View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by University of Richmond

University of Richmond
UR Scholarship Repository

Master's Theses | Student Research

1977

Correlating locus of control with the motive to avoid success

Gary W. Embrey

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses

Recommended Citation
Embrey, Gary W., "Correlating locus of control with the motive to avoid success" (1977). *Master's Theses.* Paper 408.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

CORRELATING LOCUS OF CONTROL WITH

THE MOTIVE TO AVOID SUCCESS

BY

Gary W. Embrey
GARY W. EMBREY

APPROVED BY:

William E. Walker
WILLIAM E. WALKER, PH.D.
MAJOR PROFESSOR

Kenneth A. Blick
KENNETH A. BLICK, PH.D.

Joanne C. Preston
JOANNE C. PRESTON, PH.D.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA

INTRODUCTION

Expectancy seems to operate as described in J.B. Rotter's Social Learning Theory (1954). His work, although seemingly related to that of other notables (Riesman, 1954, in particular), is distinguished through one vital concept--perception. According to Rotter, any reinforcement or reward will gain or lose effectiveness in insuring the recurrence of a preceding behavior or event only if it is perceived to have a casual relationship. One must believe the reward to be contingent upon his behavior or independent of it in order for an expectancy to be established (Rotter, 1954, 1960). It follows then that the reward or reinforcement would strengthen the expectancy that a behavior or act should be followed by that same reinforcement in the future; and once established, the failure of that reinforcement to appear should reduce or extinguish the expectancy. Over time an individual establishes patterns for reinforcement and these differ in degree of attribution of contingency on his actions (Rotter, 1966).

An individual may perceive a consequence to follow his behavior, yet not be contingent on those behaviors, and deem that consequence to result from chance, luck, fate, or powerful others. Rotter(1966) labels this as a belief in external control and predicts that the individual should display increased passivity since he believes himself to

exert little control over his environment or the outcome of events. Conversely, one who perceives a consequence as a direct result of, or contingent upon, his behavior or actions must believe in internal control (or his power to influence the outcome of events).

This history of establishing patterns of reinforcement leading to various expectancies and beliefs in the amount of control one exerts on his environment, has important implications, particularly related to the amount of success or failure one experiences and the coping patterns that develop.

Rotter (1966) envisioned a continuum with external and internal beliefs at either end. While most of the populations should fall in about the middle range of the scale, it is the author's belief that our culture may indeed describe a successful individual as leaning towards the internal. Our societal structure is predicated on striving, competitive endeavors and one must exhibit a belief in his ability to determine the outcome of his efforts to attempt the pursuit of his goals. Note, however, that extreme scores on either end may indicate maladjustment by societal standards; i.e., the external may adopt defensive techniques of rationalization or denial of any involvement in failure, attributing it instead to fate, chance, luck, or someone else causing the misfortune. In

addition, the external may exhibit extreme passivity in the face of environmental difficulties since the individual feels no control over events that may occur. These indeed would be extreme instances of rejection of responsibility. Internals, conversely, may supersede even their own abilities in extreme cases, in fostering beliefs well above their capabilities hedging instead on having delusions of grandeur (Rotter, 1966).

As with most any theory, the components are less clearly defined in reality. Theoretically, internals would be expected to show more striving in areas related to achievement than those who feel little control over their environment. However, as Rotter (1966) points out, research shows that many defensive externals exist in college and adult populations who were originally highly competitive. These people adapted their external view as a defense against failure and though they still maintain striving behavior in clearly structured competitive situations, they account for failures by expressing external attitudes. This may well be related to Astin's (1963) conviction that some college students lose a certain amount of self confidence and ambition by association with particular peer groups, particularly if an individual feels he must continually be comparing his ability to a student peer group of unusually high intelligence.

Franklin (1963), examining youth's expectancies along several variables, reported that high school students that intended to go to college were significantly more internal than those who did not intend to attend college. Here again, seemingly demonstrating a striving to achieve in an academic setting. Lefcourt (1966) also advises that one should expect internal control persons to demonstrate the search for mastery that is definitive of need for achievement. However, McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953), admit that the relation between need of achievement and a belief in one's own ability to determine the outcome of their efforts, is probably not linear since a person high on the motive to achieve might not be equally high on a belief in internal control of reinforcement. Conversely, this person may believe that his behavior determines the kind of reinforcements he obtains yet is low on need for achievement.

Rotter (1966) would caution us to bear in mind that some studies that characterize the students of college populations as relatively more external may in fact be so only relative to other college populations yet considered more internal on the average than the mean of the population at large.

Since the growing body of evidence does indicate that one establishes a given set of expectancies under

specific conditions and those expectancies are influenced by one's perceptions and beliefs, then an examination of one microcosm of the total environment under which some of these expectancies develop may well be useful in understanding the chain of events from action to consequence. Specifically, the college or university will be examined attending to its impact on perceptions and beliefs.

It is not unreasonable to assume that one enters college with expectancies that may well change over time to such an extent that one would leave with a new set of expectancies reflecting the influence peers and environment place on him. Indeed, Feldman and Newcomb (1970) compiled an extensive collection of studies spanning the last four decades and have verified different values, mores, and attitudes for individuals from the time they enter college to their completion date. Typically, these studies employ one of two methods of research: longitudinal or cross-sectional. The latter examines the different strata of underclassmen; commonly freshmen and seniors are contrasted.

Some directional trends are immediately emminent such as the characteristics of autonomy, dominance, and confidence and appear to describe seniors as opposed to freshmen (Feldman and Newcomb, 1970). While these are certainly only statements of degree, bearing in mind

as already pointed out by Franklin (1963) and Rotter (1966) that we assume college populations to generally display more internal characteristics than the populace at large and have somewhere along the line demonstrated the characteristics of striving and efforts to determine their own future; freshmen too may exhibit these qualities to a lesser degree and perhaps experience is a viable teacher as in many other situations. Certainly it is feasible to infer that one such impact of the college environment with its emphasis on autonomy over the course of four years is to enhance more internal attitudes as the individual forms his perceptions of causally related events and experiences more success for his efforts toward acheivement. Indeed, Feldman and Newcomb (1970) suggest some studies that show seniors as more achievement and success oriented, motivated, and as having the ability to produce a more intense, sustained, and vigorous effort in securing those ends. They admit, however, that other studies present the exact opposite view. Perhaps this contradiction is plausible based again on Astin's (1963) assertions where, for example, some seniors experience having to compete with a highly intelligent peer group, thereby initiating doubt in their own abilities. This feeling of doubt indicates serious implications for the motivation to achieve. Equally important is the vigor and intensity they might

produce in any sustained effort if in fact they have perceived their past efforts as mediocre and have adopted an attitude of "why bother". Thus, the individual perceives himself as second rate not from a realistic assessment of his abilities but from "being" second-rated, and begins to entertain lower career ambitions and achievement aspirations. Horner (1970) might explain the reason that many women who exhibit the "motive to avoid success" change their career aspirations toward more traditional feminine roles, in a similar fashion. These women change not in ability but in how they cope with societal pressure to assume the "second rated" feminine role.

Besides having to contest one's expectancies of the college environment, an individual must simultaneously contend with more generalized cultural expectations dealing with concepts as basic as one's sex role in a given environment and his view of the college's demands.

Bardwick (1971) credits, in part, differential parental treatment to the sex role one acquires at an early age and acknowledges that it becomes more clearly defined as the individual grows older. Horner (1966) also believes sex-role standards to be acquired early in life and that these standards develop into stable characteristics of the individual's personality. Even in the face of current women's movements and alledged liberal views becoming more prominent

Hochreich (1974) reports that clear sex-stereotypes still do exist and are shared by both sexes even when actual subject scores diverge considerably from their same-sex stereotypes on measures of trust and locus of control.

Feldman and Newcomb (1970) found that a larger proportion of males than females either expect to or do attend college at each level of ability or socioeconomic status. However, the difference seems to diminish as higher socioeconomic levels are breeched. At lower socioeconomic levels, sex role sterotypes may be more clearly defined in terms of expected duties or opportunities available to each sex. Conversely, at higher socioeconomic levels, where material resources are more equally distributed, both sexes may pursue similar goals with minimal hinderance to their career aspirations. Here again, these attitudes and perceptions may be changed or altered over time from the freshman to senior years, for those that gain entrance into colleges or universities. Some studies have indeed shown male seniors to have somewhat less conventionally masculine interests than freshman males, and female seniors have displayed less stereotyped feminine attitudes than freshman females (Feldman and Newcomb, 1970).

Rotter (1966) points out that in certain instances an internal may chose to forsake his self deterministic

characteristics and display a more external conforming attitude if he perceives this measure to be advantageous to himself. Thus he would not be sacrificing any of his control since he did in fact consciously and willingly choose to conform in order to secure gains for himself. Conjecture may have it that this is in operation, at least some of the time, when one exhibits typical stereotypic behaviors if the individual perceives these behaviors as advantageous toward gaining reinforcement. Could it not be that Horner's (1970) women who display the "motive to avoid success" and change their career aspirations to those that coincide more precisely with traditional feminine roles, are in fact choosing to sacrifice success in terms of achievement for success in other areas, i.e., popularity, femininity, social approval/acceptance?

In a college setting, Horner (1968) felt she had isolated what she refers to as the previously mentioned "motive to avoid success". Her interests were aroused on two counts: the conspicuous absence of results from female populations in most all need achievement studies prior to that time, and the reported findings of higher test anxiety scores for women than men. She hypothesized that the "motive" was: a stable disposition acquired early in life with other sex role standards, more common in women than men, probably not equally important for

all women, more strongly aroused in competitive achievement situations generally consistent with male identity, and once aroused, acts to inhibit expression of the tendency to achieve success. Horner quotes such notables as Eleanor Maccoby, Margaret Mead, and Sigmund Freud in illustrating an intellectual women's position in achievement situations as defying the conventions of what girls should do, since intellectual striving by women could be perceived as competitively aggressive behavior which must needs be repressed to be truly feminine. Thus intellectual achievement is equated with loss of femininity whereby in failure, the woman is not living up to her own standards of performance; and in success, she is not living up to societal expectations about the feminine role. This seems in tune with Hochreich's (1974) findings about the perceived sex-role stereotypes where females are believed to be more external and assuming more conventional feminine roles.

Women's as opposed to men's achievement motives seem subject to a broader range of variables and influences. To begin with, Putnam and Hansen (1972) state girls have a more negative self-image than boys. O'Leary (1974) notes that traditionally women are reared to want to fill the role society casts for them, and are trained to model an accepted female image. She also feels that women perceive affiliation as achievement and an affirmation of

"self". Indeed, Veroff (1969) poses that the achievement motive for boys seems to be cued by internal standards of excellence while for girls, external support is of critical importance. In 1962, Sears found affiliation to correlate with academic success for girls, not achievement needs. Perhaps these are some of the things that led Horner to search for more definite answers concerned with women's achievement motives.

If indeed, affiliation is an integral part of achievement motives for women and they extract self esteem from success in more traditionally feminine stereotypic notions (as Korman, 1970, suggests), it is not difficult to understand Horner's (1968) reasoning that the "motive" is more pronounced in women than men especially in competitive achievement situations. Bardwick (1971) and Schwenn (1970) each report that some girls will strive to succeed as long as most of their friends do not know how well they are doing, however, their feminine self-percept may be jeopardized if they continue their efforts to achieve since successful academic competition is defined as a personality quality identified with men.

> "The typical female has greater anxiety over agressive and competitive behavior than the male. She, therefore, experiences greater conflict over intellectual competition which in turn leads to inhibition of intense strivings for academic excellence."(Kagan and Moss, 1962).

In addition to Horner's (1968) hypotheses: 1) that the motive is more common among women than men and 2) it will be more pronounced in competitive academic situations inhibiting successful achieving responses, this study shall attempt to 3) demonstrate a relatedness between feminine achievement strivings and perceived control for women and 4) predict that experience should be a viable anxiety reducer such that senior women would be less likely to exhibit the "motive" than freshman women.

METHODS

Subjects: A sample of 67 males and 120 females were randomly selected from the freshman and senior undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology and English classes at the University of Richmond. All subjects were white and ranged from 17 to 23 years of age.

Apparatus: The I-E Scale (Rotter, Liverant, and Crowne, 1961) was administered to obtain locus of control scores for the subjects. Each subject was also asked to complete a story that begins: "After first-term finals, John (Ann) finds himself (herself) at the top of his (her) medical school class". (Referred to, from this point on, as the Motive test.)

The English and Math sections of the Survey of College Achievement Tests were utilized to assess achievement

oriented performance for subjects. The SCA was chosen specifically because of its value as a group estimate of achievement. The K-R reliabilities for Form I vary from .67 to .77.

Procedures: The "Motive" test and the I-E Scale were administered during regular class sessions. Subjects were allowed 30 seconds to read the story lead and 5 minutes to write a story based on that lead. The girls were instructed to write their stories about Ann and the boys about John. The subjects were then instructed to complete the I-E scales. Test materials were coded for anonymity. The stories were scored for "motive" imagery using Horner's criteria shown in Appendix A (Makosky, 1972). Makosky reported an intra-score reliability of .90 for 30 randomly selected women's protocols with a score-rescore interval of two weeks.

The women subjects were divided into four groups: 1) freshman women displaying the "motive", 2) senior women displaying the "motive", 3) "non-motive" freshman women, and 4) "non-motive" senior women. Of the 60 subjects tested from each of the freshman and senior classes, the middle 30 scores were ignored. The 15 extreme scores were assumed to have or not have the "motive to avoid success". The women in each of these groups were then

assigned randomly to one of three experimental conditions: a) competition with males, b) competition with females, and c) no competition.

****
INSERT FIGURE 1
****

A group of one female and seven male confederates were employed and briefed as to how they should react to the competitive testing situation prior to arriving at the test site. The males were randomly paired with the females assigned to each of the two male competition groups. The female was employed at such times when two female subjects could not be paired to be tested at the same time under the female competition conditions.

In the competitive conditions, subjects were paired in 5 laboratory rooms such that they were able to see their competitor but not his/her work. Designated subject arrival times were staggered 15-30 minutes apart to insure the belief that the competition was restricted to that particular situation and that subject's assigned partner. Upon arriving at the test site, subjects (and confederates) were asked if they knew one another and paired such that they competed against someone who was unfamiliar to them since a friend may have reduced the competitive spirit that was required in the situation. Subjects in the competitive conditions received the following instructions:

Figure 1

Experimental Design

	Competition			Class
	Male	Female	None	
Motive	5s	5s	5s	Freshman
	5s	5s	5s	Senior
No Motive	5s	5s	5s	Freshman
	5s	5s	5s	Senior

> "We are concerned here with sex stereotyping, i.e., behaviors that are typically more characteristic of one sex than the other. We are trying to discover if this particular achievement test has a specific bias toward either sex such that it would be easier for that sexed individual to perform well on the test. Please attend to your own work, work quietly and quickly, and do the best you can."

In the non-competitive conditions, subjects were tested alone and received the following instructions:

> "We are concerned here with sex stereotyping, i.e., behaviors that are typically more characteristic of one sex than the other. We are trying to discover if this particular achievement test has a specific bias toward either sex such that it would be easier for that sexed individual to perform well on the test. Please work quickly and do the best you can."

Subjects tested under the same experimental condition were tested during the same portion of the day such that they would remain naive as to the other two experimental conditions.

By virtue of the staggered test times, subject pairs or subjects tested alone received the appropriate instructions independent of other test groups or subjects.

Subjects were allowed 30 minutes to complete the achievement tests and all their materials were coded as were the previous scales.

To assess the effectiveness of the experimental manipulation in producing the desired environment, two

post test questions were administered:

1) Did you feel like you wanted to do better than your partner? Rate how hard you were competing on a scale from 1-10 by circling the appropriate number.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all competitive							Extremely competitive		

2) Did you feel anxious in this situation? Rate your level of anxiety on a scale from 1-10 by circling the appropriate number.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all anxious							Extremely anxious		

Subjects will be debriefed in their regular classes during scheduled sessions.

RESULTS

Three raters were employed and the average of their scores was used to obtain an inter-score reliability of .63 for the "motive" imagery.

****
INSERT FIGURE 2
****

Regression analysis utilizing linear, quadratic, cubic and quartic components were unable to find any significant correlation between locus of control and "motive" scores. These results held true not only for general application but were also evident when the male and female scores were

Figure 2

Summary Table of "Motive" Scores

Subjects	Number Ss Tested	Range of Scores	Average Score	% ≥ 1	% ≥ 3
Freshman Males	38	0 - 3.6	.6	34%	6%
Senior Males	29	0 - 3.3	1.0		
Freshman Females	60	0 - 4.67	1.2	56%	10%
Senior Females	60	0 - 5	.8		

examined separately and when freshman and senior scores were examined separately.

****
INSERT FIGURE 3
****

An analysis of variance was conducted to determine if different achievement scores were produced in view of the three competitive conditions for either the freshman or senior girls with or without the "motive". The results indicated no significant interactions nor main effects for any of the variables: class, "motive", and competition.

****
INSERT FIGURES 4, 5, 6, 7
****

A second analysis of variance was administered post hoc to discern any differences among the English verses Math achievement scores, but again, no significant interactions or main effects were indicated for the variables: "motive" and competition. A significant difference did appear between class levels in the Math Achievement scores; however this was not considered pertinent to the experimental manipulation in the present study.

****
INSERT FIGURES 8, 9, 10, 11
****

Examination of the post test questions revealed an average competitive score of 4.05 and an average anxiety score of 4.25 with only 40% of the women scoring above 5 on the competitive scale and 38% on the anxiety scale.

Figure 3

Correlation Summary Table

	Number of Subjects	Correlation
All Subjects	188	.02
All Seniors	89	-.003
All Freshmen	99	-.01
All Males	67	.02
Male Seniors	29	.08
Male Freshmen	38	-.26
All Females	120	.01
Female Seniors	60	.01
Female Freshmen	60	.01

Figure 4

Table of Means and Standard Deviations

	Competition			Class
	Male	Female	None	
Motive	$\bar{x}$=22 SD=1.82	$\bar{x}$=16.75 SD=3.59	$\bar{x}$=17.4 SD=2.07	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=17.25 SD=2.36	$\bar{x}$=20.25 SD=2.22	$\bar{x}$=17.8 SD=5.12	Senior
No Motive	$\bar{x}$=19.75 SD=4.79	$\bar{x}$=18.0 SD=2.16	$\bar{x}$=20.0 SD=2.58	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=18.0 SD=3.46	$\bar{x}$=16.2 SD=2.68	$\bar{x}$=16.0 SD=4.32	Senior

Figure 5

Table of Means and Standard Deviations

(Four Subjects / Cell)

	Competition			Class
	Male	Female	None	
Motive	$\bar{x}$=22 SD=1.82	$\bar{x}$=16.75 SD=3.59	$\bar{x}$=17.75 SD=2.22	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=17.25 SD=2.36	$\bar{x}$=20.25 SD=2.22	$\bar{x}$=19.25 SD=4.57	Senior
No Motive	$\bar{x}$=19.75 SD=4.79	$\bar{x}$=18.0 SD=2.16	$\bar{x}$=20.0 SD=2.58	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=17.5 SD=3.78	$\bar{x}$=16.5 SD=3.00	$\bar{x}$=16.0 SD=4.32	Senior

Figure 6

Table of "F" Values

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of x's Squared	Variance	F
Between A's	2	23.56	11.78	1.08
Between B's	1	24.16	24.16	2.21
Between C's	1	4.32	4.32	.39
A X B	2	31.99	16.00	1.46
A X C	2	8.96	4.48	.41
B X C	1	15.42	15.42	1.41
A X B X C	2	44.46	22.23	2.03
Error	40	437.80	10.95	

Figure 7

Table of "F" Values

(Four Subjects / Cell)

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of x's Squared	Variance	F
Between A's	2	13.17	6.59	.61
Between B's	1	18.75	18.75	1.75
Between C's	1	10.09	10.09	.94
A X B	2	40.53	20.27	1.89
A X C	2	1.17	0.59	.05
B X C	1	21.32	21.32	1.99
A X B X C	2	40.14	20.07	1.87
Error	36	386.50	10.74	

Figure 8

English Means and Standard Deviations

(Four Subjects / Cell)

	Competition			Class
	Male	Female	None	
Motive	$\bar{x}$=13.50 SD=1.92	$\bar{x}$=11.75 SD=2.50	$\bar{x}$=11.5 SD=1.92	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=11.75 SD=1.26	$\bar{x}$=13.50 SD=1.29	$\bar{x}$=13.50 SD=2.65	Senior
No Motive	$\bar{x}$=11.25 SD=1.89	$\bar{x}$=10.50 SD=2.38	$\bar{x}$=14.0 SD=2.94	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=12.25 SD=3.77	$\bar{x}$=12.5 SD=1.73	$\bar{x}$=11.75 SD=2.87	Senior

Figure 9

Math Means and Standard Deviations

(Four Subjects / Cell)

	Competition			Class
	Male	Female	None	
Motive	$\bar{x}$=8.50 SD=2.65	$\bar{x}$=5.00 SD=2.16	$\bar{x}$=6.25 SD=0.96	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=5.50 SD=1.29	$\bar{x}$=6.75 SD=1.89	$\bar{x}$=5.75 SD=3.59	Senior
No Motive	$\bar{x}$=8.50 SD=3.51	$\bar{x}$=7.50 SD=1.73	$\bar{x}$=6.00 SD=2.45	Freshmen
	$\bar{x}$=5.25 SD=1.50	$\bar{x}$=4.00 SD=1.82	$\bar{x}$=4.25 SD=2.36	Senior

Figure 10

English Test "F" Values

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of x's Squared	Variance	F
Between A's	2	3.50	1.75	.31
Between B's	1	2.53	2.53	.45
Between C's	1	3.53	3.53	.63
A X B	2	12.18	6.09	1.09
A X C	2	5.18	2.59	.46
B X C	1	.50	.50	.09
A X B X C	2	25.15	12.58	2.25
Error	36	201.75	5.60	

Figure 11

Math Test "F" Values

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of x's Squared	Variance	F
Between A's	2	17.10	8.55	1.62
Between B's	1	34.96	34.96	6.63 *
Between C's	1	1.63	1.63	.31
A X B	2	12.25	6.13	1.16
A X C	2	1.58	.79	.15
B X C	1	15.24	15.24	2.89
A X B X C	2	13.91	6.96	1.32
Error	36	189.81	5.27	

* (A significant difference did appear for class level in the Math Achievement scores; However this difference was not considered pertinent to the experimental manipulation in the present study).

DISCUSSION

Based on the evidence presented in similar previous "motive" studies (Horner, 1968; Makosky, 1972), a general affirmation of Horner's (1968) hypothesis was expected: 1) that women are more apt to display the "motive to avoid success" than men and 2) for those women who exhibit the "motive", it should be more pronounced in competitive achievement situations (particularly when paired with men for competition). And indeed 10% of the women tested scored 3 or above with a range of 0-5 on the "motive" test as opposed to only 6% of the men scoring 3 or above with a range of 0-3.6 on the motive test. Perhaps more impressive are the facts that 56% of the women showed some inclination for exhibiting the "motive" by scoring 1 or above on the "motive" test where only 34% of the men scored 1 or above on the "motive" test. However, the present study did not confirm the inhibitory effects of the "motive" under competitive conditions since no significant differences in achievement scores were recorded for women with or without the "motive" under any of the competitive conditions.

The probable cause for the failure of the present study to confirm Horner's (1968) hypothesis becomes evident upon examination of the post test questions concerning competitiveness and anxiety level. The women tested reported not to feel particularly competitive nor anxious about taking the tests since the average reported scor

for both competitiveness and anxiousness on a scale from 1-10 was about 4. Only 40% of the women reported above 5 on the competitive scale and 38% on the anxious scale.

At the outset the author felt that, with the addition of the experience variable (class level), the results may not have been as clear cut as Horner's (1968) hypotheses. Indeed, some of these hypotheses may have been held differentially for women at different academic levels.

Bardwick (1971) states that the value one places on the self determines the level of self esteem and the lower the level of self-esteem, the greater the anxiety and the greater the anxiety the greater the tendency to assume a societally prescribed role. The woman would then be hesitant to engage in behaviors requiring assumed male sex-role appropriate traits such as striving for achievement in competitive academic settings. Thus any woman facing the "double-bind" of conflicting goals may suppress achievement strivings while experiencing heightened anxiety. However, it was the author's expectation that class level may be an important factor in that the senior woman, by virtue of the fact that she has weathered innumerable instances of just such a situation throughout her college years, may have a reduced anxiety level and not display the "motive" as readily. She may have been forced to adopt alternate coping patterns such as defensively lowering her aspirations and reducing her anxiety level or she

may have reduced her anxiety simply because of experience in the situation since competitive academic settings would have long since lost their novelty.

It seems evident, however, that the instructions in the present study were not sufficient to instill the subjects with the competitive nature of the task and all the subjects performed the task at a relatively reduced level of anxiety. Therefore the women who were judged to have more of a propensity for the "motive to avoid success" failed to display any of the inhibitory influences quite possibly because they were not anxious enough.

If Feldman and Newcomb (1970) are correct, the senior women should have a more structured personality organization through experience and time may have induced changes in their values, mores, and attitudes. Therefore they should be more secure in self identities and less apt to experience anxiety due to more external traditional sex-role stereotyped values. Further, senior women should have had ample time to establish important college contacts through which they can negotiate more smoothly in the area of interpersonal relations. This would likely be an asset to these women permitting the fulfillment of both their social skill and affiliative needs (Battle, 1965, 1966; Stein, 1971; O'Leary, 1974; Veroff, 1969; Hoffman, 1972; and Walberg, 1969).

Since no difference could be extracted between senior and freshmen women with or without the "motive to avoid

success", these assumptions must remain nothing more than conjecture. Perhaps the freshman women, or the senior women for that matter, did not perceive the SCA task as male oriented. If that be the case, then it certainly seems plausible that there was little to threaten their self esteem and hence their anxiety was reduced. Without the perceived sex-role orientation these women would not have been subjected to the conflictual "double-bind" situation. Therefore if the subjects did not view the test situation as threatening and if they failed to perceive the circumstance as competitive even after reading the instructions, then there is little hope of distinguishing between "motive" and "non-motive" women in this situation. By the same token experience or class level would not have been a factor since the women were operating under little stress.

Finally, if women are traditionally reared to look to external cues for their performance standards, (Veroff, 1969; O'Leary, 1974) and these cues do in fact play a significant part in the feminine personality make-up (Bardwick, 1971; Horner, 1968), then a relatedness between feminine achievement strivings and perceived control for women may be expected. If in fact, a woman experiencing anxiety in a competitive achievement situation, does so because (as Horner, 1968, puts it) she feels success to be potentially threatening to her femininity or social status; then might she not also foster a belief in this all-powerful tradi-

tional feminine sex-stereotype influencing or even controlling her life to some extent? Women who have no anxiety about striving academically, and fail to display the "motive", must certainly entertain some belief in their own ability to set goals and attain them or in essence, their ability to control events they are involved in.

It would seem reasonable to expect some correlation between locus of control and the "motive to avoid success", whereby the more internal an individual is, the less likely he/she is to exhibit the "motive to avoid success". Yet no correlation for general application was found, nor did there appear to be any relatedness between the two variables for males or females at either of the class levels tested (freshman or senior). Perhaps a woman who is internal may choose to exhibit behavior in line with those expected of one who displays the "motive to avoid success" if she perceives some personal gain from it, i.e., she may choose to alter her career ambitions to a more traditional feminine role in order to facilitate acceptance in a particular peer group. On the other hand an external may not display the "motive to avoid success" simply because he/she has adopted defensive coping patterns to reduce his/her anxiety level and hence extinguish any inhibitory influence it may have in competitive situations. Thus it may well be that any given individual may be internal or external and may or

may not have the "motive to avoid success", but one does not necessarily preclude the other.

Although the expected findings were not supported in the present study, further research in the area of achievement motivation for women seems warranted. Perhaps the present study could be made into a more efficient tool for research with the addition of some measure to enhance the subject's belief in the competitiveness of the task situation and increase the subject's anxiety level. One suggestion would be to rewrite the instructions such that the subjects were led to believe they were directly competing with another group and that poor performance would infringe upon the subject's intellectual integrity. Future experiments should include both class levels and sex-stereotyped tasks as variables to define more clearly the types of conflicts and give some clue as to their solution.

APPENDIX A

Scoring Criteria for Assessing "Motive to Avoid Success"

Horner, 1968, p. 105

A very simple Present-Absent scoring system was adopted to fear of success imagery. The stories were scored for the "motive" if there was negative imagery expressed which reflected concern about the success. For instance:

A. Negative consequences because of the success

B. Anticipation of negative consequences because of the success

C. Negative affect because of the success

D. Instrumental activity away from present or future success, including leaving the field for more traditional work such as nursing, school teaching, or social work

E. Any direct expression of conflict about success

F. Denial of the situation described by the cue

G. Bizarre, inappropriate, unrealistic, or non-adaptive responses to the situation described by the cue.

REFERENCES

Astin, A.W., Further Validation of the Environmental Assesment Technique. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 217-226.

Bardwick,J.M., Psychology of Women - A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts, New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 168-183.

Battle, E.S., Motivational Determinants of Academic Task Persistence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2,209-218.

Battle, E.S., Motivational Determinants of Academic Competence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 634-642.

Feldman, K.A., and Newcomb, T.M.,The Impact of College on Students, San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

Franklin, R.D., Youth's Expectancies about Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement Related to N Variables. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, 1963.

Hochreich, D.J., Sex-Role Stereotypes for Internal-External Control and Interpersonal Trust. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, No. 2, 273.

Hoffman, L.W., Early Childhood Experiences and Women's Achievement Motives. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 129-156.

Horner, M., Sex Differences in Achievement Motivation and Performance in Competitive and Non-Competitive Situations. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan,1968.

Horner, M., The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women. Women on Campus: Symposium, 1970, 12-23; in Bardwick, J.M., Readings on the Psychology of Women, New York: Harper and Row, 1972, 62-67.

Kagan, J., and Moss, H., Birth to Maturity, New York: Wiley, 1962.

Korman, H.K., Toward A Hypothesis of Work Behavior.Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 31-41.

Lefcourt, H.M., Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.

Makosky, V.P., Fear of Success, Sex-Role Orientation of the Task, and Competitive Condition as Variables Affecting Women's Performance in Achievement-Oriented Situations. Paper presented to Midwestern Psychological Association, St. Lawrence University, 1972.

McClelland, D., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., and Lowell, E.L., The Achievement Motive, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

O'Leary, V.E., Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occuptional Aspirations in Women. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, No. 11, 809-826.

Putnam, B., and Hansen, J.C., Relationship of Self Concept and Feminine Role Concept to Vocational Maturity in Young Women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 436-440.

Reisman, D., Individualism Reconsidered, Glencoe,Ill.: Free Press, 1954.

Rotter, J.B., Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Rotter, J.B., Some Implications of a Social Learning Theory for the Prediction of Goal Directed Behavior from Testing Procedures. Psychological Review, 1960, 67, 301-316.

Rotter, J.B., Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, Whole No. 609, 1-28.

Rotter, J.B., Liverant, S., and Crowne, D.P., The Growth and Extinction of Expectancies in Chance Controlled and Skilled Tests. Journal of Psychology, 1961, 52, 161-177.

Schwenn, M., Arousal of the Moive to Avoid Success. Unpublished Junior Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1970; in O'Leary, V.E., Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, No. 11, 809-826.

Sears, P.S., Correlates of Need Achievement and Need Afiliation and Classroom Management, Self-Concept and Creativity. Stanford University, Laboratory of Human Development, Unpublished, 1962; in Bardwick, J.M., Psychology of Women - A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts, New York: Harper & Row, 1971, 168-183.

Stein, A.H., The Effects of Sex-Role Standards for Achievement and Sex-Role Preference on Three Determinants of Achievement Motivation. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 219-231.

Veroff, J., Social Comparison and the Development of Achievement Motivation; in Smith, C. (ed.), Achievement Related Motives in Children, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 46-101.

Walberg, H.J., Physics, Femininity, and Creativity. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 47-54.