrent conditions: (a) an environment in which the outcomes are independent of the actions and thus uncontrollable, (b) an expectation that no action can change an event or control its outcome; this expectation arises from an internal (personal helplessness), stable (the expectation that the causal factors are going to persist) and global (the expectation that the same factors apply to a wide range of situations) attributional style and (c) a reactionary relinquishment from unpleasant events.

The presence of Learned Helplessness can be empirically tested on the basis of three different criteria with respect to the above three conditions: (a) the perception of uncontrollability, (b) a pessimistic explanatory style and (c) a behaviour of inappropriate passivity (Ντάβου and Αρμενάκης 2000).

Early experimental studies ((Brown and Inouye 1978); (DeVellis, McEvoy DeVellis et al. 1978)) have also shown that Learned Helplessness effects can be found in humans even through mere observations of similar individuals in similar circumstances, without people personally experiencing the lack of control. For example DeVellis, DeVellis and McCauley (1978) exposed observers to participants who were either successful or unsuccessful in avoiding loss of reward on an instrumental task. On a subsequent instrumental task, both observers and participants in
the success condition scored better on a response latency measure than those in the failure condition. Brown and Inouye (1978) similarly found that observation of a competent model who ostensibly failed on an anagram task resulted in reduced persistence in a subsequent anagram task. This phenomenon is termed “vicarious helplessness” and refers to the situation when a person feels helpless by witnessing other people being helpless. This phenomenon has been claimed to reflect that “assumptions about the degree of contingency in one’s life are based, in part, on observations of similar individuals in similar circumstances” (DeVellis, McEvoy DeVellis et al. 1978). Moreover, “group helplessness” has also been claimed to exist (Simkin, Lederer et al. 1983), possibly allowing for whole societies to be termed helpless.

In 1975 Seligman argued that the Learned Helplessness deficits show great similarity with the symptoms of depression, to the extent that if the deficits are transient, then the Learned Helplessness phenomenon is thought to be present. However, if those symptoms persist for weeks or years, then the person should be thought as to suffer from depression. Subsequent research indeed showed that the two phenomena are parallel in respect to their aetiology, therapy and prevention ((Peterson and Seligman 1989)). The major factor that was identified was causal attribution style, which is considered to be a risk factor for depression. Thus, when the person attributes his uncontrollability to internal, stable and global factors and at the same time attributes his positive experiences to external, unstable and specific factors, then he is in the hi-risk group for depression.

To reiterate, Learned Helplessness has been defined as a state of idleness, inaction and passivity coupled with the feeling of personal inability, which is developed when people who are exposed or who witness other people being exposed to uncontrollable and inescapable events of
failure learn that responses and outcomes are independent of each other. This learning can lead to an expectation that responses will be futile and can generalize to new situations and interfere with future learning. The resulting passivity can stabilize and can debilitate subsequent performance through motivational, cognitive and emotional effects, resulting in the person being a passive learner who depends on others for decisions and guidance, unwilling to try and influence his/her environment, even in situations when he/she can indeed control it.

The above theory has been developed in controlled experimental settings, where helplessness was systematically induced. It would be equally interesting to investigate the intermediate levels of the Learned Helplessness phenomenon that people might be experiencing in settings where helplessness is not induced systematically, but rather through everyday life situations that the person feels he/she cannot have control over. Life as a member of a democratic state lends itself to this kind of investigation, since people often argue that they are not participating, i.e. they express apathy, because they feel they cannot make a difference, i.e. they believe that they have no control over the political environment.

To the best of the author’s knowledge, the investigation of political behaviour through the looking glass of the Learned Helplessness phenomenon has never been conducted previously. However, one must be very careful not to assign explanatory status to Learned Helplessness, as it is essentially a descriptive term. When applying the concept, it is important to delineate the psychological processes that underlie Learned Helplessness effects and to evaluate whether these processes parallel those in the targeted human problems.

The objective of this study is to explore the possible correlation of the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness with the perception of the quality of
democracy. Democracy is the political regime in which “people are in power”, thus its perceived quality should illustrate the extent to which the citizens believe they have control over political life. It is hypothesised, that a negative perception of the quality of democracy will positively correlate with the Learned Helplessness phenomenon. Should such a correlation be detected, there will be room to suspect that political apathy is the cognitive and behavioural deficit of the citizens’ feeling of helplessness in the political sphere.

It would be of great theoretical interest to target the investigation towards a group that is naturally motivated towards action and reaction and that tries to influence and change its environment and its life style ((Coleman 1980); (Yonnet 1985)). If a correlation between Learned Helplessness and the perception of the quality of democracy is detected in a group with the above characteristics, it will be easier to generalise the results than if using any other group that would be more naturally inclined towards passivity due to age or other life events. On these theoretical grounds, students were chosen as the study’s population under investigation.
Method

Participants

The sample used consisted of 220 students (26 male and 190 female, 4 failed to report sex, mean age=22.6 yr., SD=0.2) enrolled in Universities in Athens, Greece. Sixty-nine of them were enrolled in the Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, 77 were enrolled in the Law Department of the Kappodistrian University and 74 were enrolled in the Department of Education of the Kappodistrian University. 93% of the participants had already completed 2 years of University education (in Greece 4 years are needed to obtain a degree).

Instrument-Variables

The instrument of the study was a questionnaire constructed by the author which included questions about the demographic characteristics of the sample, a scale measuring the participants’ perception of the quality of democracy in Greece, scales designed to detect the Learned Helplessness phenomenon, Beck’s Depression Inventory, as well as some questions targeted in the way participants felt about their participation in the elections (see Appendix).

The scale measuring the perception of the quality of democracy comprised of the 12 questions on page 7 and 8 of the questionnaire. Each of those questions was developed to match one of the 11 criteria for the measurement of the quality of democracy (the fourth criterion corresponds to questions 4 and 5), as described by Micheletti (1998). These criteria are used in Sweden for an annual measurement of the quality of democracy.
Learned Helplessness was measured using 3 different scales, since according to the theory, the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness is empirically detected when the three following conditions co-exist: (a) a perception of uncontrollability, (b) a pessimistic explanatory style and (c) inappropriate passivity. The scales used for the measurement of the perception of uncontrollability (page 9) and of the explanatory style (pages 8-9) are the same as those previously used by Ντάβου & Αρμενάκης (2000). Inappropriate passivity was measured using an adversative question, asking whether the students had attended any one session of the student assembly (which is open to all students).

Depressed mood was assessed by means of the Beck Depression Inventory, which consists of 21 four-choice statements (Beck and Steer 1993). Participants were asked to mark the statements that describe best how they felt at the time of the testing.

**Procedure**

The questionnaires were administered in the universities’ premises. The participants filled in the questionnaires on a voluntary basis. The students enrolled in the Kappodistrian University filled in the questionnaires after having finished their exams and the students enrolled in the Panteion University filled them in after a lecture or in the library. After the completion of the questionnaire, the purpose of the study was explained. The participants needed a mean time of 15-20 minutes to fill in the questionnaires, which were collected on the spot.
Results

Statistical analysis of the data was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software program (version 11.0).

Since only 26 out of the 220 participants were male, sex could not be used as an independent variable.

The scale for the measurement of the perception of the quality of democracy was tested for internal validity and was found to be highly valid (Kronbach’s a=0.789), so it was analysed without any further manipulation. Two groups, the “positive perception of the quality of democracy group” and the “negative perception of the quality of democracy group”, were identified by employing the median number of the participants’ scores as the cutting point.

Further, the presence of the Learned Helplessness phenomenon was explored though the three scales described above, each one accounting for a different condition that needs to be met: (a) the perception of uncontrollability (b) inappropriate passivity and (c) pessimistic explanatory style.

The scale used to explore the first condition, that of the perception of uncontrollability, was found to be highly valid (Krombach’s a=0.7427). Two groups (perception of uncontrollability vs. perception of controllability) were identified by using again the median of the participants’ scores as the cutting point.

Inappropriate passivity was measured by inquiring on whether the participants had attended any one session of the student assembly. Results show that 49.6% of the participants had indeed attended at least one session of the student assembly, whereas the remaining 48.6% abstained from such sessions.
The scale employed to explore the attributional style of the participants was found not to be internally valid on a satisfactory level (Kronbach’s α=0.3524), therefore a factor analysis was performed. The factor analysis identified three factors: (a) positive explanatory style (questions 1,5,6,8,13,15,18,19) (b) negative explanatory style (questions 2,7,9,11,12,14,16,17,20) and (c) stability of the future (questions 3 and 10). It follows from reason, that the people with a high score on the factor “negative explanatory style” and a low score on the factor “positive explanatory style” should be the ones satisfying the condition for pessimistic attributional style. Again, the median number was employed as a cutting point for both factors. So, in order for a participant to be classified as having adopted a pessimistic explanatory style, he needed to be above the cutting point for both factors of negative and positive explanatory style. In the case of those participants who did not satisfy this criterion, their scores were not used for further analysis, as they were probably caught filling in the questionnaire in a careless manner. This procedure allowed for 24% of the participants to be identified as having a “pessimistic attributional style” and 34% as having an “optimistic attributional style”. The rest of the participants failed to fill in the scale or were not classified in any of the two categories.

The combination of the results of the three scales revealed that 18 students (8.1%) fulfilled all three conditions put forward to identify a person subject to the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness, 174 (79%) fulfilled one or more of the three conditions, while only 28 (12.7%) students did not fulfil any of the criteria. Further analysis included only the students that fulfilled all three conditions, although this manipulation is strict, and a number of previous studies have in fact considered that any combination of at least two conditions is sufficient for describing Learned Helplessness (Ντάβου and Αρμενάκης 2000).
Depressed mood was also assessed by means of the Beck Depression Inventory. The results revealed that 87.7% of the participants did not show any signs of depressed mood, 8.4% were found to suffer from a low level of depression, 2.6% were found to suffer from a moderate level of depression and 1.6% or 3 people were found to suffer from serious depression. Unfortunately due to the anonymity of the participation, these individuals could not be traced down in order to be provided with treatment or be referred to a specialist.

The possible correlations between the variables “perception of the quality of democracy”, “Learned Helplessness” and “depressed mood” were then tested using Pearson’s r. As the theory predicts, there was a positive correlation between “Learned Helplessness” and “depressed mood” (r = 0.380, a = 0.01), the latter being regarded as the most serious and chronic form of Learned Helplessness. It is interesting to note, that 22% of the participants who were identified as belonging to the Learned Helplessness group suffered from some level of depression.

Moreover, the variables “Learned Helplessness” and “perception of democracy” were found to be correlated (r = -0.300, a = 0.05), confirming the hypothesis of the study that a negative perception of the quality of democracy would positively correlate with the Learned Helplessness phenomenon.

Interesting results were also obtained from the analysis of the answers that the participants gave to the questions about whether their participating in different kinds of elections (national, local, European parliament elections or student elections) would have an effect on their lives. (Tables 1). The 4 questions dealing with the 4 forms of elections were found to have a high internal validity (Krombach’s a = 0.78). Only 46.3% of the participants seemed to believe that their participation in electoral processes can have a
very big, big or moderate effect on their lives, whereas the majority of the participants believed that their participation can have only a small effect or no effect on his life. These results seem to be stable across the different kinds of elections.

Table 1. Do you believe that your participation in the elections (European parliament elections, national, local, or student elections) can have an effect on your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European parliament</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very big effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big effect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate effect</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The present study is the first piece of research to explore the possible correlation between the subjective perception of the quality of democracy in Greece and the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness in Greek students. The findings were consistent with the hypothesis that a negative perception of the quality of democracy would positively correlate with the presence of Learned Helplessness and thus its results i.e. that the person becomes an apathetic receiver of the events that affect their life, unwilling to act in order to change its environment. Furthermore, a correlation between the Learned Helplessness phenomenon and depressive mood was detected. Therefore, there is room to argue that political apathy is the cognitive and behavioural deficit of the citizens' feeling of helplessness in the political sphere.

Previous studies have also shown that young adults in Greece are not directing their energy towards common goals. On the contrary, abstention from political activities and withdrawal from other spheres of social life have been argued to characterize young adults ((Παντελίδου-Μαλουτά 1993; Χρηστάκης 1994)). This conclusion was also drawn by Δεμερτζής & Αρένακης (2000) in their study on political discontentment and the media using students as subjects. According to their study, only one half of the student population are interested in politics.

Yet, if students, who comprise a social group that has the privilege to be able study and to engage in critical thinking, show such a reluctance to work toward common goals, possibly because they feel they cannot have control over them, then this phenomenon should be magnified amongst the young adults who are not receiving university education. Ντάβου and Αρένακης (2000) have argued that political discontentment and withdrawal from political life is to be found to a further extend in the
general population. Indeed, the percentage of the general population that lacks interest in politics is somewhat higher, at 59.1% ((Δώδος, Καφετζής et al. 1997))

It might be worth looking more closely at the three conditions that need to be satisfied in order to render an individual as subject to the Learned Helplessness phenomenon (perception of uncontrollability, inappropriate passivity and pessimistic explanatory style) as explored by previous research undertaken in Greece.

The first condition of the perception of uncontrollability was investigated by Δεμερτζη and Αρμενάκη (2000) and Δώδος, Καφετζής and Νικολακόπουλος (1997), looking at a student population and a general population accordingly. They asked their participants whether they agreed with the following statement: “People like me cannot influence what the government does”. The results showed that 60.8% of the student population and 56.3% of the general population believed they cannot influence what the government does. Moreover, 54.4% of the general population seemed to agree with the statement that “Sometimes politics seem to be so complicated that people like me cannot understand what is really going on”, let alone have control over it, one might add.

As far as passivity is concerned, one should not have a hard time detecting it. Passivity is depicted primarily in the constantly decreasing percentage of people who vote, a phenomenon that is being observed throughout the world. In the case of Greece, the turnout in the national elections was 74.97% in the 2000 elections (http://ekloges2000.tanea.gr). In other words, one out of four Greek citizens did not turn up in the polling station. This is rather serious for a country like Greece where voting is obligatory, even if one chooses to use the “blank vote”, indicating no preference. Abstention from voting is a characteristic of the student elections
as well, where only half of the students bother to vote. (In the 1998 election 54% abstained, and in both 1999 and 2000, 50% abstained.) Passivity is further illustrated in the lack of interest young people show when it comes to politics. Only 15.6% of the students report being frequently engaged in discussions on political issues. (Ntάβου and Αρμενάκης 2000). Moreover, when asked what kind of emotions politics bring to mind, 51.5% students answered that politics bring to mind boredom, an emotion closely related to passivity and the less than half said that politics bring to mind an urge for involvement (32.5%), enthusiasm (8.1%) and passion (10%).

Furthermore, pessimistic style is indirectly depicted in some of the results of the Ntάβου and Αρμενάκης study (2000). More specifically 18.7% of the participants of the study agreed to the statement that “The future looks dark”, 16% to the statement “I have lost a lot of chances and I believe this is not going to change in the future” and only 67.8% agreed to the statement “I am particularly lucky and I expect to have a better life than the mean person”. These percentages may not be remarkably high, but one should keep in mind the age group of the sample i.e. students, who are the ones expected to show self-confidence and motivation.

A number of findings therefore exists that supports the existence of a perception of uncontrollability, passivity and pessimistic explanatory style. Still, the above findings were not analysed as a group of data in order for their co-existence to be evaluated and the existence of the Learned Helplessness phenomenon to be supported, as in the case of the present study. Hence they can only indirectly support its existence.

Nevertheless, this study was designed to test the correlation of the Learned Helplessness phenomenon with the perception of the quality of democracy. This correlation was rather weak. It should be noted, however, that the presence of the phenomenon in question was tested by the co-
existence of all three conditions (perception of uncontrollability, pessimistic explanatory style and inappropriate passivity), whereas previous work has usually settled for the co-existence of any two of the three conditions (Ντάβου and Αρμενάκης 2000). The methodological approach of the present study may have resulted in the exclusion of cases that would otherwise have been classified as Learned Helplessness cases and would have given more power to the results of the study, but this approach is consistent with the theory of Learned Helplessness in a strict manner. Thus, it was considered optimal, since the scientific status of psychology cannot be preserved by making compromises in the methodology employed for the collection and analysis of the data.

Some cautious remarks need to be made. Firstly, the age group of the participants presents a potential limitation as it is not representative of the general population. In addition to that, the sample size was rather small and it was not representative of the student population of all the Greek Universities or even those located in Athens, thus one should be careful when attempting to generalize. Moreover, the students’ attending of the student assembly may not be the most valid measure for their passivity, but was nevertheless the best one that could be used.

There are many ways in which this work can be carried forward. Future studies need to consider using larger sample sizes, investigating possible differences related to gender as well as exploring causal relationships between the quality of democracy and psychological processes such as Learned Helplessness.

In conclusion, the present study has demonstrated the correlation between a negative perception of the quality of democracy and the Learned Helplessness phenomenon. This finding has implications for understanding the psychological factors that effect political behaviour and more specifically
political apathy. Further, it is indicative of the fact that psychology stands in a unique position to explore the factors underlying political apathy, to increase the knowledge about the mechanisms that are employed and by doing so, to work towards providing more efficient ways of political participation in order to give our democracy the quality it deserves.
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APPENDIX
Αγαπητέ συμφοιτητή/τρια,

Το ερωτηματολόγιο που κρατάς στα χέρια σου αποσκοπεί στη συγκέντρωση πληροφοριών σχετικά με την διπλωματική μου εργασία με τίτλο: οι θεσμοί και τη δημοκρατία σήμερα σε σχέση με το φαινόμενο της επίκτητης αίσθησης αδυναμίας.

Σε παρακαλώ να διαβάσεις προσεχτικά όλες τις ερωτήσεις και να απαντήσεις σε όλες με ειλικρίνεια και σαφήνεια.

Το ερωτηματολόγιο είναι ανώνυμο και η γνώμη σου για τα διάφορα θέματα που εμπεριέχονται θα ληφθεί υπόψη μόνο για ερευνητικούς σκοπούς.

Τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας μπορεί να τα μάθεις εφόσον σε ενδιαφέρουν σε δύο μήνες περίπου, ερχόμενος σε επαφή με το γραφείο της κυρίας Αλεξάνδρας Χατζή στο Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο.

Ευχαριστώ για τη συνεργασία,

Μαριέττα Παπαδάτου-Παστού
ΕΡΩΤΗΜΑΤΟΛΟΓΙΟ

Α. ΔΗΜΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΑ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΣΤΙΚΑ

Φύλο: Αγόρι ☐ Κορίτσι ☐
Σχολή φοίτησης:
................................................................. ☐
Τμήμα φοίτησης:
................................................................. ☐
Έτος γεννήσεως: ................................. ☐ ☐
5. Έτος σπουδών: .................................

6. Τόπος μόνιμης κατοικίας:
   α. Χωριό ☐
   β. Κοιμόπολη (από 2.500 μέχρι 5.000 κατ.) ☐
   γ. Πόλη (από 5.000 μέχρι 10.000 κατ.) ☐
   δ. Πόλη (από 10.000 μέχρι 50.000 κατ.) ☐
   ε. Πόλη (από 50.000 μέχρι 100.000 κατ.) ☐
   στ. Μεγάλη πόλη (από 100.000 μέχρι 300.000 κατ.) ☐
   ζ. Θεσσαλονίκη ☐
   η. Αθήνα ή Πειραιάς ☐

7. Τι δουλειά κάνουν οι γονείς σου;  

   μητέρα ☐
   1. Αγρότης ☐
   2. Εργάτης ☐
   3. Αυτοαπασχολούμενος (βιοτέχνης, έμπορος, επαγγελματίας) ☐
   4. Ελεύθερος επαγγελματίας (γιατρός, δικηγόρος, μηχανικός) ☐
   Ιδιωτικός υπάλληλος ☐
   Δημόσιος υπάλληλος ☐
   Διευθυντικό στέλεχος ☐
   Εργοτάξιος ☐
   Συνταξιούχος ☐
   Οικιακά ☐
   Άλλο επάγγελμα ........................................ ☐
   Δεν απαντώ ☐
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8. Ποιο είναι το μηνιαίο εισόδημα της οικογένειάς σου;
   - Μικρότερο των 800,00 ευρώ
   - 800,00 έως 1000,00
   - 1000,00 έως 2000,00
   - 2000,00 έως 3000,00
   - Μεγαλύτερο των 4000,00 ευρώ
   - Δεν γνωρίζω

9. Ποιες είναι οι γραμματικές γνώσεις των γονέων σου; πατέρας μητέρας
   a. Απόφοιτος Δημοτικού
   b. Απόφοιτος Γυμνασίου
   γ. Απόφοιτος Τεχνικής Σχολής
   δ. Απόφοιτος Διοίκηση
   ε. Απόφοιτος ΤΕΕ
   στ. Απόφοιτος Ανώτερης Σχολής
   ζ. Απόφοιτος Ανωτάτης Σχολής
   η. Μεταπτυχιακό Δίπλωμα

B. KYRISES EROTHTSEIS

1. Έχεις ψηφίσει στις τελευταίες Βουλευτικές Εκλογές;
   NAI ☐ OXI ☐

2. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
   a. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
   β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
   γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
   δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
   e. κάτι άλλο

3. Πιστεύεις ότι η συμμετοχή σου στις βουλευτικές εκλογές μπορεί να επηρεάσει τη ζωή σου;
   Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

4. Έχεις ψηφίσει στις τελευταίες δημοτικές/νομαρχιακές εκλογές;
   NAI ☐ OXI ☐
5. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
   a. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
   b. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
   γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
   δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
   e. κάτι άλλο

6. Πιστεύεις ότι η συμμετοχή σου στις δημοτικές/νομαρχιακές εκλογές μπορεί να επηρεάσει τη ζωή σου;
   Πάρα πολύ ☐  Αρκετό ☐  Μέτριο ☐  Λίγο ☐  Καθόλου ☐

7. Έχες ψηφίσει στις τελευταίες ευρωεκλογές;
   ΝΑΙ ☐  ΟΧΙ ☐

8. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
   a. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
   b. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
   γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
   δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
   e. κάτι άλλο

9. Πιστεύεις ότι η συμμετοχή σου στις ευρωεκλογές μπορεί να επηρεάσει τη ζωή σου
   Πάρα πολύ ☐  Αρκετό ☐  Μέτριο ☐  Λίγο ☐  Καθόλου ☐

10. Ψήφισες στις φοιτητικές εκλογές όταν βρισκόσουν στο 1ο έτος;
   ΝΑΙ ☐  ΟΧΙ ☐
11. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
   α. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
   β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
   γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
   δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
   ε. κάτι άλλο

12. Ψήφισες στις φοιτητικές εκλογές όταν βρισκόσουν στο 2ο έτος;
    ΝΑΙ ☐ OXI ☐ Δεν έχω φτάσει στο έτος αυτό ☐

13. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
    α. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
    β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
    γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
    δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
    ε. κάτι άλλο

14. Ψήφισες στις φοιτητικές εκλογές όταν βρισκόσουν στο 3ο έτος;
    ΝΑΙ ☐ OXI ☐ Δεν έχω φτάσει στο έτος αυτό ☐

15. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
    α. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής
    β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά
    γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω
    δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά
    ε. κάτι άλλο
16. Πιστεύεις ότι η συμμετοχή σου στις φοιτητικές εκλογές μπορεί να επηρεάσει τις σπουδές σου;
Πάρα πολύ □  Αρκετό □  Μέτριο □  Λίγο □  Καθόλου □

17. Είσαι μέλος κάποιας φοιτητικής παράταξης;
ΝΑΙ □  ΟΧΙ □  Ήμουν αλλά σταμάτησα να ασχολούμαι □

18. Κατά τη διάρκεια των σπουδών σου σε πόσες περίπου γενικές συνελεύσεις έχεις συμμετάσχει;
α. Καμία □
β. 1-2 □
γ. 3-5 □
δ. 5-10 □
e 10-20 □
στ. 20 και άνω □

19. Ποιοι είναι οι κύριοι λόγοι της συμμετοχής σου;
α. Βελτίωση θεμάτων που αφορούν τις σπουδές □
β. Βελτίωση των θεμάτων που αφορούν τις φοιτητικές παροχές (π.χ. σίτιση, στέγαση) □
γ. Θεωρώ ότι είναι υποχρέωσή μου ως φοιτητής □
δ. Από περιέργεια □

20. Ποιοι είναι οι κύριοι λόγοι της μη συμμετοχής σου;
α. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής □
β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα φοιτητικά θέματα □
γ. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά □
δ. δεν θεωρώ ότι η συμμετοχή μου θα κάνει διαφορά □
e. Κάτι άλλο □
21. Εάν συμμετείχες τουλάχιστον σε μία Γενική Συνέλευση, είχες τη δυνατότητα να εκφράσεις τη γνώμη σου;

NAI ☐ OXI ☑

22. Αν Ναι, πιστεύεις ότι η γνώμη σου εισακούστηκε:

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετά ☐ Μέτρια ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☑

23. Πιστεύεις ότι μπορείς να επηρεάσεις τις αποφάσεις των Γενικών Συνελεύσεων των Φοιτητών;

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετά ☐ Μέτρια ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☑

24. Είσαι μέλος πολιτικού κόμματος;

NAI ☐ OXI ☑

25. Είσαι μέλος
   a. αθλητικού συλλόγου ☐
   b. πολιτιστικού συλλόγου ☐
   γ. θρησκευτικής οργάνωσης ☐
   δ. άλλης οργάνωσης ☐

26. Εργάζεσαι;

NAI ☐ OXI ☑

27. Επιθυμείς να εργαστείς και δεν βρίσκεις δουλειά;

NAI ☐ OXI ☑

28. Εάν εργάζεσαι, ψήφισες στις εκλογές του σωματείου σου;

NAI ☐ OXI ☑

29. Εάν δεν ψήφισες ποιοι ήταν οι λόγοι;
   a. συνειδητή επιλογή μη συμμετοχής ☐
   β. δεν με ενδιαφέρουν τα πολιτικά ☐
   γ. μου είναι δύσκολο να αποφασίσω ☐
   δ. θεωρώ ότι η ψήφος μου έτσι και αλλιώς δεν κάνει διαφορά ☐
   ε. κάτι άλλο ☐
1. Σε ποιο βαθμό, κατά τη γνώμη σου, μπορεί να υπάρχει έλεγχος από τον πολίτη, ή την κοινή γνώμη, στα θέματα (agenda) που συζητούνται στο Κοινοβούλιο;

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

2. Πόσο μπορεί η "κοινή γνώμη" να επηρεάσει τα δρώμενα είτε στο κοινοβούλιο είτε σε άλλα κέντρα λήψης πολιτικών αποφάσεων;

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

3. Πιστεύεις ότι η συμμετοχή του πολίτη στις εκλογές μπορεί να καθορίσει τη δημοκρατικότητα της εκλεγμένης κυβέρνησης;

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

4. Πιστεύεις ότι για τη λήψη των πολιτικών αποφάσεων από μια εκλεγμένη κυβέρνηση ισχύει "η αρχή της εισόδημας των πολιτών";

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

5. Πιστεύεις ότι για τη λήψη των πολιτικών αποφάσεων από μια εκλεγμένη κυβέρνηση ισχύει "η αρχή της δικαιοσύνης και άλλων κοινωνικών ομάδων";

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

6. Πιστεύεις ότι στα δημοκρατικά πλαίσια είτε εκλεγμένης ή άλλων κοινωνικών ομάδων θα πρέπει να ισχύει η ανοχή των πολιτών προς τους "ξένους";

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

7. Πιστεύεις ότι το "δικαίωμα της ελευθερίας του πολίτη" μπορεί να εκπληρωθεί μέσα από το νομικό και πολιτικό πλαίσιο που επικρατεί στο νομικό μας σύστημα;

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

8. Πιστεύεις ότι η έννοια του κράτους δικαίου μπορεί να εκπληρωθεί μέσα από το νομικό σύστημα "νομικό σύστημα";

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐

9. Πιστεύεις ότι τηρείται "ο διαχωρισμός των εξουσιών" μέσα από το θεσμικό σύστημα "νομικό σύστημα";

Πάρα πολύ ☐ Αρκετό ☐ Μέτριο ☐ Λίγο ☐ Καθόλου ☐
Παρακάτω παρουσιάζονται 20 προτάσεις. Παρακαλούμε διάβασε τις προτάσεις προσεκτικά μία προς μία. Εάν εκφράζει τη στάση σου ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗ ΔΙΑΡΚΕΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΒΛΟΜΑΔΑΣ ΠΟΥ ΠΕΡΑΣΕ ΕΩΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗ ΣΤΙΓΜΗ, βάλε σε κύκλο το "ΝΑΙ". Εάν η πρόταση δε σε εκφράζει, βάλε σε κύκλο το "ΟΧΙ".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Πρόταση</th>
<th>ΝΑΙ</th>
<th>ΟΧΙ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Κατά κυκλο στο αποφάσεις τις υπόκεινται αποφάσεις Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Δεν παρουσιάζεται κακά επιδιώξεις και έλεγχοι σε τις προσεκτικής;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Κατά κυκλο στον πρόποες του πρώτου προσήνεργος Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Κατά κυκλο στον επιτροπέ αποφάσεων Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Εάν σε κάνεις παρατηρήσεις θα έκρινες κακά;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Πιστεύεις ότι μείωση να πέσει καλά, θα βοηθά να παραμείνειν από τις πρόγνωση πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Κατά κυκλο στον τρόπο αποφάσεων του πρώτου προσήνεργος Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Κατά κυκλο στον πρόποες του πρώτου προσήνεργος Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Κατά κυκλο στον επιτροπέ αποφάσεων Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Εάν σε κάνεις παρατηρήσεις θα είχες καλά;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Κατά κυκλο στον πρόποες του πρώτου προσήνεργος Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Κατά κυκλο στον επιτροπέ αποφάσεων Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Εάν σε κάνεις παρατηρήσεις θα είχες καλά;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Κατά κυκλο στον πρόποες του πρώτου προσήνεργος Πάρα πολύ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Πιστεύω πολύ στο µέλλον…………………………………… …………………...
Είναι ανόητο να επιδιώκω οτιδήποτε, αφού ποτέ δεν τα καταφέρνω………………
Είναι πολύ απίθανο να νιώσω οποιαδήποτε αληθινή ικανοποίηση στο µέλλον……
Το µέλλον φαίνεται ασαφές και αβέβαιο………………………………………….
Προσδοκώ περισσότερες καλές παρά κακές στιγµές………………………………
Δεν έχω νόηµα να προσπαθώ πραγµατικά για κάτι που θέλω αφού πιθανότατα δε θα το πετύχω……………………………………………………………………..
Σε ποιο βαθµό, νοµίζεις ότι ισχύει κάθε µία από τις παρακάτω προτάσεις:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Πέρα πολύ</th>
<th>Πολύ</th>
<th>Μέτρια</th>
<th>Λίγο</th>
<th>Καθόλου</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Νοµίζω ότι µπορώ να επηρεάσω πολιτικές αποφάσεις σε θέµατα που µε αφορούν………………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Αισθάνοµαι ικανός/ή να αντιπαξίδιζω στις επιµέρους της καθηµερινής ζωής……………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Έχω την αισθήσεως πως οτιδήποτε µπορούσα να συµβεί την οποιαδήποτε στιγµή……………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Αισθάνοµαι ότι ελέγχω την προσωπική µου ασφάλεια………………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Από µία εξαρτάται το πώς θα εξελιχθούν οι στιγµές µου………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Πιστεύω ότι τολικά εγώ θα επιλέξω το επάγγελµα που θα κάνω…………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Το πώς θα εξελιχθεί η καριέρα µου εξαρτάται από παρόµοιους έχω από µένα……………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Αισθάνοµαι ότι εγώ ορίζω τι θα µου συµβεί αύριο………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Αισθάνοµαι ότι δεν µπορώ να αντιδράσω στον τρόπο που διαµορφώνεται η σηµερινή κοινωνική πραγµατικότητα………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ακόµη κι αν αισθάνοµαι αδικηµένος/ή, ελέχτει µπορώ να κάνω για να βρω το δίκιο µου…………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Νοµίζω ότι έχω τη δύναµη να δράσω για να αλλάξουν ζητήµατα της σηµερινής κοινωνικής πραγµατικότητας…………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Σε γενικές γραµµές πιστεύω ότι το να δραστηριοποιηθεί κανένας επιφέρει θετική αποτελέσµατα…………………………………………………………………………</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Διάβασε όλη την ομάδα των προτάσεων σε κάθε κατηγορία και μετά διάλαξε εκείνη την πρόταση της κάθε ομάδας που περιγράφει καλύτερα αυτό που νιώθεις σήμερα, δηλαδή ακριβώς τώρα. Βάλε εάν x στο κουτάκι δίπλα από την πρόταση που διάλεξες. Αν νομίζεις ότι περισσότερες από μία προτάσεις σε κάποιες ομάδες σου ταιριάζουν, βάλε x σε περισσότερα από ένα κουτάκι.

A.
- Είμαι τόσο λυπημένος ή δυστυχώς που δεν μπορώ να το ανεχτώ.
- Είμαι κακόκεφος και λυπημένος συνεχώς και δεν μπορώ να ξαφνίκω.
- Αισθάνομαι άσχημα ή λυπημένος.
- ∆εν αισθάνομαι λυπημένος.

B.
- Αισθάνομαι ότι το μέλλον είναι χωρίς ελπίδα και ότι τα πράγματα δεν μπορούν να φτιάξουν.
- Αισθάνομαι ότι δεν περιμένω τίποτα.
- Νιώθω απογοητευμένος για το μέλλον.
- ∆εν είμαι ιδαίτερα απαισιόδοξος ή απογοητευμένος με το μέλλον.

Γ.
- Νομίζω ότι είμαι πλήρης αποτυχία σαν άνθρωπος.
- Καθώς βλέπω προς τα πίσω την ζωή μου το μόνο που βλέπω είναι αποτυχίες.
- Αισθάνομαι ότι έχω αποτύχει περισσότερο από ένα μέσο άνθρωπο.
- ∆εν αισθάνομαι ότι έχω αποτύχει.

Α.
- ∆εν είμαι ικανοποιημένος με τίποτα.
- ∆εν ικανοποιούμαι με τίποτα πλέον.
- ∆εν απολαμβάνω τα πράγματα όπως στο παρελθόν.
- ∆εν είμαι ιδαίτερα ανικανοποίητος.

Ε.
- Αισθάνομαι λυπημένος και χωρίς αξία.
- Αισθάνομαι πολύ ένοχος.
- Αισθάνομαι άσχημα ή ότι δεν αξίζω πολύ συχνά.
- ∆εν αισθάνομαι ιδαίτερα ένοχος.

ΣΤ.
- Μισώ τον εαυτό μου.
- Είμαι απογοητευμένος με τον εαυτό μου.
- Είμαι απογοητευμένος με τον εαυτό μου.
- ∆εν αισθάνομαι απογοητευμένος από τον εαυτό μου.
Ζ.
☐ Θα σκοτώσων αν είχα την ευκαιρία.
☐ Έχω κάνει σχέδια να αυτοκτονήσω.
☐ Αισθάνομαι ότι θα ήταν καλύτερα αν πέθαινα.
☐ Δεν έχω καμιά πρόθεση να βλάψω τον εαυτό μου.

Η.
☐ Έχω χάσει όλο μου το ενδιαφέρον για τους άλλους ανθρώπους και δεν με ενδιαφέρουν καθόλου.
☐ Έχω χάσει το μεγαλύτερο μέρος του ενδιαφέροντος μου για τους άλλους και ελάχιστα αισθάνομαι για αυτούς.
☐ Ενδιαφέρομαι λιγότερο για τους άλλους από ότι στο παρελθόν.
☐ Δεν έχω χάσει το ενδιαφέρον μου για τους άλλους.

Θ.
☐ Δεν μπορώ να πάρω μια απόφαση πλέον.
☐ Έχω μεγάλη δυσκολία να πάρω απόφαση.
☐ Προσπαθώ να αναβάλω την λήψη αποφάσεων.
☐ Παίρνω αποφάσεις καλά όπως πάντα.

Ι.
☐ Αισθάνομαι ότι είμαι ύπνος ή αποκρουστικός.
☐ Αισθάνομαι ότι υπάρχουν διαρκείς μεταβολές στην εμφάνισή μου και με κάνουν να φαίνομαι μη ελκυστικός.
☐ Αισθάνομαι γιατί φαίνομαι μεγάλος ή μη ελκυστικός.
☐ Δεν αισθάνομαι ότι φαίνομαι χειρότερα από πριν.

Κ.
☐ Δεν μπορώ να εργαστώ καθόλου.
☐ Πρέπει να πιέσω τον εαυτό μου πολύ για να κάνω κάτι.
☐ Απαιτείται εξαιρετική προσπάθεια για να αρχίσω να κάνω κάτι.
☐ Μπορώ να εργαστώ όπως πριν.

Λ.
☐ Είμαι πολύ κουρασμένος και έτσι δεν κάνω τίποτα.
☐ Κουράζομαι από ότι κάνω.
☐ Κουράζομαι ευκολότερα από πριν.
☐ Δεν κουράζομαι ιδιαίτερα περισσότερο από το συνηθισμένο.
Μ.
☐ Δεν έχω ορέξη πια καθόλου.
☐ Η ορέξη μου χειροτέρεψε.
☐ Η ορέξη μου δεν είναι τόσο καλή όσο ήταν.
☐ Η ορέξη μου δεν επιδεινώθηκε.

Σημειώστε οτιδήποτε άλλο θα θέλατε σχετικά με την έρευνα:

..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................................