ATTRIBUTIONS AND DEPRESSION ACROSS CULTURES

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this thesis is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This thesis does not include proprietary or classified information.

_____
Ryan Patrick Siney

Certificate of Approval:

_____	_____
Peter Harzem Professor Psychology	Virginia O'Leary, Chair Professor Psychology
_____	_____
Philip Lewis Professor Psychology	Stephen L. McFarland Acting Dean Graduate School

ATTRIBUTIONS AND DEPRESSION ACROSS CULTURES

Ryan Patrick Siney

A Thesis

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Science

Auburn, Alabama
December 16, 2005

ATTRIBUTIONS AND DEPRESSION ACROSS CULTURES

Ryan Patrick Siney

_____
Signature of Author

_____
Date of Graduation

THESIS ABSTRACT

Ryan Patrick Siney

Master of Science, Auburn University, December 16, 2005
(Bachelor of Arts, Miami University, May 3, 2003)

111 Typed Pages

Directed by Dr. Virginia O'Leary

There is evidence that culture and depression can both affect the pattern of explanations that people give for events. To date, research on attributions has considered only culture or depression with respect to attributions, and no studies have investigated the cumulative effects of these factors. This study explores the differences in attributions introduced by both culture and depression. The samples used in this study (Nepal and the United States) are compared using several measures of depression and a measure of attributional style. Results support the hypothesis that there are differences in attributions based on both culture and depression and that depression may have a differential affect on attributions depending on an individual's cultural background.

Style Manual Used: Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association

Computer Software Used: Microsoft Word for Windows

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables……...…….……..…….……vii

Introduction……..…….……..……...……..1

Method……..…..……..…..……...……...21

Results…….…….…….…..……...27

Discussion…….……..…….…..33

References…….…….……..…..……43

Tables…….…….…….…….….59

Appendices…….……..…….…….……85

A. Measure of Attributional Style……..……..……86

B. Nepali Version of Measure of Attributional Style……...……..98

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for US and Nepal Samples 59
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Depressed Participants in US and Nepal Samples.....60
Table 3: Eigenvalues and Variances for Internality Dimension.....61
Table 4: Eigenvalues and Variances for Generality Dimension.....62
Table 5: Eigenvalues and Variances for Depressed Participants on Internality Dimension.....63
Table 6: Eigenvalues and Variances for Depressed Participants on Generality Dimension.....64
Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension in Nepal Sample.....65
Table 8: Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension for US Participants.....66
Table 9: Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for Nepal Sample.....67
Table 10: Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for US Sample 68
Table 11: Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample.....69
Table 12: Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension 70
Table 13: Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample.....71
Table 14: Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension.....72
Table 15: Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions for US Sample 73
Table 16: Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Nepal Sample 74
Table 17: Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions.....75
Table 18: Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample.....76
Table 19: Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for US Sample.....77
Table 20: Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Nepal Sample 78
Table 21: Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Depressed Participants in US Sample.....79
Table 22: Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample.....80
Table 23: Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample.....81
Table 24: Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for US Sample 82
Table 25: Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample.....83
Table 26: Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample.....84

Introduction

Though the relationship between culture and mental processes is not completely understood, there is sufficient evidence that mental events are affected by the culture in which one develops. The field of psychology seems only to have just begun to explore the relationship between thought and culture, with many holes in the literature that need to be filled with data on this relationship. One area in which studies are virtually non-existent is the interaction between depression, attributions, and culture. Separate literatures exist for research on depression and culture and for attribution and culture, but no data has yet been published regarding the interaction of depression, attributions, and culture jointly. The goal of the present study is to examine this relationship by comparing a sample from an Eastern culture (Nepal) to that of a Western culture (the United States). The implications for studies such as this one are extensive; a large number of both medical doctors and psychologists are trained in the West (or are trained in the East using Western methods based on Western research). As data are collected that support differing patterns of psychological phenomena between the East and West, it should become clear that a universal psychology is ill-suited for a world in which culture's effects are far reaching. Culture shows itself not only in the customs and traditions of a society but also in the moment to moment thoughts and behaviors of its members. The present study attempts to examine one way in which culture can manifest itself in those thoughts and behaviors, namely through depression and attributions.

Attributions

Harold Kelley (1973) stressed the importance of studying attributions: he claimed they are the basis for one's decisions about how to behave or respond in any given situation. The courses of action available to a person undeniably rely on the situations' attributions, or one's reasoning about why an event happened or what caused an event to occur. Examining attributions across different events can give us clues about one's attributional style, or a consistency in the way that one explains events. Obtaining information about one's attributional style allows researchers and clinicians to make better predictions about other aspects of an individual, such as their happiness and health (Peterson, Buchanan, & Seligman, 1995).

Peterson et al. (1995) suggest that the study of attributional style grew primarily out of research on learned helplessness and personal control. The learned helplessness model (Maier & Seligman, 1976; Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978) proposed that there can be cognitive, emotional, and motivational effects that result from an event over which an individual has no control. This approach to the study of attributional style is an attempt to identify the dimensions of control people feel they have over life events and to discover the effects of assigning such loci of control.

Eisner (1995) has suggested that an array of influences may shape attributional style. One of these is genetic information. Schulman, Keith, and Seligman (1991) examined attributional style in identical twins and found that their attributions correlated at .48, while fraternal twins had a correlation of .00. Another early influence is the explanatory style of one's parents. Seligman, Peterson, Kaslow, Tanenbaum, Alloy and Abramson (1984) compared the attributions of mothers with those of their

children and found that attribution for negative events was correlated at .39. Similarly, Dweck, Davidson, Nelson, and Edna (1978) found that young students' attributions about their classroom performance are correlated with their teachers' attributions about performance. Whether teachers attribute poor performance to a lack of effort or to a lack of intelligence, their students tend to make similar attributions (Dweck et al., 1978). Childrens' exposure to events that are uncontrollable may also play a role in developing an attributional style. Nolen-Hoeksema, Girgus, and Seligman (1991) report that children who experience a major uncontrollable event, such as the divorce of their parents, have more negative attributional styles compared to children with fewer uncontrollable life events. Eisner (1992, 1995) has found that trust in adolescence plays a role in attributional style as well; mistrust of others predicted a negative explanatory style, but negative explanatory styles did not reliably predict mistrust. This result indicates that trust might be an important factor in developing a negative attributional style rather than vice versa (Eisner, 1995).

Measuring Attributional Style

There are two measures widely used in research as tools for assessing attributional style: the Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982) and the Content Analysis of Verbatim Explanations (Peterson, Luborsky, & Seligman, 1983). Both measures attempt to extract information from the participant about their attributions on three different dimensions, internal versus external, stable versus unstable, and global versus specific. The internal versus external dimension refers to the perceived locus of control for a particular event. The stability dimension attempts to asses whether the attributions made about an event

are stable across time for this event or are likely to change based on other circumstances. The global versus specific dimension reveals information about the specificity of the attribution to events similar to the event in question or particular to the event being assessed. Determining where the participant's attributions lie on each of these three dimensions is the goal of these measures, and responses allow researchers to make general conclusions about the overall attributional style of the participant.

One of the earliest measures of attributional style, and perhaps the most widely used, is the Attributional Style Questionnaire and its derivatives (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky, & Seligman, 1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire presents subjects with six positive events and six negative events (for example "You meet a friend who acts hostilely towards you"). Additionally, six of the events concern interpersonal relationships and six contain achievement situations. For each event, the subject must write down one cause of the event and indicate the locus, stability, and specificity of the attribution. Scores are then computed for positive and negative events and for interpersonal and achievement situations. Variations of the Attributional Style Questionnaire has been constructed for specific types of attributional style by modifying the types of life events used, while keeping the test format and scoring constant. Some examples of these variations are the Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire (Kaslow, Tannenbaum, & Seligman, 1978), the Organizational Attributional Style Questionnaire (Kent & Martinko, 1995), and the Academic Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson & Barett, 1987).

The Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions method was developed so that oral or written statements by any individual, not just those who have responded to

questionnaires, can be analyzed in an attempt to discern the individual's attributional style. Experienced users of Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions train other potential users in an eight hour workshop intended to teach researchers or therapists how to extract and rate attributes from speech or written words. Any attribution statement extracted by the reviewer is then rated on three scales for the locus, stability, and specificity of the attributions.

Many researchers have expressed concerns about the measurement of attributional style using these measures. Low to moderate internal consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients have been found (Robins & Hayes, 1995; Cutrona, Russell, & Jones 1984; Johnson & Miller, 1990; Zautra, Guenther, & Chartier, 1985). Additionally, Robins and Block (1989) Zautra et al (1985) report finding low correlations between each of the three dimensions (locus, stability, and specificity) as measured by the Attributional Style Questionnaire. However, factor analyses of Attributional Style Questionnaire results have shown that distinct attributional styles exist for positive and negative life events (Xenikou, Furnham, & McCarrey, 1997). Peterson, Bettes, and Seligman (1985) obtained similarly low internal consistency for the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions method, but found inter-rater agreement to be adequate, as did Schulman, Keith, and Seligman (1989). Riskind, Castellon, and Beck (1989) and Schulman, Castellon, and Seligman (1989) both found the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions method to be successful in predicting depression, primarily using responses on the stability and specificity. Despite this, Schulman et al (1989) found that the Attributional Style Questionnaire had an even higher rate of success at predicting traits such as depression. Robins and Hayes (1995) suggest that the

lack of consistently high test-retest validity and internal consistency may be due to a difference in participants' attributions for events that are hypothetical versus events that occur "naturally." Results from many studies have found such differences in attributions for real versus hypothetical events (Brown & Harris, 1978; Zaurtra, et al., 1985; Cutrona, et al., 1984).

Attributional Style and Depression

A large proportion of the research concerning attributional style has focused on the relationship between depression and attributions. This is in part due to the reformulated model of learned helplessness by Abramson et al (1978), which proposed that an individual's attribution about the cause of an event is a major determinant of their resulting experiences, among them helplessness and depression. Peterson and Seligman (1984) propose that a pessimistic attribution style, attributions which are internal (blamed on one's self), stable (last for a long time), and global (applicable to many situations), is most related to depression. Attributions which fit these dimensions are considered to be depressogenic attributions.

Numerous studies have revealed relationships between the presence of depressogenic attributions and symptoms of depression in various populations.

Undergraduate Students

Seligman et al. (1970) discovered that the presence of depressive symptoms is highly correlated with internal, stable, and global attributions (as measured by the Attributional Style Questionnaire) in college-age students. These results were corroborated by Peterson, Bettes, and Seligman (1985), who additionally found that the open-ended attributions provided by college students were correlated with depressive

symptoms regardless of the type of life event considered. It should also be noted that several studies, also using the Attributional Style Questionnaire, have failed to detect a significant relationship between attributions and depression using a college student sample (Peterson, Schwartz, & Seligman, 1981; Cochran & Hammen, 1985; Needles & Abramson, 1990).

Women

Peterson and Seligman (1984) examined the attributions of low socioeconomic status women and found that attributions that were internal and global were highly correlated with the presence of depression (as measured by the Beck Depression Inventory; Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961), but that the stability dimension was not correlated with depression. O'Hara, Rehm, and Campbell (1982) and Cutrona (1983) found that the presence of significantly more depressogenic attributions (internal, stable, and global attributions) than positive attributions in postpartum women reliably predicted the onset of postpartum depression. In fact, O'Hara et al. (1982) reported that a depressogenic attributional style was the single best predictor for the level of postpartum depression and the speed of recovery from that depression. Nevertheless, there are findings that contradict this evidence by failing to find significant relationships between attributions and depression in women (Manly, McMahon, Bradley, & Davidson, 1982; O'Hara, Neunaber, & Zekoski, 1984).

Children

Using the Children's Attributional Style Questionnaire (Kaslow, et al., 1978) and the Children's Depression Inventory (Kovacs and Beck, 1977), found that depressogenic attributions by children on all three attributional dimensions successfully

predicted symptoms of depression across six months. Similarly, Asarnow and Bates (1988) measured clinically depressed children and found that their attributions were significantly more internal, stable, and global than a nondepressed control. Results from another study on children substantiate this link, but only for the stability dimension (Robins & Hinkley, 1989). Nolen-Hoeksema, Girgus, and Seligman (1986) performed a more longitudinal study of children's attributions and reported that non-depressed children who provided depressogenic attributions were more likely to be depressed three months later than those nondepressed children who made more positive attributions.

Clinically Depressed Adults

Raps, Peterson, Reinhard, Abramson, and Seligman (1982) compared attributions from clinically depressed hospital inpatients, nondepressed schizophrenics, and nondepressed hospital patients. An analysis of these attributions found that those who were clinically depressed made significantly more internal, stable, and global attributions than members of the other two groups. This suggests that depressogenic attributions are related to the presence of depression rather than to more general medical problems or other types of psychopathology. Raps at al (1982) further reported that a depressogenic attributional style for negative life events correlated significantly with the total amount of time the patient was depressed. Persons and Rao (1981) also found that internal and global depressogenic attributions correlated with clinical unipolar depression and that depressogenic attributions decreased in quantity as patients were treated with antidepressant drugs.

The studies which fail to offer evidence for a link between depression and attributions should be examined more closely. Most of these studies fail to measure attributional style across several types of life events and over an extended period of time (Peterson & Seligman, 1984; Epstein, 1980). Peterson and Raps (1983) analyzed methods and data from research on depression and attribution and found that nearly all of the studies which failed to show such a relationship asked participants for their attributions for only a single life event. All but one of the studies supporting such a relationship between attribution and depression asked participants about several situations. Robins (1988) cautions that many of these studies had insufficient statistical power to successfully assess the relationship between depression and attributions. After correcting for these concerns, Robins (1988) reports that there is strong evidence for a connection between depression and attributions, especially on the stability and specificity dimensions.

Models of Attribution and Depression

A key question raised by many of these studies is whether depressogenic attributions are one of the factors that lead to depressive symptoms or if depressogenic attributions are a symptom of existing depression. Several models have been proposed in an attempt to describe the relationship between depression and attributions (Brewin, 1985). One is the symptom model, which posits that depressogenic attributions are simply a symptom of depression and appear only when a participant is clinically depressed. Hamilton and Abramson (1983) compared a depressed group to a nondepressed control group and discovered that their attributions as measured by the Attributional Style Questionnaire were different. When the depressed group was tested

again after their depressive symptoms had subsided, their attributions were not significantly different than the control group. These results were corroborated by Fennell and Campbell (1984) and by Lewisohn, Steinmetz, Larson, and Franklin (1981). Brewin and Harris (1985) attempted to induce a negative mood state in otherwise nondepressed participants, and failed to find a difference in attributions for these participants when compared to a control group. Brewin (1985) points out that this may be due to the lack of uncontrollability which is important to depression and depressogenic attributional styles according to the learned helplessness of Abramson et al (1978).

A second proposed model is the onset model. The onset model assumes that depressogenic attributions appear in the wake of a major uncontrollable life event, and that depressive symptoms then result from these attributions. According to Brewin (1985), there is little empirical support for this model; several studies have asked participants to report the single most upsetting life event and measured attributions related to the event, but the results of these studies have been conflicting and ambiguous (Gong-Guy & Hammen, 1980; Miller, Klee & Norman, 1982; Firth & Brewin, 1982; Hammen, Krantz, & Cochran, 1981).

The vulnerability model suggests that a major negative life event can interact with an overall pre-existing negative attributional style to create even more depressogenic attributions, which ultimately leads to the onset of depression (Abramson, et al., 1978). Metalsky, Abramson, Seligman, Semmel, and Peterson (1982) found that students who performed poorly on an exam made more depressogenic attributions after the exam than prior to it, while students who did not experience the

negative event experienced no change in attributions. Rothwell and Williams (1983) found similar results in a group of men who had recently lost their jobs compared to men who had not. Williams (1985) and Brewin (1985) caution that the methodology used in these studies is not entirely sound and that a closer look at the results when accounting for these methodological problems may reveal that there is no support for the vulnerability model.

Another conception is the recovery/coping model, which suggests that the onset of depression leads to depressogenic attributions for life events that preceded the onset of depression. Recovery from depression occurs when the patients cease to make depressogenic attributions. Several studies have provided support for using the presence of depressogenic attributions for predicting the remission of depressive symptoms, as suggested by the recovery model (Cutrona, 1983; Firth & Brewin, 1982; Lewisohn, Steinmetz, Larson, & Franklin, 1981; Miller & Norman, 1981; Golin, Sweeney, & Shaeffer, 1981). Though fewer in number, there are also studies in which the decline of depressogenic attributions did not predict subsequent alleviation of depressive symptoms (Peterson, Schwartz, & Seligman, 1981; Manly McMahon, Bradley, & Davidson, 1982).

Attributional Style and Culture

The notion that culture affects cognitions and behaviors is not a new one. The idea existed as long ago as 400 BC: Herodotus believed that the Greeks thought differently than the Egyptians since the Egyptian read from right to left instead of left to right, like the Greeks (Hunt & Agnoli, 1991). The hypothesis was more concretely formulated in the 20th century by Benjamin Whorf and Edward Sapir (Sapir, 1951;

Whorf, 1956). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is considered by many to have two versions, one strong and one weak (Malt, Sloman, & Gennari, 2003). The strong version insists that culture is inextricably linked to thought and that most, if not all, cognitive tasks are guided by the culture of the individual. A weaker version suggests that culture, language, and thought can be linked within the framework of some cognitive tasks, but not every cognitive task is influenced by culture or language. The ideas of Sapir and Whorf have led to the creation of an entire sub-discipline of psychology devoted to determining the effects, if any, of culture on our cognitive processes.

An early hypothesis concerning the effects of culture on attributions was made by Hsu (1953) who proposed that Americans' conceptions of the world are centered on people, and that Chinese conceptions are based on situations. These findings have been replicated in samples from India and Bali (Dumont, 1970; Geertz, 1975). This coincides with Hofstede's (1980) individualism-collectivism dimension of culture. Strongly individualistic cultures promote individuals as the main actor in life events and are concerned with meeting the goals of these individuals, while more collectivist cultures view the actions and needs of the group as most important. Hofstede (2001) measured several countries on the individualism-collectivism dimension and discovered that Americans scored as highly individualistic while those from Eastern cultures scored as more collectivist.

This difference between Western and Eastern systems of thought has been extended to attributions. Attributions are, in part, an explanation of the perceived causes of events, which can be either internal or external. These perceived loci can vary as a result of culture (Bae & Crittenden, 2001). Higgins and Bhatt (2001) found that

individuals in India (a more collectivist culture) reported significantly higher external attributions about life events than did members of a more individualistic culture. Most studies, however, have reported that internal attributions are made more often than external attributions by members of Eastern cultures (Crittenden & Bae, 1994; Mezulis, Abramson, Hyde, & Hankin, 2004). Higgins and Bhatt (2001) also found support for differences in the way that these two cultures make attributions based on their sense of control (internal versus external) over life events. These findings support a difference in attributional styles across culture and imply that the learned helplessness model may apply cross-culturally for attributions.

A clear problem in measuring attributions across cultures is that of equivalence. It is not certain that members of two different cultures will value a given life event in the same way. For example, the loss of one's job is a major negative life event for an American, regardless of where that individual lies on most dimensions, such as depression. Different cultures, however, might lead their members to conceptualize an event differently such that differences in attributions about the event are not a result of the explanatory style of the individual or the culture but are rather a result of the interpretation of the life event (Oettingen, 1995). This concern is partially allayed by using the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions technique, which allows the researcher to draw attributions from a participant's normal discourse rather than to survey them about possibly culturally-biased life events. Oettingen (1995) advocates the use of a blind Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions technique, in which the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions coders are blind to the cultural background of the participant and thus the potential influence of culture on attributions.

Though culture's effects on attribution likely extends into many different settings (Bond, 1983; Oettingen, 1995), published research has covered only a few of these settings.

Academic Performance

Studies on cross-cultural attributions for academic performance are the most abundant in the literature; Smith and Bond (1999) suggest that this is because educational settings are one of the few that are fairly comparable across many cultures. Not surprisingly, many of the studies on academic attributions across cultures have produced results that support differential effects of American and Eastern cultures (Yan & Gaier, 1994; Kashima & Triandis, 1986; Crittenden, 1991).

Political and Religious Systems

A handful of studies outside of the realm of academics have been conducted, overcoming some methodological concerns by using the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expressions method. Oettingen and Morawska (1990) found a difference in attributions for positive and negative life events between Jewish and Christian cultures and between religious-based and secular-based statements and documents within these cultures. Oettingen and Seligman (1990) compared attributions between East Germans and West Germans (prior to the fall of the Berlin wall) about events in the Olympics. Results indicated that attributions were much more negative for East Germans even when the outcome of an Olympic event favored the East Germans. Oettingen (1995) evokes the learned helplessness model in explaining these results: in cultures where there are less stable governments and economies, control over many life events is out of the hands of the individual. Additionally, as predicted by the learned helplessness model, Oettingen

and Seligman (1990) found support for higher levels of depressive symptoms in East Germans than in West Germans even when controlling for factors such as socioeconomic status.

Language

Many researchers use language as a means to study the deeper differences in thought and behavior among cultural groups. Differences in conceptions of time, number, naming, and classification have been discovered by examining the ways in which these concepts are conceptualized in a culture's language (Miller, Smith, Zhu, & Zhang, 1995; Miura, Kim, Chang, & Okamoto, 1988; Kelly, Miller, Feng, & Fang, 1999; Boroditsky, 2001). Kanouse (1972) found that people's attributions correlated with the type of verbs (manifest action verbs or subjective feeling verbs) used to describe their attributions. Languages which differ in the types of verbs used might lead their speakers to make different attributions; research by Malt et al. (2003) show evidence that speakers of Spanish and English make different attributions about the same events based on the type of verbs used in these languages. Further, Zarate, Uleman, and Voils (2001) found that English speakers had significantly faster reaction times to internally-oriented attribution words when the reaction time task was primed by internal attribution words. However, this effect was not seen for Spanish speakers. This suggests that language and culture indeed have an effect on attributional assessment. Bond (1983) found that native Chinese speakers who were proficient in English provided responses on a dogmatism scale that corresponded with Eastern thought when asked in Chinese but responded with more Westernized values when asked in English. This supports the idea that language is important in setting cultural frame with which to

evaluate the world. Attributions are a component of this world-view, and these results indicate that the languages used to describe and think about life events are important factors in understanding attributional style (Ross & DiTecco, 1975).

Attributions in Nepal

Very little research has been published about attributions in Nepal. Watkins and Regmi (1989) asked 308 undergraduate students at Tribhuvan University to complete the Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982) regarding their most recent grades. The Causal Dimension Scale asks participants to attribute the cause of the event in question to either internal or external factors. Results showed that students who had high grades and students who had low grades did not significantly differ in the number of internal or external attributions made about those grades.

Watkins and Regmi (1993) surveyed 228 graduate students at Tribhuvan University about their most recent grades and analyzed the content of their statements. Those students who performed well were more likely to attribute their success to effort, while those who scored poorly attributed their failure to illness (an internal factor) or to the poor quality of their education or a mistake by their professor. There were few attributions about ability. Past research has reported that students offering the type of attributions made by these Nepalese students (factors other than effort, which are not under the control of the student) lead to a decrease in future performance; teaching students to attribute both successes and failures to effort has been shown to stop this decrease in performance and is recommended here by Watkins and Regmi (Chapman & Lawes, 1987; Cullen, 1985; Dweck, et al., 1978 as cited by Watkins & Regmi, 1993). These results contradict the earlier findings by Watkins and Regmi (1989), but differ in

a manner consistent with the claims of Oettingen (1995) and Peterson et al (1983), who suggest that a content-analysis measure of attributional style is more appropriate than a standard measure such as the Causal Dimension Scale used by Watkins and Regmi (1989) in their earlier study.

Paul (1995) indicates that difficulties in measuring attribution in Nepal arise from the fact that some sub-cultures within Nepalese society, particularly the Sherpas, are unwilling to make attributions that would harm or reduce the esteem of others, even if it means ignoring reality in favor of a inaccuracy. According to Paul (1977, 1995), members of the Sherpa culture have an implicit agreement not to talk about others in a way that would cause social conflict, and typically make attributions that are highly external and favor others rather than themselves. Of course, these are not necessarily the true feelings of the individual, but cultural expectations require that culturally acceptable attributions be made publicly. Paul (1995) proposes that this pattern of attribution among Sherpas may be due to the fact that, historically, the actors in all social interactions remained in close physical proximity with each other for their entire lives and learned that attributions that favor social harmony lead to a better quality of life than those which favor the individual. This is essentially a reformulation of Hofstede's (1980) collectivist dimension. Another potential issue in researching attributions among Hindus in Nepal is the tendency for attributions to vary based on caste membership.

Depression Across Cultures

There is significant support in the literature for varying rates of depression across cultures (Becker & Schmaling, 1991; Aldwin & Greenberger, 1987; Tanka-

Matsumi, 2001). Parker, Gladstone, and Chee (2001), for example, examined rates of depression among Chinese individuals in China and Chinese immigrants in the US. They found that both groups had significantly lower rates of depression than is typical in Western societies. This suggests that the factors which act on depression are at least partly cultural and not environmental. Further, Parker et al (2001) found that the Chinese express their depression differently than Western individuals; depressed participants reported higher rates of denial of their depression and higher rates of somatic symptoms than their Western counterparts. Results from a World Health Organization (2004) study contradict those of Parker et al (2001): depressed individuals in Canada, Japan, Iran, and Switzerland reported experiencing the same types of symptoms of depression, such as a lack of energy, suicidal thoughts, high anxiety, and a change in appetite. There are a number of studies that have found similar consistency of symptoms across cultures (Keitner, et al, 1991; Haghighatgou & Peterson, 1995; Yamamoto, Soliman, Parsons, & Davies, 1987 as cited by Matsumoto & Juang, 2003).

Harkness (1987), Prince (1967), and Schumaker (1996) suggest that pattern of depression seen in Western cultures is most different in cultures with the least contact with Western society. This has led to a number of studies on depression in China, which has tended to resist Western capitalistic ideas. Numerous studies have supported the work of Parker et al (2001) by confirming a difference in the rates and expression of depressive symptoms in Chinese versus Western samples (for example, Marsella, Sartorius, Jablensky, & Fenton, 1985; Stewart, Betson, Lam, Chung, & Chung, 1999; Chen, 1996; Stewart, Kennard, Lee, Hughes, Mayes, Emslie, & Lewishohn, 2004). Markus and Kitayama (1994) have suggested that this is due to a difference in the

cognitive styles of indivualistic versus collectivist cultures; individuals in more collectivist societies may tend to have a lower sense of worth, efficacy, and control over their lives. Triandis (1994) has correspondingly suggested that different ways of attributing events to internal or external forces may underlie the disparity in rates of depression across cultures, consistent with the prediction of the learned helplessness model.

Depression in Nepal

Few studies have attempted to asses the rate of depression in Nepal. Simpson, Schumaker, Dorahy, and Shrestha (1996) administered the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977) to 250 Nepalese undergraduates. When compared to a similar Australian sample, the Nepalese sample did not differ in overall rate of depression, although there were significantly more depressed men than woman in Nepal but not in Australia. A measure of life satisfaction for these samples showed that Australians showed a stronger link between low life satisfaction and depressive symptoms than did the Nepalese. Simpson et al (1996) interpret this to mean that depression is independent of life satisfaction in Nepal. However, Simpson et al (1996) report that individuals in the Nepali sample who were from more rural areas had higher rates of depression than those in urban areas. These results are interesting because some researchers (Harkness, 1987; Prince, 1967; Schumaker, 1996) have suggested that cultures whose contact with Western culture is minimal might experience different rates of depressive symptoms than those who have more contact with the West. This interpretation would suggest that Nepalese people from urban areas should have a different rate of depression than those in more isolated rural areas. Simpson et al.

(1996) posit that those in rural areas report higher rates of depressive symptoms because they are seen as more primitive by their cultural peers; the stigma of the lower socioeconomic status that can accompany living in more isolated areas in Nepal may serve to increase depressive symptoms.

Despite the lack of research published on Nepal, it is expected that cultural factors mentioned above (such as language and socio-political conditions) will lead to differing attributional styles between the West and Nepal, and that these attributions will further differ in the context of depression.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Two groups of participants were recruited for this study. Questionnaire packets, containing demographic questions, The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977), the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961) and the Measure of Attributional Style (Kwon & Whisman, 1992), were distributed in the undergraduate residence halls at Tribuhvan University in Kathmandu, Nepal. Each of these surveys was originally constructed in English, and was translated into Nepali by a native speaker of Nepali. The instruments were then successfully backtranslated into English to ensure the accuracy of the translation. One hundred sixty six undergraduate students (85 male and 81 female) responded and comprise the Nepali sample. Additionally, 122 (50 male and 72 female) undergraduate students at Auburn University were recruited in psychology courses to create the American comparison group.

The mean age of participants in the Nepali sample was 24.7 years, compared to 20.6 years in the US sample. The marital status of participants in both groups was similar: 90.4% of Nepalis and 95.9% of Americans reported being single. The most obvious difference between the two groups was their religious background: a majority of the US sample considered themselves Christian (90.2%) while most Nepalis classified themselves as Hindu (90.4%).

Scores on the Beck Depression Inventory, Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, and Measure of Attributional style will be used to explore the connections between culture and attributions and between depression and attributions, and attempt to understand the relationship that both culture and depression have on attributions. To date, no data has been available about the role of both depression and culture on attribution, thus the purpose of this study is to provide initial exploratory data that might serve to give direction to future experimental research.

The Measure of Attributional Style

Like the Attributional Style Questionnaire, the Measure of Attributional Style (Kwon & Whisman, 1992) presents participants with hypothetical life events, for which the participant selects a cause from among four choices. Unlike the Attributional Style Questionnaire, the Measure of Attributional Style is entirely forced-choice and dispenses with the problem of coding and scoring participant-provided attributions. Each choice contains an attribution which is either internal or external and either global or specific (each question has one response that is internal and global, external and global, internal and specific, and external and specific). Internal attributions are ones that are marked by some placement responsibility on oneself. For example, for the scenario "You invited a bunch of people over to a party that you were having and only two people came", the two possible internal attributions are "You did not advertise the party as well as you could have," and "You are not a very good entertainer." Note that one of these internal attributions is global and could generalize to many other situations ("You are not a very good entertainer,") and one is more specific to the scenario in question ("You did not advertise the party as well as you could have"). The other two

choices are external, one specific ("Most of the people had other commitments and could not come,") and one general ("People have a tendency to be asocial,").

The responses generate a total score for each of these two dimensions, internality and generality. Kwon (1999) reports that the generality dimension is intended to capture aspects of both the global-specific dimension and the stable-unstable dimension of attributions. Additionally, after each attribution question, the participant is asked to select the likelihood that the situation described will have a major negative consequence, for example, being fired from one's job. These likelihood ratings yield a negative consequences score.

The hypothetical life events described in the Measure of Attributional Style can be divided in two ways to provide information about different types of life events. Kwon and Whisman (1992) built into the Measure of Attributional Style a subscale for differences between interpersonal situations (scenarios involving friends and social events) and achievement situations (performance and work-related scenarios). Thus attributions can be examined across these situations to see if the same pattern of attributions exists for both interpersonal and achievement scenarios.

Kwon and Whisman (1992) report a test-retest reliability for the Measure of Attributional Style generality dimension of .82 over 3 months, and an internal consistency reliability of .74 for the generality dimension. Kwon (1999) indicates that the Measure of Attributional Style is a more accurate predictor of depression and dysphoria than the Expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson & Villanova, 1988), an updated and expanded version of the Attributional Style Questionnaire.

The Measure of Attributional Style was used here primarily because its forced-choice format dispenses with any response coding and translation issues. Due to differences in culture and language between the US and Nepal, using a measure such as the Attributional Style Questionnaire or the Content Analysis of Verbatim Expression technique is not a viable option for studying attributions because of the determining equivalence in responses across the two cultures. The Measure of Attributional Style allows responses to be compared more easily because of the forced-choice format and because the measure contains life events that are equivalent between the two cultures (work related events and interpersonal situations). The only non-equivalent life scenario is question 21, which concerns dating. Because of the large cultural differences in dating habits between the US and Nepal (many marriages in Nepal are arranged and thus dating does not have the same meaning as it might in the US), this item was dropped from the survey and no data was collected.

Depression Measures

Both the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961) and Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977) were administered to both US and Nepali samples. Both of these scales have been validated in samples from non-Western cultures. Gupta and Yick (2001) tested a sample of Chinese individuals using the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale and found that the scale accurately assessed depression and that there were no translation issues inherent in the test. Their results, however, indicated that a three factor solution fit the data better than the traditional four factor solution usually derived from the measure (Radloff, 1977). Cheung and Bagley (1998) similarly reported that the

Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale was an accurate predictor of depression in a Hong Kong sample and that the aspects of depression being measured are stable across time. Samples from Europe, Mexico, and Korea have further demonstrated the validity of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale in non-American samples (Golding & Aneschensel, 1989; Noh, Avison, & Kaspar, 1992). The Beck Depression Inventory has demonstrated similar validity in other cultures. Tashakkori, Barefoot, and Mehryar (1989) used the Beck Depression Inventory in a sample of Iranian college students and found that it was a significant predictor of the presence of depressive symptoms. College students in Bahrain also provided data that demonstrate the validity and reliability of this assessment tool in Arabic (Al-Musawi, 2001). When administered to a Chinese sample, the translated version of the Beck Depression Inventory was an accurate predictor of major depressive symptoms and contained a factor structure similar to that of American respondents (Yeung, Howarth, Chan, Sonowalla, Neirenberg, & Fava, 2002; Skeck, 1990). The Beck Depression Inventory has also been validated in Spanish and Persian speaking samples (Bonicatto, Dew, & Soria, 1998; Hojat, Shapurian, & Mehrayr, 1986).

Though both the Beck Depression Inventory and Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale have been validated cross-culturally, the Beck Depression Inventory will be used primarily in data analysis because of its more widespread use in assessing and diagnosing clinical depression in the United States and because it has been validated across cultures using college student participants. Results obtained using the Beck Depression Inventory to indicate depression will then be compared to the

results obtained by using the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; results should match if the two scales are measuring the same aspects of depression in both cultures.

Results

Results from the Measure of Attributional Style yield several variables: the total number of internal, external, global, and specific attributions made by each participant. Two additional scores are created by the totals for both the Beck Depression Inventory and the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (see Tables 1 and 2 for the means of these scores in each sample). These variables were used to analyze data in three ways: comparisons of the samples using means, comparisons of the samples using regression equations, and a comparison of the responses to the Measure of Attributional style using a confirmatory factor analysis for the interpersonal and achievement subscales.

Comparisons of Group Means

Depression data alone from the two samples were compared using an independent samples t-test procedure to determine if prevalence of depression was the same across the two samples. Results indicate that means of depression scores as measured by both the Beck Depression Inventory and The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale do significantly differ between the two groups for both depression measures, $t(286) = 2.586$, $p \leq .010$ and $t(286) = 2.646$, $p \leq .009$ respectively. Using both measures, Nepali participants reported higher depression scores than US participants.

Data was next analyzed using independent sample t-tests to compare the mean scores of respondents on the internality and generality dimensions of the Measure of Attributional Style. Internality scores were significantly different between the US and Nepal samples, $t(286) = 6.227$, $p \leq .000$, as were scores for generality, $t(286) = 13.440$, $p \leq .000$. Additionally, scores for the negative consequences element were significantly different between the two samples, $t(286) = 13.557$, $p \leq .000$. Mean scores for these three dimensions of the Measure of Attributional Style (shown in Tables 1 and 2) reveal that participants in the Nepal sample made more external and specific attributions than their American counterparts and indicated that a negative consequence was more likely to result from the events described in the questionnaire than did the US participants.

Analyses were next conducted by examining responses on the Measure of Attributional Style separately for depressed and non-depressed participants within each group, using the Beck Depression Inventory criteria for diagnosis as clinically depressed (a score of 21 or over; Beck and Steer, 1993). This allows for comparisons between the depressed individuals within the Nepal group (n = 38) to depressed individuals within the US group (n = 18). The mean scores of the depressed participants within each cultural sample were significantly different on all three measures, internality $t(54) = 3.003$, $p \leq .004$, generality, $t(54) = 5.001$, $p \leq .000$, and negative consequences, $t(54) = 3.313$, $p \leq .002$. Depressed participants in Nepal made significantly more external and global attributions than depressed US participants.

The interpersonal and achievement subscales for attribution were analyzed next. For interpersonal situations, the total number of internal and external attributions was found to be significantly different across the samples, $t(286) = 3.409$, $p \leq .001$, with

Nepalis making more internal attributions than US participants. Likewise, there was a significant difference between US and Nepali participants in the number of global and specific attributions for interpersonal situations, $t(286) = 10.954$, $p \leq .000$, with Nepalis making more specific attributions. There was also a significant difference in the negative consequences dimension score for interpersonal scenarios, $t(286) = 6.330$, $p \leq .000$; again, Nepali participants indicated that a negative consequence was more likely than did US participants. When only depressed participants are considered, the internality and negative consequences dimensions are no longer significant; only generality differs between the depressed US and depressed Nepali participants for interpersonal situations, $t(54) = 2.546$, $p \leq .014$. Results for the achievement subscale showed that there were differences in the number of internal and external attributions and in the number of global and specific attributions between the US and Nepali samples regardless of depression, $t(286) = 5.690$, $p \leq .000$ and $t(286) = 11.096$, $p \leq .000$ respectively. Nepali participants were more likely to respond using an external and specific attribution. The difference between the negative consequences scores for US and Nepali participants failed to reach significance. Examining the influence of depression on the achievement subscale reveals that the internality and generality dimensions remain significantly different between the samples ($t(54) = 3.215$, $p \leq .002$ and $t(54) = 5.089$, $p \leq .000$ respectively). Depressed Nepali participants make more internal attributions than non-depressed Nepalis and both depressed and non-depressed US participants. The difference between the US and Nepal negative consequences scores for depressed participants again failed to reach significance.

Multiple Regressions

One possible problem with the above data analysis is that, despite its use in clinical settings, utilizing the Beck Depression Inventory score of 21 or higher may mask some results due to the arbitrary nature of this cutoff point. A multiple regression procedure allows the total Beck Depression Inventory score to be used in data analysis, rather than using the categories of depressed and non-depressed. Two multiple regression procedures were employed. First, attribution scores (total number of internal attributions, total number of global attributions, negative consequences score) for each sample were regressed in an effort to predict depression as measured by Beck Depression Inventory total score. For the Nepali sample, the best regression model (R^2 = .18, $F(1, 164) = 7.054$, $p \leq .001$) included the negative consequences score and the total number of internal attributions as significant predictors (for generality score, $t(65)=3.259$, $p \leq .001$, for negative consequences, $t(165)=2.037$, $p \leq .043$), but the internality score was not a significant predictor. For the US sample, all three scores were significant predictors for depression score, R^2 = .21, $F(3, 188) = 10.609$, $p \leq .000$ (for generality, $t(121) = 3.065$, $p \leq .003$, for internality, $t(121) = 2.781$, $p \leq .006$, and for negative consequences $t(121) = 2.461$, $p \leq .015$). These results indicate that there are different components to predicting depression based on attributions as assessed by the Measure of Attributional Style across the two samples.

Next, the sample served as the dependent variable in an effort to determine if attributional style and depression significantly differentiate between participants in the two samples. This regression model, consisting of the Beck Depression Inventory Score and the scores for internality, generality, and negative consequences, was significant,

R^2 = .39, F(4, 51)= 17.220, p ≤ .000. Removing depression score from the regression still generates a significant model, R^2 = .32, F(3, 52)= 16.705, p ≤ .000, but the amount of variability accounted for, as measured via the R squared, is reduced from 39% to 32%.

Each of the above regressions was next repeated using the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale score in place of the Beck Depression Inventory score. For the model predicting depression score for the Nepal sample, the model including only generality score and negative consequences score remained the best model, R^2 = .15, F(2, 163)= 9.074, p ≤ .003. Similarly, the model including all three scores remained the best model for the US sample, R^2 = .13, F(3, 118)= 9.078, p ≤ .000. The model which attempts to predict sample using depression score along with attribution scores also remained significant, R^2 = .51, F(4, 283)= 102.089, p ≤ .000. Correlating responses on the Beck Depression Inventory to responses to the Center for Epidemiological Studies yields a correlation coefficient of .656, supporting the hypothesis that levels of depression are being measured similarly in both of these measures.

Factor Analysis of Subscales

A confirmatory factor analysis was performed on responses to the Measure of Attributional Style in order to determine if the interpersonal and achievement subscales constituted separate factors in one or both samples. The factor analysis utilized the principal components extraction method and a varimax rotation. Any eigenvalue greater than one was accepted for inclusion (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). Eight separate analyses were produced: one for each dimension (internality and generality) for each

sample group, US, Nepal, US depressed, and Nepal depressed (depression was again defined as having scored 21 or higher on the Beck Depression Inventory). Eigenvalues and variances are reported in Tables 3 – 6. Each of the factor analyses resulted in two factors. An examination of the questions that load onto each of these two factors (see Tables 7 – 14) reveals that one factor corresponds to interpersonal situations and one factor corresponds to achievement situations (any factor loading of greater than .3 or less than -.3 was considered to have loaded onto a factor). Though the factor that accounts for the greater variance differs across the factor analyses run here, the same two-factor structure persists.

Discussion

The results reported above unambiguously support the hypothesis that both culture and depression affect attributions and that the effect of depression on attributions is different across cultures. The means of scores on the internality dimension, the generality dimension, and the negative consequences dimension of attributions were significantly different both across cultures and between depressed individuals within those cultures. Further, the means of the depressed participants in the Nepali sample were different from those in the depressed US sample. These findings underscore the need to consider culture in the prediction, assessment, and treatment of psychological phenomena.

Additionally, the data support the hypothesis that the construct of attribution is comprised of separate factors for achievement and interpersonal events. US and Nepali participants responded differently to the Measure of Attributional Style based on whether the question was related to interpersonal situations or to achievement situations. However, depressed individuals differed only on the generality dimension for interpersonal situations and on the negative consequences dimension for achievement situations. This suggests that some feature of attributional style which otherwise differentiates the US and Nepali samples on these dimensions is in some way mitigated in the context of depression. In other words, depressed participants responded similarly

regardless of culture, suggesting that some effects of depression on attribution can override differences in attributional styles present across cultures.

A more detailed look at the results reveals some unexpected discoveries. For example, the Nepal sample as a whole made more external attributions than the US sample. This is contrary to many other studies which report that Eastern cultures make more internal attributions (Crittenden & Bae, 1994; Mezulia, Abramson, Hyde, & Hankin, 2004), as well as observational data made on the basis of cultural expectations (Lillard & Skibbe, 2001). This may explain why the regression model which predicts the Nepalis' depression score fails to include internality as a significant predictor; there may be enough variability in the internality scores in the Nepalese sample to attain a significant *t* when compared to the US sample, but not a strong enough difference to predict depression score reliably.

What might contribute to this result? It should be noted that Nepal may not be a typical Eastern culture, especially considering current circumstances in Nepal. In an area only slightly larger than the state of Arkansas, people from more than 12 ethnic groups (each with their own dialect) live in less than ideal conditions. Nearly 50% of the population lives in poverty, making Nepal one of the poorest nations on Earth, and nearly 50% of the people are unemployed. To compound these problems, the people of Nepal are waging a civil war against Maoist guerillas who wish to destroy the constitutional monarchy form of government and replace it with a communist state. This has resulted in a multitude of terrorist attacks on the part of the Maoist insurgents, killing thousands of people over the last decade. Even the monarchy does not provide a firm source of strength for the Nepalese people. In 2001, the crown prince of Nepal

shocked the Nepalese people by murdering his father and mother (the king and queen) as well as several other members of the royal family. As a result, the current king, Gyanendra, was installed. In February of 2005, Gyanendra dissolved the government and suspended many of the freedoms formerly provided by the democratic constitution of Nepal and usurped much of the power for himself. What effect does this have on attributions and depression in Nepal? The learned helplessness model of Maier & Seligman (1976) and the model of hopelessness depression of Abramson, Metalsky, and Alloy (1989) predict that depressive symptoms result from feelings of helplessness and from negative events. It could certainly be predicted that the Nepalese might sense a lack of control over their life events given the unstable state of their country at present. This would explain the higher scores reported by the Nepalese on both the Beck Depression Inventory and the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale in this study. The empirically established links between depression and attributions would imply that the attributions of the Nepalese would be affected by these greater rates of depression.

Features of Nepali culture suggest that there should be differences in attributional style as well, namely the Nepali language. Unlike English, Nepali sentences rarely indicate personal responsibility for an event. For example, while in English we might say "I broke the glass", a Nepali speaker would say "The glass broke." Personal responsibility is often omitted from this type of statement. It is reasonable to hypothesize that this linguistic difference could affect cognitions and thus attributions, and although that specific hypothesis was not investigated in this study, it could be one of the reasons that attributions differ between the US and Nepal (Edwards

& Potter, 1993). Future research should investigate the effects of the Nepali language on attributions.

Another feature of Nepali culture that might affect attributions is the belief in fatalism, or the idea that actions and choices are unimportant because the future is predetermined. Bista (1991) reports that the value system of Nepal places no emphasis on the taking of responsibility for failures. For example, if a student fails an exam, it is typical for him to be upset with the teacher and not with himself for his failure. This is, in part, due the perception that personal effort has little to do with the outcome of an event, and thus attributions are much more likely to be external than internal for negative events. This fatalistic pattern of attributions also pervades social relations, family life, and political decisions, and it has been suggested that this approach to life events may contribute to the lack of development in Nepal (Bista, 1991). This aspect of Nepali society certainly suggests that attributional style differences would be detected between the US and Nepal, as the data in this study indicate.

As is the case with all psychological measures that are used cross-culturally, the issue of whether the test is measuring equivalent constructs in each culture is important. This issue is resolved normally by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis of responses to the measure in each culturally sample and examining the amount of overlap that exists between the components that comprise each factor for each culture. The Measure of Attributional Style, however, is designed in such a way that makes such a factor analysis meaningless: the dimensions of attributional style, internality and generality, along with the negative consequences likelihoods, are embedded in the responses to the scenarios, not in the questions themselves. Because a factor analysis is

intended to find test items that hang together and not to analyze responses to those items, using a factor analysis to test equivalence was not an option for this study.

Several non-parametric tests can serve to provide some data in place of a factor analysis. It would be expected that, if the Measure of Attributional Style is assessing some construct of attributions, response rates for each style of attribution (global or specific and internal or external) would be significantly different than chance would predict for the depressed sample. It would be expected that the depressed participants make more internal and global attributions than their non-depressed counterparts, who might perform more as chance would predict. One-sample Chi-Square tests were performed for each question in order to determine if responses on each question were significantly different from the null hypothesis that each style would receive 25% of the responses. For the US sample overall, only one question (question 45) failed to reach significance and thus responses were no different than predicted by chance (see Table 15). For the Nepali sample, only question 51 failed to reach significance (see Table 16). When depressed participants in each sample are considered, the number of questions that received responses varying significantly from chance is reduced drastically: only 15 questions attained significance for the US depressed participants and 10 questions for the Nepali depressed participants (see Tables 17 and 18). Eight of these questions overlap and failed to produce responses different than chance in either sample.

Next, chi-square tests were performed on responses to the negative consequences questions. It would be expected that, by chance, responses would be evenly distributed among the six likelihood choices if the Measure of Attributional Style were not assessing some aspect of attributions. The chi-square tests for both the

US and Nepal samples reveal that each question received a number of responses that significantly differ from chance. Chi-square results are reported in Tables 19 and 20. Responses for only three questions no longer differed significantly from chance when only depressed participants are included for analysis in the Nepal sample, and responses for three questions in the depressed US sample are also significantly different than predicted by chance (see Tables 21 and 22). These chi-square procedures reveal that, when depression is not a factor, the Measure of Attributional Style does produce responses that may be assessing some feature of attributions. When only depressed participants are considered, however, responses often do not differ from chance predictions.

In order to determine which questions received significantly different responses across the samples on the generality and internality dimensions, a binomial test was conducted. If the Measure of Attributional Style truly assessed some attributional construct, it would be expected that responses on these two dimensions for each question would be different from the expected chance outcome, that is that 50% of the responses will be internal and 50% external and that 50% will be global and 50% specific.

Results for the Nepal sample (reported in Table 23) show that, using an alpha of .05, five of 25 questions for the internality dimension fail to reach a response level significantly different than chance and eight of 25 questions fail to attain significance on the generality dimension. None of the non-significant questions overlap between the two dimensions, indicating that 12 of the 25 questions produced responses that differed significantly from chance on either the internality and generality dimensions.

Results for the US sample (Table 24) reveal that six questions for the internality dimension and two questions for the generality dimension fail to attain significantly different responses than predicted by chance. Question 51 fails to achieve significance for both the internality and generality dimensions for the US sample. Thus, 18 questions do produce significantly different responses in this sample on both dimensions. Three of the items, questions 13, 29, and 47, fail to attain significance in either sample for the internality dimension and both question 47 and 51 fail to attain significantly different responses than chance for the generality dimension. The same pattern of significance holds for the generality and internality dimension for depressed participants as was true for chi-square tests for depressed participants: including only those with Deck Depression Inventory scores over 21 for analysis results in a drastic drop in the number of questions which produce responses that differ significantly from chance.

For the cultural samples as a whole, results for these binomial tests are acceptable. It would be natural that several of the questions fail to discriminate between different styles of attribution or between different negative consequence probabilities within each sample. However, when depressed participants alone are considered, the number of significant questions drops to just a few. The opposite of this result is what should be expected: non-depressed participants might respond more as chance would predict, but depressed participants should produce responses that are significantly different than chance if they are indeed making more depressogenic attributions. Clearly, these questions cannot be considered to be meaningful for the purposes of interpretation because they fail to capture responses at anything other than a random probability. There are several possible explanations for this result. Both the US and

Nepal samples as a whole do produce responses that are different than chance on nearly all of the questions, but this significant difference disappears when non-depressed participants are removed from analysis. This suggests that depressed individuals in both samples may have a more disorganized pattern of attributions that is not found in the non-depressed sample. This result, however, would be contradictory to previous findings that propose that depressed individuals often have a stable attributional style. Another possible reason for this result is that the Measure of Attributional Style is not a well-constructed test for the purpose of determining the interacting effects of culture and depression on attributions. The Measure of Attributional Style has received very limited attention in the literature to date, so it is difficult to determine if the results obtained here using this measure are typical of other studies. It is also possible that the Measure of Attributional Style is capturing some aspect of attributions that was not accounted for by this study. Given that the measure does produce the predicted patterns of attributional difference between the US and Nepal, there must be some validity to the measure. There does seem to be specificity for depression in the measure given that there are wide differences in the number of questions that produce responses significantly different than chance between the depressed and non-depressed samples. The Measure of Attributional Style, while having very high face validity, has not established construct validity, which should be considered when interpreting results.

A possible concern is that the measure is forced-choice, unlike most measures of attribution. While this forced choice format was necessary for this study because of translation difficulties, open-ended questions may be more appropriate for attributional assessments. Lillard and Skibbe (2001) reported that participants in their study were far

more likely to endorse internal attributions when given an open-ended question than when offered choices. They suggest that people may be inclined to posit an internal explanation for behavior unless presented with a possible external attribution that they would not have developed spontaneously.

Another potential difficulty of interpreting results from the Measure of Attributional Style is that each of the items in the measure is a negative event, for example, having an argument with a friend or being fired from a job. Tripp, Catano, and Sullivan (1997) provide data that suggest that attributions for positive and negative events may be different, especially in the context of depression. Tripp et al. (1997) propose that attributions for positive and negative events actually constitute two separate factors of attributional style. If this were the case, the Measure of Attributional Style is measuring only one of these two proposed constructs.

On the other hand, it should be noted that results strongly supported the hypothesis that interpersonal and achievement situations comprise two factors of attributional style. This finding indicates that the Measure of Attributional Style is useful for differentiating between these two types of life situations. More in-depth data are clearly needed before information gathered using the Measure of Attributional Style is easily interpretable.

According to the World Health Organization (2004), depression will grow by 2020 to become the second leading cause of reduced productivity in the world. This highlights the need for diagnosis and treatment mechanisms that take cultural variations into account. Though difference in the incidence of depression and the patterns of attributions that were made across cultures were different in this study, the reasons for

these differences remain indefinable for the moment. Because of the socio-political climate of Nepal, it is reasonable to expect that different cognitive styles would emerge in comparison to Western inhabitants, but the methodology of the current study is not intended to tease out these influential cultural factors. Future research should use better attributional assessment tools to investigate the features of the culture that have effects on attributions or on cognition in general.

References

Aldwin, C., & Greenberger, E. (1987). Cultural differences in predictors of depression. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15,* 789-813.

Al-Musawi, N. M. (2001). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory with university students in Bahrain. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 77,* 568-579.

Abramson, L.Y., Metalsky, G.I., & Alloy, L.B. (1989). Hopelessness depression: A theory-based subtype of depression. *Psychological Review, 96,* 358-372.

Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M.E.P., & Teasdale, J.D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 87,* 49-74.

Asarnow, J. R., & Bates, S. (1988). Depression in child psychiatric inpatients: Cognitive and attributional patterns. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 6,* 601-615.

Bae, H., & Crittenden, K.S. (2001). From attribution to dispositional inferences: Patterns of Korean students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 129*, 481-489.

Beck, A.T. & Steer, R.A. (1993). *Beck Depression Inventory manual*. San Antonio, Texas: Harcourt Brace.

Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychology, 4,* 561-571.

Becker, J., & Schmaling, K. (1991). **Interpersonal aspects of depression from psychodynamic and attachment perspectives.** In J. Becker & A. Kleinman (Eds.), *Psychosocial aspects of depression.* (pp. 131-168). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bista, D.B. (1991). *Fatalism and development: Nepal's struggle for modernization.* London: Sangam Books.

Bond, M. H. (1983). Linking person perception dimensions to behavioral intention dimensions: The Chinese connection. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14,* 41-63.

Bonicatto, S. Dew, A. M., Soria, J. J., (1998). Analysis of the psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the Beck Depression Inventory in Argentina. *Psychiatric Research, 79*, 277-285.

Boroditsky, L. (2001). Does language shape thought? English and Mandarin speakers' conceptions of time. *Cognitive Psychology, 43,* 1-22.

Brewin, C.R. (1985). Depression and causal attributions: What is their relation? *Psychological Bulletin, 98,* 297-309.

Brewin, C. R. & Harris, J. (1985). Induced mood and causal attributions: Further evidence. *Cognitive Therapy & Research, 2,* 225-229.

Brown, G., & Harris, T. (1978). *Social origins of depression: A study of psychiatric disorder in women*. New York: Free Press.

Chapman, J.W. & Lawes, M.M. (1987). Open-ended attributions for outcome on a major national examination. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 57,* 205-211.

Cheung, C., & Bagley, C. (1998). Validating an American scale in Hong Kong: The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D). *Journal of Psychology, 132,* 169-186.

Cochran, S.D., & Hammen, C.L. (1985). Perceptions of stressful life events and depression: a test of attributional models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 1562-1571.

Crittenden, K.S. (1991). Asian self-effacement or feminine modesty? Attributional patterns of women in university students in Taiwan. *Gender and Society, 5,* 98-117.

Cullen, J.L. (1985). **Children's ability to cope with failure: Implications of a metacognitive approach for the classroom.** In D.L. Forrest-Pressley, G.L. MacKinninm & T.G. Walker (Eds.). *Metacognition, cognition, and human performance*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Cutrona, C. E., Russell, D., & Jones, R. D. (1984). Cross-situational consistency in attributions: Does attributional style exist? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1043-1058.

Cutrona, C. E. (1983). Causal attributions and perinatal depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 92*, 161-172.

Dweck, C.S., Davidson, W., Nelson, S., & Enna, B. (1978). Sex differences in learned helplessness: (II) The contingencies of evaluative feedback in the classroom and (III) An experimental analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 14,* 268-276.

Dumont, L. (1970). *Homo hierarchus*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eaves, G., & Rush, A.J. (1984). Cognitive patterns in symptomatic and remitted unipolar major depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93,* 31-40.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1993). Language and causation: A discursive action model of description and attribution. *Psychological Review, 100*, 23-41.

Eisner, J.P. (1992). Interpersonal trust in close relationships: The construct of its role in friendship formation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Eisner, J.P. (1995). **The origins of explanatory style: Trust as a determinant of optimism and pessimism.** In G. Buchanan & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), *Explanatory style*. (pp. 49-56). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Epstein, S. (1980). The stability of behavior: Implications for psychological research. *American Psychologist, 89,* 678-682.

Fennell, M.J., & Campbell, E.A. (1984). The Cognitions Questionnaire: Specific thinking errors in depression. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23,* 81-92.

Firth, J., & Brewin, C.R. (1982). Attributions and recovery from depression: a preliminary study using cross-lagged correlation analysis. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 21,* 229-230.

Geertz, C. (1975). *The Integration of cultures*. London: Hutchinson Publishers.

Golding, J. M., & Aneshensel, C. S. (1989). Factor structure of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale among Mexican-Americans and non-Hispanic whites. *Psychological Assessment, 1,* 163-168.

Golin, S., Sweeney, P. D., & Shaeffer, D. E. (1981). The causality of causal attributions in depression: A cross-lagged panel correlational analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90,* 14-22.

Gong-Guy, E., & Hammen, C. (1980). Causal perceptions of stressful events in depressed and nondepressed outpatients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 89*, 662-669

Lillard, A., & Skibbe, L. (2001). **Theory of mind: Conscious attribution and spontaneous trait inferences.** In R. Hassin, J. Uleman, & J. Bargh (Eds.), *The new unconscious*. (pp. 277-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, E.W., & Abramson, L.Y. (1983). Cognitive patterns and major depression disorder: A longitudinal study in a hospital setting. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 92,* 173-184.

Hammen, C., Krantz, S., & Cochran, S. D. (1981). Relationships between depression and causal attributions about stressful events. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 5,* 351-358.

Harkness, S. (1987). The cultural mediation of postpartum depression. *Anthropological Quarterly, 1,* 194-209.

Higgins, N.C., & Bhatt, G. (2001). Culture moderates the self-serving bias: Etic and emic features of causal attributions in India and Canada. *Social Behavior and Personality, 29,* 49-62.

Haghighatgou, H., & Peterson, C. (1995). Coping and depressive symptoms among Iranian students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 175-180.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hojat, M., Shapurian, R., Mehrya, A.H., (1986). Psychometric properties of a Persian version of the short form of the Beck Depression Inventory for Iranian college students, *Psychological Reports, 59,* 331-338.

Hsu, F. (1953). *Americans and Chinese: Passages to differences.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Hunt, E., & Agnoli, F. (1991). The Worfian hypothesis: A cognitive psychology perspective. *Psychological Review, 98,* 377-389.

Johnson, J.G., & Miller, S.M. (1990). Attributional, life event, and affective predictors of onset of depression, anxiety, and negative attributional style. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *14,* 417–430.

Kaslow, N. J., Tanenbaum, R. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1978). The KASTEN: A children's Attributional Style Questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript. University of Pennsylvania.

Kelley, H.H. (1973). The process of causal attribution. *American Psychologist, 82,* 107-128.

Kelly, M., Miller, K., Fang, G., & Feng, G. (1999). When days are numbered: Calendar structure and the development of calendar processing in English and Chinese. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 73,* 289-314.

Kent, R. & Martinko, M. (1995). **The development and evaluation of a scale to measure organizational attributional style.** In Martinko, M. (Ed.), *Attribution Theory: An Organizational Perspective* (pp. 53–75). Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press.

Kashima, Y., & Triandis, H.C. (1986). The self-serving bias in attributions as a coping strategy: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17*, 83-97.

Kovacs, M., & Beck, A.T. (1977) **An empirical-clinical approach toward a definition of childhood depression.** In J.G. Schulerbrandt & A. Askin (Eds.), *Depression in childhood: Diagnosis, treatment, and conceptual issues* (pp. 1-27). New York: Raven.

Kwon, P. (1999). Attributional style and psychodynamic defense mechanisms: Toward an integrative model of depression. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 645-658.

Kwon, P., & Whisman, M.A. (1992, November). *A longitudinal study of the hopelessness theory of depression: New measures for assessing depressogenic attributional style*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Behavior Therapy, Boston, MA.

Lewisohn, P.M., Steinmetz, J.L., Larson, D.W., & Franklin, J. (1981). Depression-related cognitions: Antecedent or consequence? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90,* 213-219.

Maier, S.F., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1976). Learned helplessness: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 105*, 3-46.

Malt, B.C., Sloman, S.A., & Gennari, S. (2003). **Speaking vs. thinking about objects and actions**. In D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (Eds.) *Language in mind: Advances in the study of language and thought* (pp. 81-111). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Manly, P.C., McMahon, R.J., Bradley, C.F., & Davidson, P.O. (1982). Depressive attributional style and depression following childbirth. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *91,* 245-254.

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 568-579.

Marsella, A.J., Sartorius, N., Jablensky, A., & Fenton, F. (1985). **Cross-cultural studies of depressive disorders: An overview**. In A. Kleinmann & B. Good (Eds.). *Culture and depression* (pp.299-324). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L.P. (2003). *Culture and psychology.* New York: Wadsworth.

Metalsky, G.I., Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M.E.P., Semmel, A., & Peterson, C. (1982). Attributional styles and life events in the classroom: Vulnerability and invulnerability to depressive mood reactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 612-617.

Mezulis, A. H., Abramson, L.Y., Hyde, J.S., and Hankin, B.L. (2004). Is there a universal positivity bias in attributions? A meta-analytic review of individual,

developmental, and cultural differences in the self-serving attributional bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*, 711-747.

Miller, I. W., Klee, S. H., & Norman, W.H. (1982). Depressed and nondepressed inpatients' cognitions of hypothetical events, experimental tasks, and stressful life events. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91*, 78-81.

Miller, I.W., & Norman, W.H. (1981). Effects of attributions for success on the evaluation of learned helplessness and depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90,* 113-124

Miller, K. F., Smith, C. M., Zhu, J., & Zhang, H. (1995). Pre-school origins of cross-national differences in mathematical competence: The role of number-naming systems. *Psychological Science, 1,* 56 - 60.

Miura, I.T., Kim, C.C., Chang, C-M., & Okamoto, Y. (1988). Effects of language characteristics on children's cognitive representation of number: Cross-national comparisons. *Child Development, 59*, 1445–1450.

Needles, D. J., & Abramson, L. Y. (1990). *Response to depressed mood: Cognitive and affective effects of rumination and distraction.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.

Noh, S., Avison, W. R., & Kaspar, V. (1992). Depressive symptoms among Korean immigrants: Assessment of a translation of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale. *Psychological Assesment, 4*, 84-91.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Girgus, J. S., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1986). Learned helplessness in children: A longitudinal study of depression, explanatory style and academic achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 435-442.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Girgus, J. S., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). Sex differences in depression and explanatory style in children. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 20*, 233–245.

O'Hara, M. W., Neunaber, D. J., & Zekoski, E. M. (1984). A prospective study of postpartum depression: Prevalence, course, and predictive factors. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93*, 158-171.

O'Hara, M. W., Rehm, L. P., & Campbell, S. B. (1982). Predicting depressive symptomatology: Cognitive-behavioral models and postpartum depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91*, 457-461.

Oettingen, G. (1995). **Explanatory style in the context of culture.** In G. Buchanan & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), *Explanatory style*. (pp. 209-224). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Oettingen, G., & Morawska, E.T. (1990). *Explanatory style in religious vs. secular domains in Russian Judaism vs. Orthodox Christianity.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania.

Oettingen, G., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1990). Pessimism and behavioural signs of depression in East versus West Berlin. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 207-220.

Parker, G., Gladstone, G., & Chee, K.T. (2001). Depression in the planet's largest ethnic group: The Chinese. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 158,* 857-864.

Paul, R.A. (1977). The place of truth in Sherpa law and religion. *Journal of Anthropological Research, 33*, 179-194.

Paul, R.A. (1995). **Act and intention in Sherpa culture and society.** In L. Rosen (Ed.) *Other intentions.* (pp 15-46). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Persons, J.B., & Rao, P.A. (1985). Longitudinal study of cognitions, life events, and depression in psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94,* 51-63.

Peterson, C., & Barrett, L. (1987). Explanatory style and academic performance among university freshman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 603–607.

Peterson, C., Bettes, B. A., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1985). Depressive symptoms and unprompted Causal attribution: Content analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 23*, 379-382.

Peterson, C., Buchanan, G., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1995). **Explanatory style: History and evolution of the field**. In G. Buchanan & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), *Explanatory style*. (pp. 1-20). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Peterson, C., Luborsky, L. & Seligman, M. E. P. (1983). Attributions and depressive mood shifts. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 92,* 96-103.

Peterson, C., & Raps, C.S. (1983). Depression, attributions, and attributional style. Unpublished manuscript, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Peterson, C., Schwartz, S.M., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1981). Self-blame and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2,* 253-259.

Peterson, C., Semmel, A., von Baeyer, C., Abramson, L.T., Metalsky, G.I., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1982). The Attributional Style Questionnaire. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6,* 287-300.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1984). Causal explanations as a risk factor for depression: Theory and evidence. *Psychological Review, 91*, 347-374.

Peterson, C., & Villanova, P. (1988). An expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97*, 87-89.

Pett, M., Lackey, N., & Sullivan, J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Prince, R. (1967). The changing picture of depressive symptoms in Africa: Is it fact or diagnostic fashion? *Canadian Journal of African Studies, 1,* 177-192.

Radloff, L.S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1,* 385-401.

Raps, C.S., Peterson, C., Reinhard, K.E., Abramson, L.Y., & Seligman, M.E..P. (1982). Attributional style among depressed patients. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91*, 102-108.

Riskind, J. H., Castellon, C. S., & Beck, A. T. (1989). Spontaneous causal explanations in unipolar depression and generalized anxiety: Content analysis of dysfunctional thought diaries. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 13,* 97-108.

Robins, C.J. (1988). Attributions and depression: Why is the literature so inconsistent? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 880-889.

Robins, C.J., & Block, P. (1989). Cognitive theories of depression viewed from a diathesis-stress perspective: Evaluations of the models of Beck and of Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 13,* 297-313.

Robins, C.J., & Hayes, A.M. (1995). **The role of causal attributions in the prediction of depression**. In G. Buchanan & M.E.P. Seligman (Eds.), *Explanatory style*. (pp. 57-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Robins, C., & Hinkley, K. (1989). Social-cognitive processing and depressive symptoms in children: A comparison of measures. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 17,* 29-36.

Ross, M. & DiTecco, D. (1975). An attributional analysis of moral judgments. *Journal of Social Issues*, *31*, 91-109.

Rothwell, N., & Williams, J.M.G. (1983). Attributional style and life events. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 22,* 139-140.

Russell, D. (1982). The Causal Dimension Scale: A measure of how individuals perceive causes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42,* 1137-1145.

Sapir, E. (1951). *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir* (D.G. Mandelbaum, Ed.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schulman, P., Castellon, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1989). Assessing explanatory style: The Content Analysis of Verbatim Explanations and the Attributional Style Questionnaire. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 27,* 505-512.

Schulman, P., Keith, D., & Seligman M.E.P. (1991). Is optimism heritable: A study of twins. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 31,* 569-574.

Schumaker, J.F. (1996). **Psychopathology and psychotherapy: Lessons from the developing world.** In S.C. Carr & J.F. Schumaker (Eds.). *Psychology and the developing world*. (pp 180-190). New York: Praeger.

Seligman, M.E.P., Peterson, C., Kaslow, N.J., Tanenbaum, R.L., Alloy, L.B., & Abramson, L.Y. (1984). Attributional style and depressive symptoms among children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93,* 235-238.

Simpson, P.L., Schumaker, J.F., Dorahy, M.J., & Shrestha, S.N. (1996). Depression and life satisfaction in Nepal and Austrailia. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136,* 783-790.

Skeck, D.T. (1990). Reliability and factorial structure of the Chinese version of the Beck Depression Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 46,* 34-43.

Smith, P.B., & Bond, M.H. (1999). Social psychology across cultures. New York: Prentice Hall.

Stewart, S.M., Betson, C., Lam, T.H., Chung, S.F., Ho H.H., & Chung T.F.C. (1999). The correlates of depressed mood in adolescents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 25,* 27-34.

Stewart, S.M., Kennard, B.D., Lee, P.W.H., Hughes, C.W., Mayes, T.L., Emslie, G.J., & Lewisohn, P.M. (2004). A cross-cultural investigation of cognitions and depressive symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 113,* 248-257.

Tanka-Matsumi, J. (2001). **Abnormal psychology and culture.** In D. Matsumoto (Ed.) *The handbook of culture and psychology.* (pp. 265-286). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tashakkori, A., Barefoot, J., & Mehryar, A. H. (1989). What does the Beck Depression Inventory measure in college students? Evidence from a non-western culture. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 45,* 595-602.

Triandis, H. (1994). **Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism.** In U. Kim, H. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, applications*. (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tripp, D.A., Catano, V., & Sullivan, M.J.L. (1997). The contributions of attributional style, expectencies, depression, and self-esteem in a cognition-based model. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 29,* 101-111.

Watkins, D., & Regmi, M. (1993). Attributing academic success and failire in Nepal. *Journal of Social Psychology, 134,* 241-242.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* (J. B. Carroll, Ed.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Williams, J.M.G. (1985). Attributional formulation of depression as a diathesis-stress model: Metalsky et al. reconsidered. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 1572-1575.

World Health Organization (2004). *Promoting mental health: Summary report.* Geneva: World Health Organization.

Xenikou, A., Furnham, A., & McCarrey, M. (1997). Attributional style for negative events: A proposition for a more reliable and valid Measure of Attributional Style. *British Journal of Psychology, 88,* 53–69.

Yamamoto, K., Soliman, A., Parsons, J., & Davies, O. L. (1987). Voices in unison: Stressful events in the lives of children in six countries. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 28,* 855-864.

Yan, W., & Gaier, E. (1994). Causal attributions for college success and failure: An American Asian comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 25*, 146-158.

Yeung, A., Howarth, S., Chan, R., Sonowalla, S., Neirenberg, A., & Fava, M. (2002). Use of the Chinese version of the Beck Depression Inventory for screening depression in primary care. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 2,* 94-99.

Zarate, M. A., Uleman, J. S., & Voils, C. (2001). Effects of culture and processing goals on the activtion and binding of trait concepts. *Social Cognition, 19*, 295-323.

Zautra, A. J., Guenther, R. T., & Chartier, G. M. (1985). Attributions for real and hypothetical events. Their relations to self-esteem and depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 94*, 530-540.

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for US and Nepal Samples

Nepal Sample (N = 166)

Variable	M	SD
Beck Depression Inventory Score	14.626	9.217
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale Score	41.544	8.031
Total Number of Internal Attributions	11.133	2.673
Total Number of External Attributions	13.837	2.677
Total Number of Global Attributions	11.548	3.451
Total Number of Specific Attributions	13.422	3.447
Negative Consequences Score	65.759	5.809

US Sample (N = 122)

Variable	M	SD
Beck Depression Inventory Score	11.664	10.107
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale Score	39.277	5.844
Total Number of Internal Attributions	13.205	2.965
Total Number of External Attributions	11.754	2.972
Total Number of Global Attributions	6.000	3.476
Total Number of Specific Attributions	18.959	3.505
Negative Consequences Score	50.025	13.312

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Depressed Participants in US and Nepal Samples

Nepal Sample (n = 38)

Variable	M	SD
Beck Depression Inventory Score	28.447	5.811
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale Score	47.118	8.997
Total Number of Internal Attributions	11.500	2.836
Total Number of External Attributions	13.500	2.836
Total Number of Global Attributions	12.974	3.158
Total Number of Specific Attributions	12.026	3.158
Negative Consequences Score	64.763	6.069

US Sample (n = 18)

Variable	M	SD
Beck Depression Inventory Score	30.186	10.380
Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale Score	45.667	8.636
Total Number of Internal Attributions	14.167	3.618
Total Number of External Attributions	10.833	3.618
Total Number of Global Attributions	8.000	3.896
Total Number of Specific Attributions	17.000	3.896
Negative Consequences Score	58.722	6.986

TABLE 3

Eigenvalues and Variances for Internality Dimension

Nepal Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	11.808	17.231	17.231
2	11.770	17.078	34.309

US Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	12.356	19.425	19.425
2	12.012	18.049	37.475

TABLE 4

Eigenvalues and Variances for Generality Dimension

Nepal Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	12.546	40.183	40.183
2	11.881	27.524	67.708

US Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.068	42.272	42.272
2	11.839	27.358	69.629

TABLE 5

Eigenvalues and Variances for Depressed Participants on Internality Dimension

Nepal Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.251	43.005	43.005
2	12.501	30.004	73.009

US Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14.364	37.455	37.455
2	13.620	24.480	51.935

TABLE 6

Eigenvalues and Variances for Depressed Participants on Generality Dimension

Nepal Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14.838	41.353	41.353
2	11.509	30.038	71.391

US Sample

Component	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.963	39.853	39.853
2	10.630	24.519	64.372

TABLE 7

Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension in Nepal Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	0.009	-0.428
3	0.106	0.367
5	-0.334	-0.398
7	-0.278	0.368
9	0.469	-0.191
11	-0.017	0.344
13	-0.609	0.222
15	-0.284	-0.408
17	0.205	-0.363
19	0.375	0.113
23	0.305	-0.131
25	0.584	0.278
27	-0.409	0.221
29	-0.257	-0.377
31	0.011	0.413
33	-0.476	-0.049
35	0.461	-0.184
37	0.039	-0.608
39	0.075	0.393
41	0.361	-0.277
43	0.404	0.239
45	-0.037	0.381
47	0.287	0.509
49	-0.103	0.368
51	0.267	0.135

TABLE 8

Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension for US Participants

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	-0.051	0.384
3	-0.001	-0.493
5	0.325	-0.133
7	0.196	0.351
9	0.519	0.216
11	0.156	-0.508
13	0.518	-0.100
15	-0.365	0.494
17	0.152	-0.579
19	0.493	-0.212
23	0.572	-0.057
25	0.585	0.132
27	-0.501	-0.280
29	0.213	0.436
31	0.132	0.502
33	0.526	0.287
35	0.324	-0.087
37	0.257	-0.351
39	0.142	0.436
41	0.524	0.219
43	0.325	0.034
45	0.267	-0.466
47	0.413	-0.259
49	0.013	-0.404
51	0.349	0.042

TABLE 9

Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for Nepal Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	0.384	-0.250
3	0.591	-0.238
5	-0.047	0.467
7	0.323	-0.398
9	0.206	0.400
11	0.583	-0.229
13	0.471	-0.407
15	0.485	0.092
17	0.201	-0.011
19	0.021	-0.385
23	0.156	0.424
25	0.187	-0.623
27	0.154	-0.241
29	0.340	0.136
31	0.349	0.073
33	0.226	0.585
35	0.299	-0.543
37	0.461	0.388
39	0.305	-0.283
41	0.077	0.391
43	0.070	0.654
45	0.514	0.163
47	0.228	0.327
49	0.490	0.232
51	0.160	0.394

TABLE 10

Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for US Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	0.257	-0.349
3	0.321	-0.419
5	0.565	0.143
7	0.198	0.428
9	0.105	0.119
11	0.225	0.475
13	0.574	0.226
15	0.211	-0.529
17	0.076	-0.610
19	0.369	-0.073
23	0.454	0.371
25	0.679	-0.032
27	0.329	0.148
29	0.425	-0.409
31	0.214	0.348
33	0.562	0.008
35	0.363	0.036
37	0.186	-0.536
39	0.310	-0.460
41	0.424	-0.080
43	0.488	-0.259
45	0.295	-0.407
47	0.351	0.459
49	0.068	0.429
51	0.485	0.174

TABLE 11

Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	0.539	-0.209
3	-0.041	0.084
5	0.248	-0.684
7	-0.363	-0.283
9	0.349	0.005
11	-0.508	0.073
13	0.213	0.603
15	0.522	0.041
17	0.588	0.265
19	-0.297	0.394
23	0.255	0.603
25	-0.274	0.348
27	-0.101	-0.483
29	0.537	-0.300
31	0.515	0.131
33	-0.062	-0.342
35	0.196	0.525
37	0.481	-0.204
39	-0.355	0.271
41	0.242	0.402
43	-0.113	0.494
45	0.578	-0.223
47	-0.147	-0.015
49	-0.602	0.158
51	-0.115	0.550

TABLE 12

Rotated Component Matrix for Internality Dimension
for Depressed Participants in US Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	0.575	-0.238
3	0.709	-0.292
5	0.155	0.123
7	-0.381	0.311
9	0.076	-0.689
11	-0.456	0.057
13	-0.035	0.791
15	-0.865	-0.069
17	0.491	0.160
19	0.545	0.382
23	0.535	0.348
25	0.173	0.442
27	0.183	-0.419
29	-0.573	0.169
31	0.844	0.063
33	0.171	0.378
35	-0.318	-0.309
37	-0.617	0.016
39	-0.310	0.145
41	-0.065	0.598
43	0.004	0.588
45	0.394	0.031
47	0.262	0.417
49	-0.425	0.031
51	0.034	0.331

TABLE 13

Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	-0.077	0.339
3	-0.142	-0.525
5	0.525	-0.113
7	-0.349	0.527
9	0.195	-0.477
11	0.217	0.509
13	-0.044	0.236
15	0.149	0.631
17	0.206	-0.046
19	-0.483	0.185
23	-0.376	-0.286
25	0.455	-0.129
27	-0.535	-0.059
29	0.036	0.602
31	0.260	-0.509
33	0.357	-0.029
35	0.616	0.128
37	0.470	0.504
39	0.213	0.408
41	0.301	-0.119
43	0.369	0.089
45	0.176	0.304
47	0.189	-0.014
49	0.093	-0.584
51	0.536	-0.168

TABLE 14

Rotated Component Matrix for Generality Dimension
for Depressed Participants in US Sample

	Component	
Question	1	2
1	-0.006	-0.801
3	0.226	0.673
5	0.470	0.232
7	0.673	-0.333
9	-0.692	0.030
11	-0.085	0.256
13	0.468	-0.273
15	0.232	0.462
17	-0.094	0.086
19	0.567	-0.227
23	-0.327	0.213
25	-0.444	-0.051
27	-0.905	-0.046
29	0.140	-0.595
31	-0.198	-0.608
33	0.006	-0.014
35	0.407	0.007
37	-0.174	0.313
39	-0.071	-0.499
41	0.658	-0.041
43	-0.493	0.048
45	-0.139	0.001
47	0.416	0.137
49	-0.052	0.584
51	0.335	0.078

TABLE 15

Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions for US Sample

Question	p	χ^2	p
1	3	41.181**	0.000
3	3	120.503**	0.000
5	3	40.024**	0.000
7	3	29.545**	0.000
9	3	31.349**	0.000
11	3	76.265**	0.000
13	3	37.614**	0.000
15	3	74.530**	0.000
17	3	31.928**	0.000
19	3	73.855**	0.000
23	3	21.885**	0.000
25	3	88.747**	0.000
27	3	128.795**	0.000
29	3	93.229**	0.000
31	3	79.494**	0.000
33	3	62.000**	0.000
35	3	46.530**	0.000
37	3	127.048**	0.000
39	3	26.006**	0.000
41	3	9.855**	0.020
43	3	36.892**	0.000
45	3	5.325	0.149
47	3	88.892**	0.000
49	3	36.699**	0.000
51	3	27.590**	0.000

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 16

Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Nepal Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
1	3	160.426**	0.000
3	3	25.082**	0.000
5	3	88.223**	0.000
7	4	98.902**	0.000
9	3	97.410**	0.000
11	3	43.902**	0.000
13	3	56.164**	0.000
15	3	143.115**	0.000
17	3	109.148**	0.000
19	3	91.049**	0.000
23	3	70.918**	0.000
25	3	160.033**	0.000
27	3	100.033**	0.000
29	3	25.738**	0.000
31	3	66.918**	0.000
33	4	102.344**	0.000
35	3	64.426**	0.000
37	3	117.541**	0.000
39	4	154.721**	0.000
41	3	22.721**	0.000
43	3	71.902**	0.000
45	4	113.000**	0.000
47	3	67.705**	0.000
49	3	115.836**	0.000
51	3	2.262**	0.520

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 17

Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions
for Depressed Participants in US Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
1	3	12.667**	0.005
3	3	0.667	0.881
5	2	1.333	0.513
7	2	0.333	0.846
9	2	6.333*	0.042
11	3	1.111	0.774
13	2	1.333	0.513
15	3	17.111**	0.001
17	3	6.000	0.112
19	3	22.000**	0.000
23	1	0.222	0.637
25	3	13.556**	0.004
27	2	6.333*	0.042
29	3	2.000	0.572
31	3	10.000*	0.019
33	3	2.444	0.485
35	2	7.000*	0.030
37	2	4.333	0.115
39	3	4.667	0.198
41	3	2.889	0.409
43	3	4.667	0.198
45	2	1.000	0.607
47	2	6.333*	0.042
49	3	9.111*	0.028
51	3	2.000	0.572

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 18

Chi-Square Tests for Measure of Attributional Style Questions
for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
1	3	7.263	0.064
3	3	12.737**	0.005
5	3	9.368*	0.025
7	3	6.842	0.077
9	3	11.474**	0.009
11	3	7.684	0.053
13	3	4.316	0.229
15	3	11.053**	0.010
17	3	3.474	0.324
19	3	19.053**	0.000
23	3	6.211	0.102
25	3	12.105**	0.007
27	3	9.579*	0.023
29	3	18.211**	0.000
31	3	8.105*	0.044
33	3	22.421**	0.000
35	3	6.842	0.077
37	3	33.368**	0.000
39	3	4.737	0.192
41	3	0.105	0.991
43	3	14.842**	0.002
45	3	6.000	0.112
47	3	15.263**	0.002
49	3	11.053*	0.011
51	3	7.263	0.064

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 19

Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for US Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
2	5	111.803**	0.000
4	5	25.443**	0.000
6	5	65.869**	0.000
8	5	38.131**	0.000
10	5	24.459**	0.000
12	5	11.967**	0.035
14	5	52.689**	0.000
16	5	15.115**	0.010
18	5	36.361**	0.000
20	5	40.098**	0.000
24	5	55.344**	0.000
26	5	85.628**	0.000
28	5	25.443**	0.000
30	5	61.628**	0.000
32	5	16.306**	0.006
34	5	44.623**	0.000
36	5	64.197**	0.000
38	5	67.836**	0.000
40	5	49.344**	0.000
42	5	72.438**	0.000
44	5	58.098**	0.000
46	5	32.918**	0.000
48	5	61.049**	0.000
50	5	80.525**	0.000
52	5	40.098**	0.000

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 20

Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Nepal Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
2	5	113.108**	0.000
4	5	36.627**	0.000
6	5	88.313**	0.000
8	5	46.891**	0.000
10	5	42.554**	0.000
12	5	26.018**	0.000
14	5	59.614**	0.000
16	5	26.723**	0.000
18	5	33.446**	0.000
20	5	55.133**	0.000
24	5	51.084**	0.000
26	5	65.542**	0.000
28	5	33.373**	0.000
30	5	61.422**	0.000
32	5	17.831**	0.003
34	5	33.800**	0.000
36	5	74.578**	0.000
38	5	45.446**	0.000
40	5	49.855**	0.000
42	5	61.855**	0.000
44	5	84.265**	0.000
46	5	15.012**	0.010
48	5	65.831**	0.000
50	5	20.072**	0.001
52	5	71.400**	0.000

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 21

Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Depressed Participants in US Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
2	5	7.333	0.062
4	5	5.889	0.208
6	5	6.444	0.092
8	5	10.667	0.058
10	5	2.000	0.572
12	5	0.889	0.926
14	5	4.222	0.238
16	5	8.667	0.123
18	5	4.667	0.198
20	5	0.222	0.974
24	5	2.000	0.572
26	5	9.111*	0.028
28	5	15.889**	0.003
30	5	4.471	0.346
32	5	6.000	0.112
34	5	3.778	0.286
36	5	6.444	0.168
38	5	4.667	0.198
40	5	6.444	0.168
42	5	4.778	0.311
44	5	7.556	0.109
46	5	0.222	0.974
48	5	2.889	0.409
50	5	11.444*	0.022
52	5	7.778	0.051

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 22

Chi-Square Tests for Negative Consequences Dimension of the Measure of Attributional Style Questions for Depressed Participants in Nepal Sample

Question	df	χ^2	p
2	5	17.526**	0.002
4	5	10.947	0.052
6	5	4.316	0.229
8	5	18.842**	0.002
10	5	15.421**	0.004
12	5	12.135*	0.033
14	5	12.000*	0.017
16	5	16.000**	0.007
18	5	23.895**	0.000
20	5	15.684**	0.003
24	5	26.105**	0.000
26	5	20.421**	0.001
28	5	22.000**	0.001
30	5	9.368*	0.025
32	5	32.105**	0.000
34	5	12.526*	0.028
36	5	19.368**	0.001
38	5	9.105	0.059
40	5	14.105**	0.007
42	5	22.526**	0.000
44	5	18.053**	0.001
46	5	5.947	0.203
48	5	10.158*	0.038
50	5	20.105**	0.001
52	5	29.324**	0.000

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$

TABLE 23

Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample on Internality Dimension

Question	p	Category with Higher Frequency
1	0.103	Internal
3	0.000**	External
5	0.393	Internal
7	0.001**	Internal
9	0.000**	Internal
11	0.000**	External
13	0.187	External
15	0.000**	External
17	0.001**	External
19	0.393	External
23	0.641	Internal
25	0.000**	Internal
27	0.000**	Internal
29	0.074	External
31	0.000**	Internal
33	0.000**	Internal
35	0.485	External
37	0.000**	External
39	0.000**	External
41	0.698	External
43	0.024*	External
45	0.103	Internal
47	0.024*	External
49	0.052	External
51	0.000**	External

*p≤.05
**p≤.01

TABLE 24

Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for US Sample on Internality Dimension

Question	p	Category with Higher Frequency
1	0.000**	External
3	0.174	External
5	0.000**	External
7	0.000**	Internal
9	0.000**	Internal
11	0.123	External
13	0.174	Internal
15	0.000**	External
17	0.000**	Internal
19	0.000**	External
23	0.001**	External
25	0.000**	External
27	0.000**	Internal
29	1.000	Internal
31	0.001**	External
33	0.000**	External
35	0.000**	Internal
37	0.000**	Internal
39	0.000**	Internal
41	0.037*	External
43	0.000**	External
45	0.000**	External
47	0.786	External
49	0.000**	External
51	0.786	Internal

*p≤.05
**p≤.01

TABLE 25

Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample
On Generality Dimension

Question	p	Category with Higher Frequency
1	0.074	Specific
3	0.000**	Global
5	0.000**	Global
7	0.000**	Global
9	0.187	Global
11	0.000**	Global
13	0.393	Global
15	0.000**	Global
17	1.000	Global
19	0.000**	Specific
23	0.000**	Global
25	0.000**	Specific
27	0.000**	Specific
29	0.816	Global
31	0.000**	Specific
33	0.036*	Specific
35	0.024*	Global
37	0.276	Global
39	0.043*	Global
41	0.074	Specific
43	0.000**	Global
45	0.140	Global
47	0.140	Global
49	0.000**	Global
51	0.103	Global

*p≤.05
**p≤.01

TABLE 26

Binomial Tests for Measure of Attributional Style for Nepal Sample On Generality Dimension

Question	p	Category with Higher Frequency
1	0.000**	Specific
3	0.000**	Global
5	0.000**	Specific
7	0.000**	Specific
9	0.000**	Specific
11	0.000**	Specific
13	0.000**	Specific
15	0.000**	Specific
17	0.000**	Specific
19	0.000**	Global
23	0.000**	Specific
25	0.000**	Global
27	0.000**	Specific
29	0.000**	Specific
31	0.000**	Specific
33	0.000**	Global
35	0.023*	Specific
37	0.000**	Global
39	0.000**	Global
41	0.008**	Specific
43	0.000**	Global
45	0.006**	Specific
47	0.319	Global
49	0.000**	Specific
51	0.239	Specific

*p≤.05
**p≤.01

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Measure of Attributional Style

Directions: Listed below are a number of different possible life situations. For each situation, imagine as vividly as you can that the situation has just occurred in your life. First, you will be asked to choose the most likely cause of the situation. Choose the most likely response, and do not mark more than one response for any question. Second, you will be asked to judge the likelihood of a possible consequence of the event.

You have recently noticed that you and your best friend are beginning to drift apart.

1. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You tend to get wary when you get close to somebody.
    b) It is common for friendships to fade with time.
    c) You have been busy lately and you have had less time for your social life.
    d) Your friend has been in a bad mood lately, which has led to some minor arguments.

2. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to a breakup of your friendship?

    a) Extremely likely
    b) Very likely
    c) Somewhat likely
    d) Somewhat unlikely
    e) Very unlikely
    f) Extremely unlikely

You have had an increasing number of arguments with your friend lately.

3. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) People tend to demand unreasonable things from others close to them.
    b) You have had a difficult time at work lately, causing you to be tense.
    c) Your friend had a bad week and has been unusually argumentative.
    d) You have difficulty maintaining close relationships.

4. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to a breakup of your friendship?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You recently had an argument with your employer at work.

5. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) Your employer was difficult to get along with that day because he/she was in a bad mood.
b) You had an exceptionally bad day and lost your temper when your employer gave you some mild criticism.
c) You have always resisted taking orders from people.
d) People in power tend to get arrogant and disrespectful.

6. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to serious problems at work?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

Lately, you have not been feeling that you have as many friends as you would like to have.

7. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) You tend to be somewhat timid around other people.
b) Other people tend to be very wary in forming friendships.
c) Lately, you have had less time to socialize with others.
d) The people that you have been meeting lately have not been very interesting.

8. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your feeling as if you have nobody to talk to?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You were recently fired from your job.

9. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

   a) The work involved in your job was not stimulating.
   b) You have difficulty fulfilling your potential.
   c) You made a rare error at your job at an unfortunate time.
   d) Employers tend to make unreasonable requests from their employees.

10. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to overwhelming problems for your career?

    a) Extremely likely
    b) Very likely
    c) Somewhat likely
    d) Somewhat unlikely
    e) Very unlikely
    f) Extremely unlikely

A few days ago, your friends went out to see a movie without calling you.

11. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You have difficulty maintaining close contact with your friends.
    b) Your friends mistakenly assumed that you were busy that day.
    c) You have been out of the house quite often lately and have been hard to reach.
    d) People can be very insensitive.

12. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your becoming more distrustful of your friends from now on?

    a) Extremely unlikely
    b) Very unlikely
    c) Somewhat unlikely
    d) Somewhat likely
    e) Very likely
    f) Extremely likely

You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for several weeks.

13. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) Employers are very distrustful of job applicants.
    b) You do not have much to offer as a job applicant.
    c) You have not yet looked hard enough for a job because you have been busy lately.
    d) Business has been unusually slow in your town the past few weeks.

14. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to a major setback in your search for employment?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

Recently, an acquaintance passed by you on the street without saying hello.

15. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) You were in a hurry, and did not look like you wanted to be bothered.
b) You tend to make other people uncomfortable.
c) The person who passed you was daydreaming and did not see you until you passed by.
d) Other people rarely go out of their way to be pleasant.

16. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your acting more distant from this person?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You recently called an old friend who did not seem too excited to hear from you.

17. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) Your friend happened to be very busy when you called.
b) You have a tendency to think that you are friends with someone, when you really are not.
c) Most people have no sense of loyalty.
d) You had unusual difficulty thinking of things to say to your friend.

18. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to a permanent disruption of your friendship?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

You have recently been unable to complete all the work expected of you.

19. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You have not been in a very productive mood lately.
    b) People often heap too much responsibility on others.
    c) You tend to buckle when given too much responsibility.
    d) You have been unfairly given more work than you can possibly handle.

20. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to a major nuisance in your life?

    a) Extremely unlikely
    b) Very unlikely
    c) Somewhat unlikely
    d) Somewhat likely
    e) Very likely
    f) Extremely likely

You went out on a date and it went badly.

21. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You have had unusual difficulty in attracting dates lately and it affected your confidence.
    b) Your date was a boring person.
    c) It is difficult to understand how any two people could enjoy a first date.
    d) You have always felt uncomfortable on dates.

22. What is the likelihood that this situation will have a devastating impact on your social life?

    a) Extremely likely
    b) Very likely
    c) Somewhat likely
    d) Somewhat unlikely
    e) Very unlikely
    f) Extremely unlikely

You recently received a negative review from your employer.

23. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You usually have difficulty fulfilling people's expectations.
    b) Your employer had an incorrect negative impression of your work habits.
    c) You have had an unusual slump in productivity at work.
    d) Employers tend to be too impersonal and expect too much from their employees.

24. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems at work?

    a) Extremely unlikely
    b) Very unlikely
    c) Somewhat unlikely
    d) Somewhat likely
    e) Very likely
    f) Extremely likely

You recently forgot an important appointment at work.

25. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You tend to forget things easily.
    b) You were busy at the time and neglected to check your calendar.
    c) Workplaces tend to be so cluttered that appointments are missed all the time.
    d) One of your coworkers forgot to remind you of your appointment.

26. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems and embarrassment at work?

    a) Extremely likely
    b) Very likely
    c) Somewhat likely
    d) Somewhat unlikely
    e) Very unlikely
    f) Extremely unlikely

A few days ago, you were late to work.

27. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) You had an unusually difficult time waking up that morning.
    b) You were caught in an unexpected traffic jam that morning.
    c) With employers demanding 8-hour workdays, there is never enough time to get adequate sleep.
    d) You have difficulty fulfilling your responsibilities quite often.

28. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to irreversible problems at work?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

A friend has been overly critical of you lately.

29. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) You have been busy lately and have not had a chance to be as pleasant as you usually are.
b) People have a hard time accepting others as they are.
c) You tend to procrastinate in doing things until people around you complain about it.
d) Your friend has been in a bad mood lately.

30. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to significant problems in your relationship with your friend?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

You recently went to a party and had a terrible time.

31. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) Parties are a waste of time.
b) You were not in the mood to go to a party, but felt obligated to go.
c) The party that you went to was boring.
d) You have a hard time loosening up in social situations.

32. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems in your social life?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You have been working overtime at work and nobody has noticed.

33. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) The reason you need to stay overtime is that you always procrastinate at work.
    b) Everyone has been unusually busy at work and have not had much time to notice you.
    c) People are selfish and do not pay attention to the accomplishments of others.
    d) You have been unusually quiet at work lately.

34. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your becoming frustrated and upset at work?

    a) Extremely likely
    b) Very likely
    c) Somewhat likely
    d) Somewhat unlikely
    e) Very unlikely
    f) Extremely unlikely

Going to work has become a nuisance lately.

35. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

    a) Your interest in your job has temporarily decreased because you have been under some stress lately.
    b) You tend to become bored with things too easily.
    c) Most people eventually begin resenting their job.
    d) Your employer has recently been overdemanding.

36. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems at work?

    a) Extremely unlikely
    b) Very unlikely
    c) Somewhat unlikely
    d) Somewhat likely
    e) Very likely
    f) Extremely likely

Your friend has not been a very good listener for you lately.

37. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) Most people, deep inside, are selfish.
b) Your friend has been stressed out lately.
c) You tend to overburden others with your problems.
d) You have been in an unusually irritable mood lately.

38. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems in your relationship?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

You recently got into a shouting match with a friend over something unimportant.

39. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) It is difficult for people to get along.
b) You tend to lose your temper easily.
c) Your friend was being unusually stubborn that day.
d) You were having a bad day and your friend irritated you at the wrong moment.

40. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to some problems between you and your friend?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You were recently denied a raise.

41. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) Although you usually get a raise, your work has not been very outstanding lately.
b) You never work hard enough to deserve a raise.
c) Employers tend to be overly stingy.
d) Your employer incorrectly evaluated your recent work.

42. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead you to leave your job?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

You have become dissatisfied with your position at work.

43. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) The past week, several of your superiors have been unusually overdemanding.
b) People in power tend to put down all their subordinates.
c) You have had recent frustrations at work that will pass.
d) You would have a better position if you had worked harder throughout your career.

44. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems at work?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

The other day, you accidentally bumped into someone at the supermarket and that person said something rude to you.

45. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) The other person was having a bad day.
b) People have little regard for other people's feelings.
c) You should pay more attention to what you are doing.
d) You were surprised and forgot to apologize.

46. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your feelings being severely hurt?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

You recently had trouble understanding orders from your employer.

47. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) People have a tendency to not explain things in adequate detail.
b) Your employer was chewing gum while talking to you.
c) You were busy with something else and did not hear everything your employer said.
d) You rarely pay enough attention to what people say.

48. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to major problems at work?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

You invited a bunch of people over to a party that you were having and only two people came.

49. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) You did not advertise the party as well as you could have.
b) People have a tendency to be asocial.
c) Most of the people had other commitments and could not come.
d) You are not a very good entertainer.

50. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your feelings being quite hurt from this?

a) Extremely likely
b) Very likely
c) Somewhat likely
d) Somewhat unlikely
e) Very unlikely
f) Extremely unlikely

Your employer recently seemed impatient with the speed of your work.

51. Which of the following is the MOST likely cause of this situation?

a) You have been unusually tired lately.
b) Your employer has been under a lot of pressure lately.
c) You tend to work more slowly than others.
d) People often expect things from others that even they themselves cannot do.

52. What is the likelihood that this situation will lead to your dismissal from work?

a) Extremely unlikely
b) Very unlikely
c) Somewhat unlikely
d) Somewhat likely
e) Very likely
f) Extremely likely

APPENDIX B

Nepali Translation of the Measure of Attributional Style

खण्ड च
कारक तत्व र तिनीहरुको परिणाम सम्बन्धी प्रश्नावली

हाम्रो जीवनमा विभिन्न घटनाहरु परिरहेका हुन्छन्। हामी प्राय यी घटना हुनका लागि कुन तत्व जिम्मेवार थियो भनेर केलाउंछौं र यो घटनाले के असर ल्याउला भनेर अनुमान पनि गर्छौं। तल जीवनमा परिआउने खालका विभिन्न स्थितिहरु दिइएको छ। एकछिनको लागि हरेक घटना तपाईंको आफ्नै जीवनमा परिआएको जस्तो ठान्नुहोस्। हरेक स्थितिको लागि दुईवटा प्रश्न छन्: पहिलो प्रश्नमा त्यो स्थिति आउनसक्ने सम्भावित कारणहरु छन् भने दोश्रो प्रश्नमा त्यस स्थितिबाट उत्पन्न हुने संभावित परिणामको बारेमा लेखिएको छ। तपाईंलाई उपयुक्त हुने कुनै एक कारण र कुनै एक परिणाम मात्र छनौट गरी घेरा लगाउनुहोस्।

यो उदाहरण हेर्नुहोस् :

स्थिति: हालैका दिनहरुमा तपाईंको साथीले तपाईंको कुरामा ध्यान दिएर सुन्छ।

यसो हुनमा तल दिइएका कारणहरु मध्ये कुन हुन सक्छ? तपाईंलाई सबभन्दा उपयुक्त लागेको कारणलाई घेरा लगाउनुहोस्।

क. धेरैजसो मान्छेहरु अन्तरआत्मादेखि असल हुन्छन्।
ख. हालैका दिनहरुमा तपाईंको साथीले तपाईंसंग बिताउन बढी समय पाएको छ।
ग. तपाईं अरुलाई आफ्नो समस्या थुपार्नुहुन्न, त्यसैले पनि होला।
घ. हालैका दिनहरुमा तपाईं आफु पनि राम्रो मनस्थितिमा हुनुहुन्छ।

अब यस घटनाले तपाईंको साथी र तपाईंको बीचमा सम्बन्ध अझ बलियो बनाउन कत्तिको सहयोग गर्ला ? तपाईंलाई उपयुक्त लागेको एउटा उत्तरमा घेरा लगाउनुहोस्।

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईंले हालै महसुस गर्नुभएको छ कि तपाईं र तपाईंको घनिष्ट साथी टाढा टाढा हुंदै जानुभएको छ।

१. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?
क. तपाईं जब कसैको नजिक हुनुहुन्छ तपाईं अलि शंकालु खालको हुनुहुन्छ।
ख. समय अनुसार मित्रता घट्दै जानु स्वभाविकै हो।
ग. आजभोलि तपाईं व्यस्त हुनुभएकोछ त्यसैले सामाजिक भेटघाट आदिमा थोरै मात्र समय दिन सक्नुहुन्छ।
घ आजभोलि तपाईंको साथीको मनस्थिति बिग्रेको छ जसले गर्दा सानोतिनो वादविवाद हुनेगरेको छ।

२. तपाईंलाई यसले आफ्नो मित्रता टुट्छ जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?
क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईं हालैका दिनहरुमा आफ्नो साथीसंग बढी विवाद गर्न लाग्नुभएको छ।

३. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?
क. मान्छेहरु आफ्नो नजिकको मान्छेसंग अनावश्यक कुराको आशा गर्दछन्।
ख. तपाईंको जागीरमा अलि नराम्रो भइराखेको छ र त्यसले तपाईंलाई तनाव भएको छ।
ग. तपाईंको साथीको यो हप्ता राम्रो छैन जसले गर्दा साथी संधैभन्दा बढी झगडालु भएको छ।
घ. तपाईंलाई नजिकको मित्रता निभाउन गाह्रो हुन्छ।

४. तपाईंलाई यसले आफ्नो मित्रता टुट्छ जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?
क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईले भरखरै आफ्नो जागीरमा हाकीम वा मालिकसंग विवाद गर्नुभयो ।

५. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. त्यो दिन तपाईको हाकीमको मनस्थिति ठीक थिएन त्यसैले त्यो दिन हाकीमले कुरा बुझेर काम गरेन ।

ख. त्यो तपाईको साह्रै नराम्रो दिन थियो जसले गर्दा हाकीमले हल्का आलोचना गर्दा पनि तपाईले आफुलाई नियन्त्रण गर्न सक्नुभएन ।

ग. तपाई सधैं अरुको ठाडो आदेशमा काम गर्ने कुराको विरोध गर्नुहुन्छ ।

घ. मान्छेहरु पदमा पुगेपछि अलि ठाडो मिजास र अरुलाई अनादर गर्ने हुन्छन् ।

६. तपाईलाई यसबाट तपाईको काम या जागीरमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालसालै तपाईलाई लाग्छ कि तपाईले आफुले बनाउन चाहे जति साथी बनाउन सक्नुभएको छैन ।

७. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ ?

क. तपाई अरु मान्छेहरुको वीचमा अलि लज्जालु वा धकमान्ने हुनुहुन्छ ।

ख. अरु मान्छेहरु साथीहरुसंग मित्रता गर्ने कुरामा साह्रै शंकालु हुन्छन् ।

ग. आजभोलि तपाईलाई अरुसंग बस्ने खेल्ने फुर्सद छैन ।

घ. तपाईले आजभोलि भेट्ने गरेका मान्छेहरु त्यति रमाइला छैनन् ।

८. तपाईलाई यो स्थितिले कुरागर्ने साथीहरु कोही छैनन् भनी सोच्ने स्थितिमा पुर्‍याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाई भरखरै जागीरबाट निकालिनुभयो ।

९. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईको जागीरको काम तपाईको क्षमता बढाउने खालको थिएन ।

ख. तपाईलाई आफ्नो क्षमता देखाउने गरी काम गर्न गाह्रो हुन्छ ।

ग. तपाईको दुर्भाग्य तपाईले अचम्मसंग एउटा गल्ती गर्नुभयो ।

घ. हाकीम/मालिकहरु आफ्ना कर्मचारीसंग अस्वाभाविक कामहरु गराउन खोज्दछन् ।

१०. तपाईलाई यसले आफ्नो पेशागत भविष्यमा (Career) ठुलो समस्या ल्याउंछ जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: केही हप्ता अघि तपाईका साथीहरु तपाईलाई नबोलाइकन फिल्म हेर्न गए ।

११. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईलाई साथीहरुसंग घनिष्ठ सम्पर्क बनाइ राख्न गाह्रो भएको छ ।

ख. तपाईको साथीहरुले सोचेकि तपाई त्यो दिनमा व्यस्त हुनुहुन्थ्यो ।

ग. तपाई आजभोलि बढी घरबाट बाहिर हुनुहुन्छ त्यसैले तपाईलाई भेटाउन गाह्रो छ ।

घ. मान्छेहरु अरुप्रति असंवेदनशील हुन्छन् ।

१२. तपाईलाई यसबाट अबदेखि साथीहरुप्रति अविश्वास गर्ने स्थिति पैदा होला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाई गएका धेरै हप्ता देखि जागिर खोज्दै हुनुहुन्छ तर भेट्नुभएको छैन ।

१३. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. जागीर दिनेहरु उम्मेदवारहरु प्रति साह्रै अविश्वास गर्ने भएका छन् ।
ख. उम्मेदवारको हिसाबले तपाईंसंग खासै धेरै क्षमता छैनन् ।
ग. तपाईं आजभोलि अरु काममा व्यस्त हुनुभएको छ र काम खोज्नमा खासै मेहनत गर्नुभएको छैन ।
घ. गएको केही समयदेखि तपाईंको ठाउंमा काम कारवाहीहरु कम भएका छन् ।

१४. तपाईंलाई यसबाट अब जागीर खोज्नेकाम बन्द गर्नुपर्छ होला भन्ने स्थिति आउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालसालै तपाईंको एकजना चिनजानको मान्छे बाटोमा भेट्दा पनि तपाईंसंग नबोलीकन गयो ।

१५. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईंको साथीलाई तपाईं हतारमा भएकोले तपाईंलाई नरोकौं जस्तो लाग्यो होला ।
ख. तपाईंले अरु मान्छेहरुलाई अलि अप्ठेरो पार्ने गनुहुन्छ ।
ग. त्यो मान्छे आफ्नै धुनमा हिंडीरहेको थियो र तपाई नकट्ने बेलासम्म उसले तपाईंलाई देखेन ।
घ. मान्छेहरु मिजासिलो हुने सामान्य शिष्टाचार पूरा गर्ने प्रयास पनि गर्दैनन् ।

१६. तपाईंलाई यसबाट अब त्यो मान्छेसंग म पनि झन् टाढाको व्यवहार गर्छु जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईंले भरखरै आफ्नो पुरानो साथीलाई फोन गर्नुभयो तर उसले त्यति चासो राखेन ।

१७. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईंले फोन गरेको बेला साथी साह्रै व्यस्त थियो ।
ख. तपाईं कसैसंग नजिकको मित्रता छ भन्ने सोच्नुहुन्छ तर वास्तवमा तपाईं हुनुहुन्न ।
ग. प्राय: मान्छेहरुमा अटूट मित्रताको माने नै थाहा छैन ।
घ. तपाईंलाई साथीसंग के कुरा गर्ने भन्ने सोच्नै गाह्रो भयो ।

१८. तपाईंलाई यसबाट त्यो साथीसंग फेरी सम्पर्क गर्न र साथी बनाउन जरुरी छैन जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईंले भरखरै आफ्नाबाट आशा गरिए जति काम गर्न सक्नुभएको छैन ।

१९. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं आजभोलि खासै उत्पादक वा मेहनती मनस्थितिमा हुनुहुन्न ।
ख. मान्छेहरु आफ्नो जिम्मेवारी अरुमा थुपर्याउन चाहन्छन् ।
ग. तपाईंलाई धेरै जिम्मेवारी दिइएपछि हात खुट्टामा नेल-हतकडी लगाए जस्तो हुन्छ ।
घ. तपाईंलाई तपाईंले गर्नसक्ने भन्दा बढी नै कामहरु दिइएको छ ।

२०. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईंको जीवनमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

(प्रश्न संख्या २१ र २२ यस प्रश्नावलीबाट हटाइएको छ ।)

स्थिति: तपाईले भरखरै आफ्नो हाकीमबाट नराम्रो कार्य सम्पादन मुल्यांकन वा नराम्रो प्रतिकृया पाउनुभयो ।

२३. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईंलाई अरु मान्छेले आशा गरेको कुरा पुर्‍याउन सधैं गाह्रो हुन्छ ।
ख. तपाईको हाकीमलाई तपाईको काम गराई प्रति नकारात्मक खालको छाप परेको छ ।
ग. तपाईको काममा पहिले कहिल्यै नभएको उत्पादनहीनता आएको छ ।
घ. हाकीमहरु साह्रै गैह्रमानवीय हुन्छन् र आफ्ना कर्मचारीसंग अलि बढी आशा गर्छन् ।

२४. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईको काम या जागीरमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईंले भरखरै आफ्नो जागीरमा महत्वपुर्ण बैठक वा भेटघाट विर्सनुभयो ।

२५. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं सजिलैसंग भुल्ने गर्नुहुन्छ ।
ख. तपाईं त्यतिखेर व्यस्त हुनुहुन्थ्यो त्यसैले आफ्नो कार्यतालिका हेर्न वास्ता गर्नुभएन ।
ग. काम गर्ने ठाउंहरु यति छरपस्ट हुन्छन् कि यस्ता वैठकका सुचनाहरु प्रायः हराउंछन् ।
घ. तपाईंको सहकर्मी साथीले तपाईंलाई सम्झाउन विर्स्यो ।

२६. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईको काम ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला वा हतोत्साहित तुल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईं केही हप्ता अघि काममा साह्रै ढिलो आउनुभयो ।

२७. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. त्यो दिन तपाईंलाई विहान उठ्न अस्वभाविक रुपले गाह्रो भयो ।
ख. त्यो दिन विहान तपाईं नसोचेको ट्राफिक जाममा पर्नुभयो ।
ग. सधैं ८ घण्टाको ड्युटी गर्दा कहिल्यै पनि प्रशस्त सुत्न पाइदैन ।
घ. तपाईंलाई आफ्नो जिम्मेवारी पुरा गर्न प्रायः गाह्रो हुन्छ ।

२८. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईको काम/जागीरमा मिलाउनै नसक्ने गरी समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालसालै तपाईंको एउटा साथी तपाईंको खोइरो खन्ने वा आलोचना गर्ने काम मात्र गर्छ ।

२९. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं आजभोलि व्यस्त हुनुभएको छ र सधैंजस्तो मिजासिलो हुन सक्नुभएको छैन ।
ख. मान्छेहरु अरु जे जस्ता छन् त्यसैलाई नै स्वीकार गर्न सक्दैनन् ।
ग. तपाईको बानी नै आफ्नो वरिपरिका साथीहरुले शिकायत नगरेसम्म कुनै काम थन्क्याउने गर्नुहुन्छ ।
घ. आजभोलि तपाईंको मनस्थिति (मुड) विग्रेको छ ।

३०. तपाईंलाई यसबाट त्यो साथीसंगको तपाईंको सम्बन्धमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थितिः तपाईं भरखरै एउटा पार्टीमा जानुभयो र त्यहां साह्रै दिक्क लाग्यो र पार्टीको मज्जा नै आएन ।

३१. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. पार्टीहरु समयको बरबादी मात्र हुन् ।
ख. तपाईंलाई पार्टीमा जाने मन थिएन तर जानै पर्ने भएकोले मात्र जानुभयो ।
ग. तपाईं गएको पार्टी नै साह्रै दिक्क लाग्दो थियो ।
घ. तपाईं यस्तो सामाजिक भेटघाटमा घुलमील हुन सक्नुहुन्न ।

३२. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईंको सामाजिक जीवनमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थितिः तपाईं अफिसमा ओभर टाइम काम गर्दै हुनुहुन्छ तर तपाईंले काम गरेको देख्ने कोही छैन ।

३३. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं अरुबेला सधैं काम थन्क्याउनुहुन्छ त्यसैले ओभरटाइम गर्नुपर्छ ।
ख. सबैजना काममा व्यस्त छन् त्यसैले तपाईंले काम गरेको हेर्ने कोही छैन ।
ग. मान्छेहरु स्वार्थी हुन्छन् र अरुले गरेको कामलाई देख्दैनन् ।
घ. आजभोलि तपाईं साह्रै चुपचापसंग काम गर्नुहुन्छ ।

३४. तपाईंलाई यसबाट आफु काममा दिक्क हुने स्थिति ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थितिः आजभोली काममा जान पनि दिक्क लाग्छ वा समस्या नै हुन लागेको छ ।

३५. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं आजभोलि अलि तनावमा हुनुहुन्छ त्यसैले क्षणिक रुपमा तपाईंलाई काममा चासो घटेको छ ।
ख. तपाईं सजिलै कुनै कुराहरुबाट दिक्क हुने खालको हुनुहुन्छ ।
ग. मान्छेहरु आखिर आफ्नो काममा वाक्क हुदै जान्छन् ।
घ. तपाईंको हाकीम वा मालिक यतिखेर तपाईंसंग अलि बढी नै काम खोज्न थालेको छ ।

३६. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईंको काम या जागीरमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थितिः आजभोली तपाईंको साथी तपाईंको कुरा सुन्दै सुन्दैन वा वास्ता गर्दैन ।

३७. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. सबैजसो मान्छेहरु भित्र कतै स्वार्थी हुन्छन् ।
ख. तपाईंको साथी आजभोलि अलि तनावमा छ ।
ग. तपाईं अरुलाई आफ्नो समस्याको भार बोकाउन खोज्नुहुन्छ ।
घ. आजभोलि तपाईं अस्वाभाविक रुपमा चिडचिडे स्वभावको हुनु भएको छ ।

३८. तपाईंलाई यसबाट साथीसंगको तपाईंको सम्बन्धमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालैका दिनमा सानो कुरामा तपाई र तपाईंको साथीबीच चर्काचर्की भयो ।

३९. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. मान्छेहरु लामो समय सम्म राम्रो भइराख्नु गाह्रो हुन्छ ।
ख. तपाईंको दिमाग छिटो तात्छ ।
ग. तपाईंको साथी त्यो दिन अस्वाभाविक रुपमा तपाईंको कुरै नसुन्ने भएको थियो ।
घ. तपाईंको दिन ठीक थिएन र तपाईंको साथीले कुबेलामा तपाईंलाई चिढ्यायो ।

४०. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईं र साथीको बीचमा कुनै समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालसालै तपाईंले पाउनुपर्ने प्रमोशन वा ग्रेड पाउनुभएन ।

४१. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईंले सधैं ग्रेड पाइ आए पनि तपाईंको काम सोचेजस्तो राम्रो भएको छैन ।
ख. तपाईंले वास्तवमा ग्रेड वा प्रमोशन पाउने गरी कडा मेहनत साथ काम गर्नुभएकै छैन ।
ग. मालिकहरु वा हाकिमहरु अलि बढी नै किंकटे वा कन्जुस हुन्छन् ।
घ. तपाईंको हाकिमले तपाईंको हालसालको कामलाई गलत ढंगले मुल्यांकन गर्‌यो ।

४२. तपाईंलाई यसबाट अब यो जागीरमा छोडीदिन्छु जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाई आफ्नो काम र पद प्रति असन्तुष्ट हुनुभएको छ ।

४३. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. गएको साता तपाईं माथीका सबै हाकिमहरु अस्वाभाविक रुपमा काम बढी खोज्ने भएका छन् ।
ख. ठुलो पदमा भएका मान्छेहरु तल्ला तहका कर्मचारीलाई हेप्छन् ।
ग. तपाईंलाई यतिखेर काममा वाक्क लाग्ने गर्छ, तर यस्तो भावना छिटै हराउंछ ।
घ. तपाईंले अहिलेसम्म अलि मेहनत साथ काम गरेको भए यो भन्दा राम्रो पद पाउनुहुन्थ्यो ।

४४. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईको काम या जागीरमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हिजो तपाईं सुपरमार्केटमा एकजनासंग झ्क्किएर ठोकिंदा त्यो मान्छेले तपाईंलाई साह्रै नराम्रो गरी भन्यो ।

४५. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. त्यो दिन त्यो मान्छेको मुड ठीक थिएन ।
ख. मान्छेलाई अरुको भावनाको अलिकति पनि कदर छैन ।
ग. तपाईंले आफु जे गर्दै हुनुहुन्थ्यो त्यसमा अलि ध्यान दिएर गर्नुपर्थ्यो ।
घ. तपाई झस्कनु भयो र क्षमा माग्न बिर्सनुभयो ।

४६. तपाईंलाई यसबाट आफ्नो मनमा साह्रै घोचेजस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईलाई हालसालै आफ्नो हाकीम वा मालिकको आदेश बुझ्न समस्या पर्‍यो ।

४७. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. मान्छेहरुको कुनै कुरालाई विस्तृत रुपमा व्याख्या नगर्ने स्वभाव हुन्छ ।
ख. तपाईंको हाकिम तपाईंसंग कुरा गर्दा चुइंगम चपाउँदै थियो ।
ग. तपाईं कुनै कुरामा व्यस्त हुनुहुन्थ्यो र हाकिमले भनेको कुरा सबै सुन्नुभएन ।
घ. अरु मान्छेले भनेको कुरालाई तपाईं प्रायः पूरा ध्यान दिएर सुन्नुहुन्न ।

४८. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईंको काम या जागीरमा ठुलो समस्या ल्याउला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: तपाईंले आफ्नो एउटा पार्टीमा थुप्रै मान्छे बोलाउनुभयो तर आउने बेलामा दुईजना मात्र आए ।

४९. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईंले आफ्नो पार्टीको जति प्रचार गर्नुपर्थ्यो त्यति गर्नुभएन ।
ख. मान्छेहरु अलि असामाजिक हुने गर्छन् ।
ग. धेरैजसो मान्छेको अरु नै काम भएकोले आउन सकेनन् ।
घ. तपाईं मान्छेहरुलाई पार्टीमा बोलाएर मनोरन्जन गराउने कुरामा त्यति पोख्त हुनुहुन्न ।

५०. तपाईंलाई यसबाट आफुलाई मनमा साह्रै चोट परेको जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

स्थिति: हालसालै तपाईंको हाकीम तपाईंको काम गरेको गति देखेर भित्रभित्रै मुर्मुरिएको छ ।

५१. यस्तो स्थिति आउनुको मुख्य कारण तपाईंलाई के जस्तो लाग्छ?

क. तपाईं आजभोलि अस्वाभाविक रुपले थाक्नुभएको वा गल्नुभएको छ ।
ख. तपाईंको हाकिम आजभोलि थुप्रै कामको बोझमा छ ।
ग. तपाईंको कामको गति अरुको भन्दा सुस्त छ ।
घ. मान्छेहरु आफुले पनि गर्न नसक्ने कामलाई अरु कसैले गरोस् भन्ने आशा गर्छन् ।

५२. तपाईंलाई यसबाट तपाईंको जागीर जाला जस्तो कत्तिको लाग्छ ?

क. निस्चित जस्तै लाग्छ
ख. एकदम धेरै सम्भावना छ
ग. सम्भव छ
घ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन होला
ङ. त्यस्तो हुँदैन
च. त्यस्तो हुनै सक्दैन

-o-