UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.19 (3);
January-June, 2025 https://unijerps.org
2023 Impact Factor: **6.834;** 2022 ***Impact Factor***: 5.156; ***2021 Impact Factor: 5.641;***
2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. *Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363*

DEVELOPMENT AND STANDARDIZATION OF LEARNED HELPLESSNESS SCALE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Prof. Nkechi-Mary Patricia Esomonu
Email: nkechipmesomonu@gmail.com
&
Agbedo Oluchi Jacinta
Email: atigweoluchi@gmail.com
Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study developed and standardized a scale for measuring secondary school students' learned helplessness Scale (LHS). The aim of this study was to develop, validate and standardize learned helplessness scale for secondary school students. The study employed an instrumentation design in which a four-point scale were developed and standardized. An initial draft of 56 item instrument was developed and standardized. After corrections a 44-item instrument emerged and was administered to 547 secondary school students. The data collected were subjected to factor analysis. The result from factor analysis showed that 30 items loaded well on five factors with minimum loading of 0.54. The 30 items were administered to 600 students to establish norms. The norm for the entire instrument was 63.65, the norms of male and female students were 36.10 and 40.01 respectively. Cronbach alpha statistics was used to establish the reliability of the instrument, its result shows an internal consistency of 0.82 for the 30 items. Hypotheses were tested using t-test statistics; the result shows that there is a significant difference between the norms of male and female students. The manual of the LHS shows the administration and scoring procedure of the scale and its psychometric properties. The instrument LHS is recommended therefore for assessing secondary school students' learned helplessness.

Keywords: Instrumentation, Creativity, Standardization.

Introduction

Secondary education is the stage of education that follows primary education and precedes tertiary or higher education. It typically serves students during their adolescence, providing them with the necessary academic foundation and life skills to pursue further education or enter the workforce. It is typically offered to students between the ages of 12 and 17, although the specific age range may vary depending on the educational system and country. The purpose of secondary education is to provide students with a well-rounded education that prepares them for higher education or the workforce. It aims to develop their intellectual, social, and emotional skills, while also fostering critical thinking, creativity, learned helplessness, and independence (Oribhabor, 2019). Most secondary education systems as

viewed by Esomonu and Ikeanumba (2021) require students to study core subjects such as mathematics, science, economics, language arts (including literature and language studies), social studies (including history and geography), and physical education. Upon successful completion of secondary education, students receive a certificate or diploma, which may be required for admission to tertiary education or for certain jobs.

Kwok (2015) stated that the purpose of a secondary education is to broaden students' perspectives and enhance their ability to analyze problems effectively, thereby contributing to societal improvement. Conversely, Morrish (2015) argued that the goal of a secondary education extends beyond just expanding students' horizons. According to Morrish, secondary schools aim to benefit both individuals and the nation as a whole. He emphasized that when secondary schools fulfill their intended purpose, students will learn to connect seemingly unrelated phenomena, acquire independent knowledge, and develop the competencies needed to face life's challenges, preparing them to become future leaders. Based on these assertions, secondary school students, who have their own responsibilities, must be independent and innovative in various ways to address academic challenges. Consequently, it is essential for them to advance creatively in rational, social, scientific, moral, and other aspects without learning to feel helpless and passive in response to negative events or circumstances even when such events are controllable or changeable.

Learned helplessness is a psychological condition in which an individual feels unable to control or change a situation, leading to a sense of powerlessness and a lack of motivation to try. This condition typically develops after repeated exposure to uncontrollable and adverse events, where the individual learns to believe that their actions have no effect on the outcome. Learned helplessness occurs when individuals experience repeated failure or adversity, leading them to believe that they have no control over their situation, and subsequently giving up trying to change it (Maier and Seligman, 2020). Learned helplessness is behavior exhibited by examinees or students after enduring repeated aversive stimuli beyond their control most especially when leaning subjects like mathematics. According to Suleiman (2021), it is a disruption in motivation and learning following exposure to non-contingent (uncontrollable) outcomes.

Learned helplessness was initially thought to be caused from the examinee's acceptance of their powerlessness: discontinuing attempts to escape or avoid the aversive stimulus, even when such alternatives are unambiguously presented (Adebayo and Abdulhamid, 2019). Upon exhibiting such behavior, the examinees are said to have acquired learned helplessness. Over the past few decades, neuroscience has provided insights into learned helplessness and these insights are that; the brain's default state is to assume that control is not present, and the presence of "helplessness" is what is actually learned (Babatunde and Adeleke, 2018). Learned helplessness is also viewed as a response pattern that retards learning, especially when learning involves materials

that are difficult for the student and thus, learned helplessness may influence academic achievement over time. Learned helplessness is more likely to result from situations where failure is uncontrollable. There are three components of learned helplessness that have particular pertinence for the classroom as detailed by Suleiman (2021): failure to initiate action, failure to learn, and emotional problems. Failure to initiate action means that students who have experienced learned helplessness tend not to try to learn new material. Passivity becomes their predominant behaviour; failure to learn means that even when new directions are given to these students, they still learn nothing from them; and emotional problems seem to accompany learned helplessness. Frustration, depression, and incompetence occur frequently.

Despite the significance of controlling learned helplessness in various contexts, secondary school students face numerous challenges that hinder their academic performance. These challenges include a lack of direction, depression, anxiety, reluctance to attempt tasks repeatedly, and no improvement over time. To address these issues, it is essential to develop an effective and practical learned helplessness scale. This scale should identify how secondary school students can be supported and motivated to repeat a failed task so as to achieve their goals of pursuing higher education programs.

According to Tay and Jebb (2017), scale development is the process of creating a reliable and valid measure of a construct to assess an attribute of interest. Similarly, Dorathy, Amadioha, and Orluwene (2021) describe scale development as a systematic approach to generating items for the assessment of a construct under study. Dorathy further explains that this process involves writing items based on theoretical foundations to ensure the scale's effectiveness and applicability in the study. Bruns and Hynes (2015) summarize that scale development entails adhering to various guiding principles and procedures. This includes determining the type of items to develop, identifying relevant domains, and transforming items into meaningful constructs to ensure content validity. Esomonu and Okeaba (2021) outline the steps for developing a scale or instrument, which include initial steps, creating a test blueprint, generating items, preliminary validation, optional pilot testing, calculating the content validity index, conducting trial testing, performing item analysis, selecting good items (involving G theory/D study and content validity index), estimating convergence, final testing, and norming and publication. Wright, Quick, Hannah, and Hargrove (2017) assert that a well-developed and validated scale provides a crucial foundation for enhancing research quality, recommending the best practices in scale construction.

To develop a valid and accurate scale, it is essential to validate the instrument. Scale validation refers to the degree to which an instrument or scale accurately measures the latent dimension or construct it was designed to assess. Dorathy, Amadioha and Orluwene (2021) describes scale validation as the process of determining how well the scale measures its intended construct. It can also be seen as comparing the construct to a criterion,

with criterion validity being one method of validation. Researchers use various steps in the development process to validate scales. According to Collindge (2014), scale validation can involve face validity, which ensures the items appear appropriate and acceptable. This is followed by pilot testing with a different sample from the intended study population and analyzing the data to ensure the scale's validity and reliability. This analysis checks for measurable factors, covariance, component errors, and more. Instrument validation ensures that an instrument measures what it is supposed to and performs as designed.

To develop a valid and reliable scale or instrument for assessing students' learned helplessness, it is crucial to consider relevant theories that systematically explain how to achieve the study's aim. Various theoretical components must be considered in scale development and execution, including Classical Test Theory (CTT), Item Response Theory (IRT) or latent test theory, Generalizability Theory (G-theory or GT), and Factor Analysis (FA), which is part of Classical Test Theory.

Factor analysis (FA) simplifies a set of complex variables or items by using statistical procedures to uncover the underlying dimensions that explain the relationships between these variables or items. It streamlines a matrix of correlations, enabling researchers to better understand the relationships between scale items and the underlying factors they may share. FA is widely used and recommended for developing and refining educational assessment instruments to provide evidence of construct validity (Tavako and Wetze, 2020). There are two types of factor analysis: exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). CFA is a theory-driven approach that tests how well the data fits a proposed model or theory. Unlike EFA, CFA requires researchers to identify a factor model before analyzing the data. CFA is fundamentally a method for statistically testing the internal structure of instruments, relying on maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) and different standards for assessing construct suitability.

Despite the importance of factor analysis in determining the quality and construct validity of scales, such as a learned helplessness scale to improve learning, teaching, and assessment quality, there are few publicly available learned helplessness scales for these purposes. Enyia (2023) researched the development and validation of a learned helplessness assessment scale among senior secondary school students with hearing impairment in Ibadan, Suleiman (2021) developed a short learned helplessness scale based on item response theory in China. Genero (2008) examined Chaotic Environments, Learned Helplessness, and Academic Achievement in Adolescence in New York. However, there is a limited number of learned helplessness scales available for secondary school students, and there is a notable lack of empirical studies on the learned helplessness attribute of secondary school students using factor analysis. The steps and stages involved in constructing a learned helplessness scale pose significant challenges to psychometricians and researchers.

Adeyemi and Ajayi (2020) observed a gender difference in learned helplessness.

According to the researchers, gender differences certainly cause physiological differences as well as affect the psychological differences in learning, so that male and female students have differences in learning. Suleiman (2015) was of the view that psychologically males and females are different. Females are losing interest in real life issues, whereas males are more interested in abstract aspects. In support of this, Babatunde and Adeleke (2018) asserted that the difference between males and females in learning is that the males are inferior in reasoning thereby leading to learned helplessness, whereas females are superior in accuracy, precision, carefulness, and thoughtfulness. This made the researcher to be concerned and motivated to fill this gap by developing and standardizing of learned helplessness scale for secondary school students in Enugu State. The aim of this study was to develop, validate and standardize learned helplessness scale for secondary school students in Enugu state using factor analysis. The following research questions were formulated for the study.

1. How valid are the items of the scale for secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) in terms of their factor loadings?
2. What is the reliability co-efficient of the scale for secondary school students' learned helplessness scale (LHS) using Crombach Alpha?
3. What are the norms for interpreting the scores of the secondary school students' learned helplessness scale (LHS)?
4. What are the norms for interpreting the scores of each dimensions or sub-scale of secondary school students' learned helplessness scale (LHS)?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. The norm of males and females in the LHS will not differ significantly.
2. There is no significant difference between the norms of the male and female students in the internal-external section of the LHS.
3. The norms of the male and female students in the global-specific section of the LHS will not differ significantly.
4. The norm of males and females will not differ significantly in the stable-unstable section of the LHS.

Methods

The study adopted an instrumentation research design. A study belongs to instrumentation research if it involves introducing new or modified content, procedure, technology or instrument of educational practice (Ogoamaka in Esomonu and Okeaba, 2016). Esomonu and Okeaba, (2016) pointed out that a study which is surely geared towards the development and standardization of instrument in education is an instrumentation study. This study involved development and standardization of an instrument for the assessment of secondary school students' learned helplessness. The study was carried out in Enugu State, Nigeria. The population of the study consisted 33,128 secondary school students of all government owned secondary schools in Agbani Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria for the 2024/2025

academic session. The sample size of the study was 547 secondary school students of all government owned secondary schools in Agbani Local Government Area of Enugu State.

Instrument Development Process

1. **Pool of attributes/item generation:** at this stage a preliminary draft was constructed based on the various indicators of learned helplessness. The draft will have 56 items.
2. **Organization of Items:** the draft instrument consisting of 56 items covering the 5 indicators of learned helplessness was arranged in 4 parts, the 1st is the bio-data of the respondents while the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th parts sought information on secondary school students learned helplessness based on internal-external, global-specific, and stable-unstable respectively.
3. **Preliminary Validation of Instrument:** the draft of instrument was subjected to face and content validation by experts in educational measurement and evaluation. These experts were required to assess the relevance, adequacy and comprehensiveness of the items of the instrument. To guide the experts in the validation exercise, the topic of study, purpose of study, research questions and hypotheses together with the draft instrument were given to the experts.
4. **Assembling the initial draft instrument:** the corrections, comments and experts' observations were incorporated in the modification of the instrument if any.
5. **Construct Validation:** after the face validation, the validated instrument was administered to 300 secondary school students from a secondary school in Anambra State that are different from the ones to be studied for the purpose of establishing construct validity. Therein, the items were subjected to factor analysis.

Exploratory Factor analysis was used for research question one, Cronbach Alpha statistic was used to answer research question two. Research questions three and four were answered using mean deviation and standard deviation. For the hypothesis, t-test of difference between two means was used. All data were analyzed with the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS version 25.0).

Results

Research Questions 1: How valid are the items of the scale for secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) in terms of their factor loadings?

Table 1: Factors loading in their Respective Factor

				Communalities
	F1	F2	F3	
ITEM1	**.582**	.203	.026	.236
ITEM2	**.665**	.092	.010	.334
ITEM3	.034	.244	.020	.453
ITEM4	**.604**	.032	.004	.373
ITEM5	**.703**	.036	-.029	.399
ITEM6	**.608**	.293	.034	.387
.ITEM7	**.594**	.018	.021	.397
ITEM8	**.581**	.105	.017	.387
ITEM9	.178	.224	-.042	.356
ITEM10	.247	.237	-.003	.259
ITEM11	**.836**	.141	-.035	.314
ITEM12	.232	.213	.076	.179
ITEM13	.028	.322	.074	.398
ITEM14	.328	.249	.014	.323
ITEM15	.214	.101	-.093	.234
ITEM16	.109	.008	.018	.390
ITEM17	.119	.212	-.001	.396
ITEM18	.218	.150	.028	.312
ITEM19	.100	**.599**	.083	.371
ITEM20	.107	**.666**	.080	.376
ITEM21	.043	.154	-.050	.311
ITEM22	.206	**.754**	.016	.375
ITEM23	.012	**.679**	.016	.328
ITEM24	.030	.246	.027	.204
ITEM25	.105	**.632**	.100	.369
ITEM26	.228	**.722**	.020	.030
ITEM27	.113	**.502**	-.002	.221
ITEM28	.006	.012	.103	.355
ITEM29	.023	-.092	.170	.345
ITEM30	.007	-.101	.267	.149
ITEM31	.105	-.010	.160	.340
ITEM32	-.010	.102	.250	.114
ITEM33	.039	-.052	**.541**	.300
ITEM34	-.101	.142	.224	.106
ITEM35	.100	.125	**.595**	.427
ITEM36	.014	.010	**.581**	349
ITEM37	.041	.016	**.643**	.320
ITEM38	-.149	.081	**.843**	.276
ITEM39	-.178	.153	.119	.240
ITEM40	.020	.017	**.616**	.385
ITEM41	.026	-.008	.305	.261
ITEM42	.209	.161	.057	.399
ITEM43	.101	-.080	.183	.278
ITEM44	-.025	.032	.260	.133

Table 2 shows the factor loadings for all the 44 items that were finally selected. Three (3) factors were extracted. Forty-four (44) items loaded up to 0.45 and above (acceptable level for factor loading as stated by Kline, 2016) on three (3) factors. The table 2 also shows

that 8 items that is, Item 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 loaded above .45 on factor 1 (internal-external level). 7 items that is, Item 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26 and 27 loaded above .45 on factor 2 (global-specific level). 6 items that is, Item 33, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 40 loaded above .45 on factor 3 (stable-unstable level). Factor that had at least 4 factors items adequately loaded on them were acceptable as valid. This is in line with assertion of Esomonu and Okeaba (2016) stating that any factor with at least 4 items adequately loaded on it is valid. Hence a total of 30 items considered factorially pure and valid load on three (3) factors were selected to make final draft.

Table 2: Summary of the Factor Loading of the Surviving 30 Items of the Inventory

F	Items	Loading
1	1	.582
	2	.665
	4	.604
	5	.705
	6	.608
	7	.594
	8	.581
	11	.836
2	19	.599
	20	.666
	22	.754
	23	.679
	25	.632
	26	.722
	27	.502
3	33	.541
	35	.595
	36	.581
	37	.643
	38	.843
	40	.616

Research Questions 2: What is the reliability co-efficient of the scale for secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) using Crombach Alpha?

Table 3 Reliability of the instrument and its sub-scale based on Cronbach Alpha

Scale Dimension	No of items	Items	Cronbach Alpha
F1	8	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11	.71
F2	7	19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 41, and 44	.83
F3	6	33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, and 43	.76

Table 3 shows the reliability of the overall scale as well as sub-scale dimensions of the construct. There are five sub-dimensions of the secondary school students' learned helplessness as revealed by result of the factor analysis. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for secondary school students' learned helplessness scale was calculated as

0.82 for the scale total score with 30 items, 0.71 for the sub-dimension 1 (internal-external level) with 8 items, 0.83 for the sub-dimension 2 (global-specific level) with 7 items. .76 for the sub-dimension 3 (stable-unstable).

Research Question 3: What are the norms for interpreting the scores of the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS)?

Table 4: General Norms of Secondary School Students' Learned Helplessness (LHS)

Mean	Variance	SD	No Items	N
63.65	78.81	8.98	30	600

Table 4 shows that the norm of the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) is 40.65 since the mean performance of 600 students is 63.65.

Table 5: The norms for female and male secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS)

Sex	Mean	SD	No Items	N
Male	36.10	7.20	30	220
Female	40.01	8.20	30	380

Table 5 reveals that average score of male students on the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) is 36.10 while the average score of female students on the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) is 40.01.

Research Question 4: What are the norms for interpreting the scores of each dimension or sub-scale of secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS)

Table 6: Sub-scale norms of Postgraduate Students' Creativity Scale (PSCS)

Factor	Sub-scale	Mean	SD	No Items
F1	Internal-external	10.12	4.21	8
F2	Global-specific	11.20	3.20	7
F3	Stable-unstable	15.21	4.23	6

Table 6 reveals the average performance of students in various part of secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS). From the table 6, items related to factor 1 norm 10.12, items related to factor 2 norm 11.20, and items related to factor 3 norm 15.21,

Hypothesis 1: The Norm of Males and Females in the LHS will not differ Significantly.

Table 7: t- test of significance difference for norm for male and female students

Sex	Mean	SD	df	t	p-value	Remark
Male	36.10	7.20				
			1198	11.73	P<.001	S
Female	40.01	8.20				

Table 7 shows that there is a significant difference between the norms of male and female students in the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) (p<.001).

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the norms of the male and female students in the internal-external section of the LHS.

Table 8 t- test of significance difference for norm for male and female students for F1 sub-scale dimension

Sex	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P-value	Remark
Male	220	12.22	6.21				
				1198	13.108	P<.001	S
Female	380	14.30	5.21				

Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference between the norms of male and female students in the internal-external section of the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) (p<.001).

Hypothesis 3: The norms of the male and female students in the global-specific section of the LHS will not differ significantly.

Table 9: t- test of significance difference for norm for male and female students F2 sub-scale dimension

Sex	N	Mean	SD	df	d	p-value	Remark
Male	220	8.27	4.31				
				1198	6.804	P<.001	S
Female	380	10.31	6.10				

Table 9 shows that there is a significant difference between the norms of male and female students in the global-specific section of secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) (p<.001).

Discussion of Findings

Research question one Table 2 shows the factor loadings for all the 21 items that were finally selected. Three (3) factors were extracted. Twenty-one (21) items loaded up to 0.45 and above (acceptable level for factor loading as stated by Kline, 2016) on three (3) factors. The table 2 also shows that 8 items loaded above .45 on factor 1 (internal-external level). 7 items loaded above .45 on factor 2 (global-specific level). 6 items loaded above .45 on factor 3 (stable-unstable). Factor that had at least 4 factors items adequately loaded on them were acceptable as valid. This is in line with assertion of Esomonu and Okeaba (2016)

stating that any factor with at least 4 items adequately loaded on it is valid. Hence a total of 44 items considered factorially pure and valid load on five (5) factors were selected to make final draft.

Research question 2 Table 3 shows the reliability of the overall scale as well as sub-scale dimensions of the construct. There are five sub-dimensions of the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) as revealed by result of the factor analysis. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the scale was calculated as 0.82 for the total score with 44 items, 0.71 for the sub-dimension 1 (internal-external level) with 8 items, 0.83 for the sub-dimension 2 (global-specific level) with 7 items 0.76 for the sub-dimension 3 (stable-unstable). Each of the factors is made up of more than 4 items with their corresponding factor loadings in line with the recommendation by Meredith (1969).

From table 4, it is clear that the norm of the LHS is 63.65; any score below the norm implies high learned helplessness while scores above the norm implies low learned helplessness. Also from table 5, the norms of males and females are 36.10 and 40.01. The difference in mean of male and female student was subjected to hypothesis test (see table 7) and the result shows that there is a significant different between the norm of the male and that of the female students in the LHS. However, the result from hypothesis 2,3 and 4 show that there is no significant difference between the norm of male and female students in the part of the LHS patterning to internal-external, global-specific, and stable-unstable sections.

Conclusion

The 44 item LHS passed through factor analysis with verimax rotation and loaded adequately on 3 factors namely; internal-external, global-specific, and stable-unstable levels. These 3 factors have high internal consistency of 0.71, 0.83, and 0.76 respectively and a general reliability of 0.76. With the above in view, the researcher concludes that the instrument (LHS) is valid and highly reliable.

Recommendations

Based on the implications and findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The scale for secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) should be adopted by secondary school administrators as tool for measuring students' learned helplessness.
2. Students should use the secondary school students' learned helplessness (LHS) for self-assessment
3. Academic advisers and guidance counselors should adopt the LHS as a diagnostic tool for accessing students' learned helplessness.
4. Improvement of students' learned helplessness should be pursued with data using the LHS as a tool to for data collection.
5. Secondary school administrators should give attention to students' learned helplessness by forming efficient ways to improve it.

REFERENCES

Adebayo, O., and Abdulhamid, S. M. (2019). Exams system for Nigerian universities with emphasis on security and result integrity. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, 7(2), 121-130.

Adeyemi, A. A., and Ajayi, A. O. (2020). Observing gender differences in learned helplessness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *45*(3), 234-245.

Bruns, F. & Hynes. (2015). Scale development. Wiley online library. *https://online-library.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp186*

Collindge, D. (2014). *Validating a questionnaire*. https://www.methodspace.com

Dorathy, S., Amadioha, A. & Orluwene, G.W. (2021). Application of generalizability theory in the estimation of dependability of critical thinking scale for university students. *Scholars Journal of Physics, Mathematics and Statistics*, 8(9), 171-178

Enyia, C. (2023). *Development and validation of a learned helplessness assessment scale among senior secondary school students with hearing impairment in Ibadan*. University of Ibadan.

Esomonu, N.P.M and Ikeanumba, C.B. (2021). Effect of formative assessment on academic achievement of postgraduate students in advanced educational statistics in public universities in southeast, Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Education and Research*, 6(4), 05-11.

Esomonu, N.P.M. & Okeaba, J.U. (2021). Development and Standardization of Inventory for Measuring Students' Integration into University Academic Culture. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(4), 201-2011

Esomonu, N.P.M., & Okeaba, O. J. (2016). Development and standardization of inventory for measuring students' integration into university academic culture. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(4), 201-211.

Kwok, S. (2015). *The purpose of a University Education*. South China monitoring post. Insight and opinion. https://www.Scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1889688/what-purpose.14/7/2015

Maier, S. F., and Seligman, M. E. P. (2020). Learned Helplessness: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 105(1), 3–46.

Morrish, H. (2015). *The telegraph, four reasons why university is still in existence* https://www.Telegraph.com.uk

Oribhabor, C. B. (2019). The influence of gender on Mathematics achievement of secondary school students in Bayelsa State. *African*

Journal of Studies in Education, 14(2), 196– 206.

Osegbue, G. C. (2025). Early childhood education in Nigeria: challenges and prospects. *Unizik Journal of Educational Laws and Leadership Studies*, *2*(1).

Osegbue, G. C. (2025). Crisis intervention and response in educational institutions: developing and implementing plans in developing countries. *African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies*, *15*(1).

Suleiman, M. S. (2021). Perception of sexual harassment among female students of Tertiary Institutions in Northern Nigeria. *Ife Social Sciences Review*, 25(2), 80-89.

Tay, & Jebb, A. (2017). Scale development. In S. Regeberg (Ed.), *the SAGE Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology 2nd Ed*. Thousand Oaks CA Sage

UNIJERPS



Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.19 (3);

January-June, 2025 https://unijerps.org

2023 Impact Factor: **6.834;** 2022 ***Impact Factor***: 5.156; ***2021 Impact Factor: 5.641;***

2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. *Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363*

LEARNED HELPLESSNESS SCALE (LHS)

Instruction: The following is a list of statements of learned helplessness of students. Consider each statement and then indicate how it applies to you. Please answer all questions. After each statement, you will find columns Always, Usually, Sometimes, and Never Tick (√) in the column which you feel best describes your learned helplessness.

S/N	Statement	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
1	No matter how much energy I put into a task, I feel I have no control over the outcome				
2	I feel that my ability to solve problems is the reason for my success.				
3	I can find solutions to difficult problems.				
4	I don't place myself in situations in which I cannot predict the outcome.				
5	If I complete a task successfully, it is probably because of my ability				
6	I have the ability to solve most of my life's problems.				
7	When I do not succeed at a task, I do not attempt any similar tasks because I feel that I would fail them also				
8	When something doesn't turn out the way I planned, I know it is because I didn't have the ability to start with.`				
9	Other people have more control over their success and/or failure than I do.				
10	I try a task if I have failed similar ones in the past.				
11	When I perform poorly, it is because I don't have the ability to perform better				
12	I accept tasks even if I am not sure that I will success at them.				
13	I feel that I have little control over the outcomes of my work.				
14	I am successful at most tasks I try.				
15	I feel that anyone else could be better than me at most tasks.				
16	I am able to reach my goals in life.				
17	When I do not succeed at a task, I blame myself.				
18	No matter how hard I try, things never seem to work out the way I want them to				
19	I feel that my success reflects my ability, not chance.				
20	My behaviour seems to influence the success of a work group.				
21	I prefer to do easy problems rather than hard ones.				
22	I express enthusiasm about your work				
23	When I encounter an obstacle in my work, I work to overcome it.				
24	I take little independent initiative; someone must help me to get started and keep going on an assignment				
25	In general, I expect to do well on schoolwork (rather than expecting to do poorly and expressing surprise at each success)				
26	When I fail one part of a task, I look discouraged – I am certain to fail at the entire task				
27	I try to finish homeworks/assignments, even when they are difficult				
28	I make negative or degrading comments about my ability when I perform poorly				
29	I give up when someone correct me or find a mistake in my work				

30	In general, I attempt to do my work thoroughly and well, rather than just trying to get by				
31	If asked why I received a poor grade, I am likely to say something about trying harder (e.g., "I did not concentrate enough that time")				
32	After failing a few problems on a school/academic task, I continue to do poorly on remaining problems even though they are within my ability range				
33	I prefer new and challenging problems over easy problems				
34	I ask for help from peers, other students, or teachers on school/academic tasks more than is necessary				
35	When someone point out a mistake I take it in stride, try to correct the error, and continues to work				
36	I am proud when I receive a good grade or when my work is praised				
37	When I begin a difficult problem, my attempts are half-hearted				
38	I do not respond with enthusiasm and pride when asked how I am doing on a school/academic task				
39	When I do badly on one part of a task, I still expects to perform well on the rest of the task				
40	I say things like "I can't do it" when I have trouble with my work				
41	When given a good grade, I do not believe I can do that subject - say, for example, that I am being nice, the problems were just easy, or I was lucky				
42	When experiencing difficulty, I persist for a while before asking for help				
43	When I encounter an obstacle in schoolwork I get discouraged and stop trying. I am easily frustrated				
44	When I receive a poor grade, I try harder in that subject next time				