1984

Achievement Motivation and Fear of Success in Women: Implications for Success in Non-Traditional Careers

Beverly Allgaier Pulaski
Loyola University Chicago

ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND FEAR OF SUCCESS IN WOMEN: IMPLICATIONS FOR SUCCESS IN NON-TRADITIONAL CAREERS

by

Beverly Allgaier Pulaski

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

April, 1984

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Marilyn Susman, my academic advisor and thesis director, for the direction, input, and support she provided during the completion of this thesis, and throughout my program at Loyola.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Dr. John Wellington, who has challenged and encouraged me in my exploration of career issues, and supported me in the completion of this project.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband and parents, whose support, encouragement and concern made the completion of this thesis and my degree program possible.

VITA

Beverly Allgaier Pulaski was born on May 8, 1954 in Chicago. She is the daughter of A. A. and Harriet Allgaier, and is married to Gregory J. Pulaski. They have one daughter, Julia.

The author was educated in north suburban Chicago, and in 1971 graduated from Regina Dominican High School in Wilmette. She attended the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, majoring in the secondary education of speech communication. She graduated with honors in May, 1975, a member of Phi Kappa Phi and numerous campus activity and scholastic honoraries.

Since completing her undergraduate degree, the author has been employed in both business and educational settings. In 1980, she entered the graduate program in Guidance and Counseling at Loyola University of Chicago, receiving her Master of Arts degree in May, 1984.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need for Study

One of the most economically and socially significant trends of the last two decades has been the dramatic increase in the number of women in the labor force. This trend that started largely as the result of the women's movement but became essential as a result of the changing economic environment, now seems to have become a norm in our society. Also abetting the movement of women into the labor force have been government regulations which have forced organizations to reevaluate their hiring and promotion practices to the benefit of women; the availability and acceptance of birth control, allowing women to plan their families to mesh with their career plans; the increase in the availability of child care facilities; and a generalized, long-awaited acceptance of working women by society at large.

Women have entered the work force in record numbers, and now account for 43.7% of those employed in the United States (U.S. Department of Labor, 1984). However, their presence in the labor force is still marked by a lack of representation in higher level occupations and a disproportionate share of the available income. For example,

60% of all working women are employed in low paying service occupations, the same percentage as 20 years ago (Feuers, 1981).

Those who are better educated still seem to be clustered in traditionally female jobs with traditionally low pay scales, such as registered nursing (95.8% women) (U.S. Department of Labor, 1984) and elementary school teaching (89% women) (Feuers, 1981). Even within these job categories, women do not seem to be getting their equal portion of the pay. An article in Time magazine (Cocks, 1982) refers to data from the National Association of Working Women which affirms that the average annual salary of a full time female clerical worker is just over $11,000, while the figure for male clericals is over $17,000. The same article also looks to the field of teaching, where the women average $3,000 a year less than their male colleagues.

Some women, of course, are making inroads into traditionally male occupations. These women are the focus of this paper. Women are seeking advanced and professional degrees in greater numbers than ever before. Over 33% of all MBA candidates are women and 30.2% of 1981's law graduates were females, with similar statistics for medical schools (Cocks, 1982). Yet the numbers seem more promising than they actually are. Women's representation

in the higher echelons within these areas is still minimal. The salaries these women receive, undeniably strong indicators of the status and importance ascribed to them by their employers, show a striking and serious discrepancy in the distribution of pay to men and women. Some factors, whether environmental or internal to the women, have apparently been significant enough both to keep them underrepresented in traditionally male jobs, and to prevent their advancement to higher level positions within these structures. The past and anticipated flow of women into these structures is significant, and further analysis of their possibilities for success in these areas is indeed warranted.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to focus on two major psychological constructs shown to be related to performance and task success: achievement motivation and fear of success. Each of these constructs has generated much research, particularly in terms of their relationship to women. Both of these factors have been shown to have significant bearing on how women are motivated and how well they perform.

The premise is that an evaluation of these constructs and how they are operant in women will provide some insight into the reasons for women's present status in the

work place, and the possibilities for their eventual success in non-traditional career structures. The purpose is to look at each of these constructs in depth, and to arrive at some propositions regarding the individual and interactional effects of these constructs on women's opportunities for success in non-traditional careers.

Summary

The number of women in the labor force has increased dramatically in the last two decades. Increased awareness on the part of women of their own potential is an important factor behind this movement, along with the increased economic pressures affecting every stratum of our society. Also fueling this trend are government regulations, more successful family planning. the availability of child care facilities, and a general sanction, by society, of women in the work place.

Unfortunately, a majority of these women are employed in traditionally female, low-paying and low-status jobs. It appears that more women are obtaining the necessary training for higher-level positions. Indications are, however, that they may face some difficulties obtaining the pay and level of success that has, to date, seemingly eluded the women already competing in those fields.

Accepting the presence of women in traditionally

male careers, the need becomes evident to examine the etiology of women's status in these non-traditional career structures. The focus of this paper will be on two psychological constructs which may have significant bearing on whether or not career success is feasible for women in these areas. Chapter I established the need for this study and stated purpose. Chapter II will focus in more detail on the historical and current perspectives on the employment of women. The third chapter will explore in depth the psychological constructs of achievement motivation and fear of success. The final chapter will summarize this paper and its implications.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL AND SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN

The purpose of this chapter is to review the historical and current perspectives on the employment of women, and to present some of the factors which have influenced women's progress in non-traditional careers. The first part presents an overview of women's employment history. The second part of this chapter investigates in detail the present status of women in higher level, non-traditional careers in terms of the positions they hold, the power they wield, and the money they make. In order to further understand the reasons for that present status, part three focuses on the socio-psychological influences that are involved, including attitudinal and structural barriers to women's success in non-traditional careers.

Historical Trends

In their review of the literature on the employment of women, Perun and Bielby (1981) noted that at the turn of the century there were three major occupations open to women outside the home: domestic service, factory work, and school teaching. Even participation in these areas was usually of a temporal nature. The real life's

work of a woman was considered to be motherhood, and marriage and the birth of children generally signalled the end of a woman's employment.

During the early 1900's, the participation of young unmarried women in the work place continually increased until by 1920, one out of every five workers was a woman (Baruch, 1967). This figure has steadily increased, from one out of four in 1940, to one out of three in 1963 (Baruch) to 43.7%, or nearly one-half in 1984 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1984). The percentage of married women working has also been increasing. In 1940 this figure was 17%, and by 1960 the figures had almost doubled to 32% (Baruch). By 1982, 51% of all married women were working outside the home (Cocks, 1982).

Reviewing other significant trends in the employment of women, Baruch reported that between 1940 and 1960, there was a marked increase in the participation of older women in the labor force. Since the late 1960's, however, the most dramatic trend has been the influx into the labor market of women under 35 with pre-school and school age children (Perun & Bielby, 1981).

The World War II era was a boon to women's employment status, although even their notable work activities during this time were presumed to be a temporary response to some very unusual circumstances. Baruch (1967) quoted

Deutsch, the author of a 1944 volume on the psychology of women as stating that

> in this country during the present war incomparably wider strata of women are active in occupational fields.....But the majority of women whom war has made more active than ever, will return as quickly and energetically as possible to the basically conservative because always dominant feminine experience, regardless of social and cultural upheaval. (p. 261)

This author obviously did not perceive the scope and strength of the trend towards increased participation of women in the labor force, a trend that is evidently continuing today. From the time of the thriving post-war economy to the present, this participation has accelerated, and there is little indication of its slackening.

Beyond mere statistics, however, a very important pattern in women's lives has been established. Whereas the mothers and grandmothers of today's women exhibited alternating patterns of work and family commitment, the situation today has changed. Perun and Bielby (1981) contend that current evidence points to women's lives exhibiting the simultaneous operation of work and family cycles throughout adulthood. If correct, this observation implies a whole new set of demands on today's women and men, and also new possibilities regarding career commitment and career orientation.

Present Status of Women

Despite the large number of women entering the work force today, the actual jobs that are available to them are limited in much the same ways as they have been throughout the century. Although there has been a trend toward more white-collar jobs for women, they are still notably different from men's in terms of the low level of career commitment required and the low pay involved. At this time, it is estimated that 80% of all working women hold traditionally female "pink-collar" jobs, and get paid 66¢ for each dollar a man gets for comparable work (Cocks, 1982).

Many women are seeking the education that will prepare them for higher level, traditionally male careers. Ferber and McMahon (1979) report that the number of women completing bachelor's degrees is approximately equal to the number of men doing so. Though women still receive only one-fifth of all professional and doctor's degrees, this represents a dramatic increase during the last decade. Since 1970, for example, Ferber and McMahon report an increase of 268% in the number of women completing professional degrees.

The area of study these women choose, however, still seems to reflect traditional sex-role expectations to some extent. For example, in 1975 approximately

11% of the bachelor's degrees and 9% of the master's degrees in physics were awarded to women (Kistiakowski, 1980). In the more general categories termed by Vetter (1981) "science and engineering", the figures are somewhat more promising. The number of women doctorates in these fields increased from 7% in 1965 to 23% in 1980. Cocks (1982) reported that the number of women obtaining engineering degrees increased from .8% in 1971 to 10.4% in 1981.

Unfortunately, however, Vetter notes that women were found to have higher unemployment rates and lower salaries than men in all fields of science and engineering, at all degree levels, and at all levels of experience. In 1979, for example, women comprised 10.8% of the science and engineering doctoral labor force, yet accounted for 32% of the doctoral scientists and engineers who were unemployed and seeking jobs. The same general trend applies to bachelor's and master's level graduates as well. Of the 1978 and 1979 graduates on the master's level in science and engineering, 85% of the males, but only 67% of the females, were employed in the field in 1980. Some suggest that the problems women have with employment may be attributed to the trend among women to study the social and behavioral sciences, areas that are more saturated with applicants. The

data regarding this contention, however, seems inconclusive (Vetter, 1981).

Vetter's article also takes an interesting look at the status of women in academic settings, again focusing on the fields of science and engineering. The author cites a report by the National Research Council (1981) that concluded that although women with post-doctoral experience are more likely to work in educational institutions, men have been much more successful than women in pursuing academic careers. For example, of the 1972 graduates who had taken post-doctoral appointments and were employed in the academic sector in 1979, only one in seven women had tenure, while one out of every three of their male colleagues had tenure by that date. Women were also more likely to be in positions outside the faculty track than were men, with respective figures of 22% and 14%. According to Vetter, the National Research Council found that one-fourth of the women, but only one-eighth of the men were not in tenure track positions.

The salaries of women faculty members also reflected a significant discrepancy. Vetter cites Minter's (1981) collection of data on faculty salaries as indicating that women faculty members in science and mathematics had salaries equivalent to 78.2% of the men's salaries. In the

social sciences the women fared slightly better, receiving 81.5% of the typical male salary. Although the information cited here is quite specific to these areas, similar trends can be presumed in other academic fields, although certainly not all of them.

The field of law, for example, is notable for the significant advances made by women faculty members. In 1970, only 2% of all tenure track law teachers were women, yet by the 1979-80 school year that number had increased to 11%. While only one-fourth of the law schools had women on their tenure track in the early 1970's, almost every school had at least one by 1980. One-fifth of all law schools, however, had only one tenure track woman by that time (Fossum, 1981).

The practicing field of law has also seen significant increases in the number of women. Considering that in 1960 only about 3% of the total law school graduates were women, today's 30% figure is astounding. This increase has been attributed to the heightened educational and career aspirations of women, which in turn were precipitated by the feminist movement. Another important factor was the end to discriminatory admission policies and practices, prompted by strict guidelines from the government and the American Bar Association.

Figures from the 50 largest law firms in the nation, however, indicate that women still have far to go. Women accounted for only 14% of the lawyers at these firms, and only 2% of the partners. Women law school graduates seem to earn a lower level of pay and status by seeking out employment in the government rather than in private practice, and only gradually moving away from the traditional "women's fields" of family law, trusts and estates, tax and research. In terms of the judiciary, it was found that in 1979, almost 4% of all judges were women--an improvement over the 1970 level of 1%, yet still not an encouraging level of representation in these powerful positions (Fossum, 1981).

Business, too, is an area where the sheer number of women in the field may indicate a more positive position than is really the case. Rhea (1980) quotes the U.S. Department of Labor statistics (1979) as indicating that in 1970, 16.6% of those listed as managers/administrators were women, a figure significantly lower than the 1981 statistic of 27.4% (U.S. Department of Labor, 1981). Providing further documentation of this trend, Larwood and Powell (1981) refer to Schaeffer and Axel's (1978) observation that in the mid seventies, the number of female managers in American corporations rose 22%, compared to an 8% rise in the number of male managers. Larwood and

Powell point to the large number of women in MBA programs as an indication that this trend will continue.

Indications are, however, that the higher one looks on the management scale, the scarcer the women. Moore and Rickel (1980) reported a recent estimate by Kantor (1977) which indicated that in over half of the companies in the U.S., women held 5% or fewer of the first level supervisory jobs. Furthermore, in three-fourths of U.S. companies, women held 2% or less of the middle management positions and none at the higher levels of management. Jelinek (1980) cited an article by Lublin (1977) that estimated the percentage of women middle managers at 6%, and at vice presidential or higher levels a mere 1%. Even within a given level, there are discrepancies in the salaries that are administered. In 1980, according to Cocks (1982), the median salary for women managers and administrators was $12,936, with a figure of $23,558 for their male counterparts.

Women have certainly made some inroads into traditionally male career fields, particularly during the last decade. Yet the raw numbers of women entering or functioning in a certain field are not necessarily indications of a high level of success or an assurance of advancement. There appear to be some factors which preclude the rapid and continued advancement of large numbers of women in

traditionally male careers.

Socio-Psychological Influences on Women's Progress in Non-Traditional Careers

Perceptions of women's competence. Within the traditionally male career structures, women must deal with a variety of questions from society at large and from their co-workers regarding their competence. Feild and Caldwell (1979) cite a study by Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser (1965) in which most of the managers in a national sample felt women were "tempermentally unfit for management" (p. 391). White, Crino, and DeSanctis (1981) refer to Patterson's (1975) study using 192 male and female middle managers which showed that females were consistently rated lower than males in terms of performance and promotability.

Schein (1973) asked middle managers to rate on a series of traits the following three groups: women in general, men in general, and what they considered to be successful middle managers. The results showed that their perception of the successful middle manager included many of the attitudes and characteristics commonly attributed to men. In fact, of the 86 managerial traits under consideration, 60 were considered "typically male" and only eight were termed "typically female".

Powell and Butterfield (1979) found that business

students described a good manager in masculine, rather than androgynous or feminine terms, and note that Basil found similar results in 1973. Hyde and Rosenberg summarized the 1972 findings of Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz by stating that the general public felt that "women were relatively less competent, less independent, less objective, and less logical than men" (1976, p. 53).

A study that involved a national sample of 884 men showed similar perceptions of women as having limited capabilities for success in high-level careers. Rosen and Jerdee (1978) asked the subjects to compare men and women on traits in the general categories of Aptitude, Knowledge and Skill, Interest and Motivation, Temperament, and Work Habits and Attitudes. The subjects felt that men overwhelmingly possessed leadership and decision-making skills, that women were sensitive, emotional, and couldn't cope with stress and pressure, and that women were less reliable and dependable. The authors concluded that "virtually every perceived difference between male and female employees was unfavorable to women aspiring to higher level occupations" (p. 841).

On the other hand, Reif, Newstrom, and Monczka (1978) cite studies which question the validity of these perceptions, including work by Knowles and Moore in 1970 and

Crowley, Levitin, and Quinn (1973). They specifically refer to a study by Durkin in 1971 in which it was found that when men and women were tested for levels of ability and knowledge in 22 dimensions related to business, women excelled in six, men in two and there was no difference in the remaining 14 categories, leaving the researcher to conclude that in theory, there ought to be more women in management than men. In general, women have been shown to be very similar to men in many characteristics required for effective management, such as capability, competitive drive, and leadership ability (Dubno, Wankel, and Emin, 1979).

Unfortunately, even if these attitudes and perceptions are invalid, as the above authors assert, there does seem to be solid data which establishes the existence of such a negative image of women regarding their competence. Certainly the small number of women in high level positions in business, universities, law firms, etc., and the large number of women in the lower echolons of those organizations, indicate that some powerful factors are at work, even beyond the attitudes of others. The remainder of this chapter will examine some of those factors.

Structural, interpersonal, and internal barriers.

In an attempt to explain the small number of women in high level jobs, three general types of barriers have been identified. The first type can be termed external or structural barriers. Among these obstacles are:

> Double standards of performance, sex-typing of jobs, misperceptions of the competence of women, ambiguous reward schedules, attitudinal prejudice, lack of career development counseling that is geared to women's needs, inappropriately assigned tasks, and task expectations not commensurate with abilities, less opportunity for advanced or in-service training, lack of role models for women, mentorism, and informal social cliques. (Williams, 1976, p.55)

Basically, these obstacles involve what Hooyman and Kaplan (1976), cited by Baugher and Martin (1981), refer to as organizational and informal discrimination. Eliminating these barriers would require intervention at the organizational level, involving major policy changes and possibly training or awareness programs. Also called for is a major shift in the attitudes toward women, a long and tenuous cultural process, but without which even the most comprehensive anti-discrimination program would lose much of its impact.

Some of the barriers mentioned above, however, are in part perpetuated by the attitudes and actions of the women themselves. What has been identified as a typically female orientation to the career structure has been associated with a sex-specific way of interacting with others and the career environment. Many problems have

been associated with this orientation, and these comprise the category of interpersonal barriers to women's success. Hennig and Jardim (1977) identified many of these barriers and the implications for women's success in managerial careers.

Women, they point out, having much less experience than men at competitive sports, have not learned the associated lessons on how to accept a temporary setback, how to take criticism, how to depend on and trust others, and how to delegate responsibility. They fail to recognize the importance of the informal communication networks operant in organizations, and generally do not make the necessary efforts to become a part of that network. In many ways, they deny themselves interaction with those who possess the information, resources, and power within the organization.

A prime example of women missing opportunities and not reaping the advantages of association is their lack of participation in the sponsorship or protégé systems within organizations. Also, women tend to focus so much on doing their job well that they neglect to put energy into gaining recognition for their accomplishments or obtaining visibility within the organization. A final barrier in this interpersonal or interactional realm is the observation that women's emotions are actively and

easily engaged in the work setting. These emotions are often expressed in a seemingly inappropriate way, thus contributing to the stereotype of women as less stable and less competent than men.

Most authors, including Hennig and Jardim (1977), have expressed the belief that these interpersonal or interactional barriers can be mediated to a great extent by career counseling and training in various skills (e.g., assertiveness, goal setting). However, indications are that there are more fundamental and deeply ingrained differences between men and women than their mode of operation in the work setting. Some might even identify these factors as the basis for those differences in orientation that were noted above. At any rate, these factors can be termed the internal barriers to success.

This category refers to the psychological constructs in which differences have been noted between the sexes in terms of structure or manner of expression. These constructs are basic components of the personality structure, and are important determinants of behavior. It is the purpose of this paper to focus in on two of these psychological constructs: achievement motivation and fear of success. These constructs were chosen because of their strongly documented relationships to performance, and because research has indicated that these might be areas

where notable sex differences exist. It therefore seems important to look at the nature of these constructs, examine how they operate in women, and identify any implications for women's success in non-traditional careers.

Summary

The first part of this chapter included a review of the historical background on women in the labor force. Following this was an investigation of the present status of women in terms of the positions they hold within the work structure and the pay they receive. A review of some of the higher level, non-traditional fields to which many women aspire revealed a disturbing trend: the clustering of women in the lower echelons of the organization, with women holding very few high level positions of status and power.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate some of the reasons for this occurrence. It was noted that women are not perceived as exceptionally competent or able to handle positions of responsibility within the workplace. Beyond this, the nature of the organization imposes some structural barriers to women's advancement in non-traditional fields. The way women interact, or fail to interact, with their environment, presents some interpersonal barriers. Finally, the very nature of their psychological

makeup might hold the key to an understanding of the issues involved in women's success in traditionally male jobs. This paper will look at two psychological constructs that are related to how women function in competitive settings, and review the implications of this data for women aspiring to higher level, non-traditional careers.

CHAPTER III

PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTS AND THEIR RELATION TO WOMEN'S SUCCESS IN NON-TRADITIONAL CAREERS

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the psychological constructs of achievement motivation and fear of success in terms of the implications they hold for women's success in traditionally male careers.

Achievement Motivation

Definition and Background. Achievement motivation is a term that appears quite frequently in the literature on women. Hyde and Rosenberg (1976) define it as "the desire to accomplish something of value or importance through one's own efforts, to meet standards of excellence in what one does" (p. 100). Tewari (1978) presents a definition that adds some new dimensions to the concept: those with a high need for achievement have "a great concern to do better, to improve performance, to undertake moderately challenging tasks...to take personal responsibility, and to seek and utilize concrete feed-back" (p.5).

The actual term "achievement motivation" arrives from the theoretical structure developed by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953). According to Stein and Bailey (1973), McClelland et al.

> conceptualized achievement motivation as a relatively stable disposition to strive for success in any situation where standards of excellence are applicable, that is, as a motive that generalized across achievement areas. (p. 346)

Integral to an understanding of achievement motivation is the concept of "affect in connection with evaluation" (McClelland et al., p. 79), which in turn is based on the authors' definition of a motive as "the learned result of pairing cues with affect or the conditions which produced affect" (p. 75). In identifying and scoring for achievement motivation, therefore, McClelland, et al. put great emphasis on finding evidence that the subject is personally involved, sees one's own performance in terms of a standard of excellence, and expresses some feeling or desire concerning the activity or result in question.

There are numerous instruments which have been used to determine the level of achievement motivation, including Mehrabian's Achievement Scale (Dias & Carifaro, 1977; Orlofsky & Stake, 1981), the Achievement Scale of the Adjective Check List (Heilbrun, Kleemeier, & Piccola, 1974), the Future Work Measure and the Implied Demand Character of the Wife's Future (Tangri, 1972). These and other instruments have been used with varying degrees of success and reliability.

The most commonly used method of measuring achievement motivation, however, is the projective technique

developed by McClelland et al. in which the subjects provide written responses to a series of pictures, often taken from the Thematic Apperception Test, that depict one or more individuals in situations that might feasibly involve some achievement themes. Immediately preceeding the administration of the measure, the experimenter will typically provide some information or directions that are meant to manipulate the level of achievement motivation in the subjects. In addition to the cues inherent in the pictures and in the message conveyed by the experimenter and the experimental situation, there are also what Veroff, Wilcox and Atkinson (1953) describe as the "cues of everyday life over which the experimenter has virtually no control" (p. 108). Each of these three types of cues can potentially trigger the affect referred to by McClelland et al., which in turn stimulates or arouses the need for achievement.

The stories written by the subjects in these experimental settings are coded and scored for achievement imagery, and the resulting score purportedly indicates the level of achievement motivation of the subject at the time of the study. According to McClelland et al., this motive, like all others, is learned. Therefore the individual's responses, in this case the stories he writes, will reflect his previously learned responses to the types

of cues present at the time of the experiment. Finally, although the subjects will respond affectively to the cues in an individualized way, McClelland et al. (1953) postulated that their various responses could be compared and inferences drawn regarding their relative levels of achievement motivation.

Achievement motivation and performance. Veroff et al. (1953) pointed to numerous studies which supported the premise of McClelland et al. and the scoring method they devised. They cited particular studies that have shown a relationship between individual differences in achievement motivation scores and differences in speed of recognition of achievement-related words (McClelland & Liberman, 1949), recall of interrupted tasks (Atkinson, 1951), and performance on verbal and arithmetic tasks (Lowell, 1952). Thus, they established a positive correlation between level of achievement motivation and performance.

McClelland et al. (1953) explain the logic of this relationship in the following passage:

> There is no necessary connection between high achievement motivation and more efficient performance. The standards in terms of which a person evaluates his performance may be quite low objectively or the affect over performance could be predominantly negative because of repeated failures. In either case a poor performer could show evidence of high achievement motivation. Still, this should be the exception rather than the rule, since an achievement approach motive at least requires performance that must be

> fairly close to expectations to yield pleasure; and as performance does approximate expectations, the expectations must increase if it is to continue to yield pleasure. Therefore there should be a significantly positive but moderate correlation between n Achievement and the actual efficiency of performance of various sorts. (p. 80)

Beyond specific types of task performance, Sorrentino (1973) refers to studies by the American Management Association (1948), Gardner (1948), Kaltenbach and McClelland (1948), and Wainer and Rubin (1969), which have identified a relationship between achievement motivation and leadership positions. He adds that an equal number of studies have failed to establish such a link, but suggests that the inconsistencies may be due to a lack of consideration for the situational aspects of leadership. The results of his own study of male college students, however, "do give strong support to the general hypothesis that achievement-related motives can serve as the source of the determinants of emergent leadership" (p. 365).

Edwards and Waters (1981) comment on the persistence of students with high achievement motivation, with this quality confirmed by Atkinson and Feather's (1966) observation of the achievement oriented personality: "Whatever the level of the challenge to achieve, he will strive more persistently than others when confronted with an opportunity to quit and undertake some different kind

of activity instead" (p. 368). Weiner and Kukla (1970) ascribe this persistence to the attributional pattern of individuals high in achievement motivation, specifically their tendency to explain failure as lack of effort rather than lack of ability, which in turn results in continued goal activity.

High achievement motivation has been linked with the tendency to attribute success to internal causes (i.e., ability & effort) by Bar-Tal and Frieze (1977) and Kukla (1972). This attributional tendency, a component of the psychological construct termed locus of control, or causal attribution, has been linked both conceptually and empirically to variables such as self-esteem, decision-making skills, career choice, and problem solving ability. The conclusions drawn by Bartsch and Hackett (1979) support this contention, and provide an additional link between achievement motivation and performance variables.

Clearly, the evidence presented to this point does emphasize the importance of achievement motivation and the far-reaching implications it has for the performance, competency, persistence, and/or ultimate success of an individual in any number of settings. It is apparent, then, that to deny the strength of this motive in any group of individuals is indeed a serious allegation. If

proven correct, this assertion would have significant impact on the expectancy for success of that group in numerous endeavors. Specifically, then, it remains to be established to what extent, and with what focus, this motive does or does not operate in women. Also of importance is identifying the resultant implications for women's success in non-traditional careers.

Preliminary research on the achievement motive in women. Early research on the achievement motive in women presented many surprising results. McClelland et al. (1953) refer to a study by Veroff in 1950 that showed high school girls to exhibit a high level of achievement motivation in both the neutral and achievement-oriented conditions when responding to pictures of male characters. The female subjects, like the males in the study, exhibited a decrease in achievement motivation scores in response to female characters during both the neutral and aroused conditions.

The most surprising aspect of Veroff's study was not the girls' identification of achievement themes with male, rather than female, picture stimuli, nor was it the relatively high level of achievement motivation that their scores indicated. Rather, it was the observation that unlike their male counterparts, these female subjects did not seem to respond to achievement-arousal

(e.g., competitive) cues in the experimental setting. McClelland et al. hypothesized that either the scoring method was not applicable to women, the type of cues known to arouse achievement striving in men for some reason did not do so in women, or that some unknown aspects of the neutral condition (i.e., a classroom setting, a test being administered) had aroused their levels of achievement motivation to such heights, it was almost impossible for them to increase any further in the achievement-arousal situation.

Wilcox, according to McClelland et al., set out to test this third hypothesis in her 1951 study. In her experiment with college women, she made a concerted effort to remove as many potential achievement cues as possible from the neutral or relaxed condition. For example, she administered the measures in the girls' dormitory rooms, and presented herself and her instructions in a very relaxed and friendly manner.

While the performance data she collected seemed to confirm the validity of the scoring methods for women, she was unable to increase the achievement motivation scores for the women following achievement arousal. One of two explanations seemed likely. Perhaps some cues that were not apparent to, or controlled by, the experimenter were continuing to motivate the women in the

relaxed condition, resulting in notably high scores. On the other hand, it was possible that the type of stimulus presented during the achievement-arousal sessions was not inherently motivating to women, that is, did not significantly engage their affect and therefore not their motive to achieve.

Another study described by McClelland et al. was that of Field in 1951. His results with college students did indicate a difference between women's scores in the aroused and relaxed conditions, thereby showing that women's scores could be experimentally increased through certain arousal techniques. This finding added further support for the generalizability of the theory and scoring method of McClelland et al.

More significantly, however, Field introduced a whole new dimension to the concept of achievement, namely that of social acceptability. He gave written cues at random to both male and female subjects as to whether they were judged by an imaginary committee of peers as being socially acceptable ("successes") or socially unacceptable ("failures"). He then administered the picture cues and requested that the subjects write their perceptions of what was going on in those pictures. The subjects then actually did rate each other as being liked or disliked, and the two categories that were formed were

used by the author in examining the results.

After scoring their thematic responses, it was discovered that the males' scores did not refelct any increases in achievement motivation in response to either positive or negative cues indicating social acceptability. The achievement scores of the women, on the other hand, did increase significantly after being told they were either socially acceptable or unacceptable, while not showing any increase in the absence of such cues (relaxed condition).

The results indicated that achievement motivation is a viable component of the female personality, and that the key is to isolate the type of cues that will arouse that motivation in women. Some sex differences did indeed appear evident, however, and led McClellan et al. to conclude

> the data unequivocally support the hypothesis that women's n Achievement is tied up with social acceptability, men's with leadership capacity and intelligence. To put it in another way, if you want to arouse n Achievement in women, refer, as Field did, to their social acceptability; if you want to arouse n Achievement in men, refer, as we did, to their leadership capacity and intelligence....this sex difference...may be related to the greater importance of dependence on others for women and independence of others for men. (p. 181)

Analyzing the contrary findings of research on achievement motivation in college women, Alper (1974) commented on the lack of studies supporting Field's use

of affiliation cues to arouse achievement motivation in women. She also pointed to Angelini's 1953 study of Brazilian college women that countered McClelland et al.'s hypothesis that strictly achievement and performance based cues could not arouse the achievement motive in women. As was the case with Field's study, however, few have been able to replicate Angelini's results.

The fifties were obviously years of significant findings regarding women and achievement motivation, although some authors have noted the comparative lack of research done on these issues since that time (e.g., Alper, 1974). Still, the classic studies of achievement motivation described above generally emphasized the differences between the sexes in regards to achievement motivation. The following two sections will explore the veracity of such an emphasis in light of more recent research in the field. The final section will present a summary and conclusions, with emphasis on implications for women in non-traditional careers.

The affiliation motive in women: research and implications. Studies by Veroff et al. (1953) and McClelland et al. (1953) seemed to establish the existence of a female achievement motive and the applicability to women of the scoring procedure developed by McClelland et al. The result of the study by Field (1950), however.

brought up an interesting factor that demanded attention.

Field's use of social acceptability as an achievement cue, and the responsiveness of women to that cue, led to the consideration of what is termed the affiliation motive or affiliation need in women. Those with a high level of affiliation motivation have "a concern for establishing, maintaining, or restoring a positive affective relationship with another person" (Tewari, 1978, p.5). The relationship of this need to achievement behavior and achievement motivation has caused much consternation among researchers.

There are, for example, those who insist that the achievement motive is relatively non-functional in women, that in fact the affiliation motive is behind women's achievement behavior. These researchers criticize what they term the "male model" of achievement motivation as being inapplicable to women, and inappropriate for explaining their behavior. While few would deny the existence of an achievement motive in women, the viewpoint explained here would maintain that the affiliation need surpasses, and possibly contraindicates, the achievement need.

Veroff et al. (1953) refers to anthropologist Margaret Mead's (1949) argument that achievement is not included in the adult female role in America. Mead's conclusion, as explained by Veroff et al. is based on

the assertion that the female role is a non-competitive one and achievement is almost exclusively assigned to the male role.

Hoffman (1972) also looks at the origins of achievement and affiliation motives, and concludes that child rearing practices and early childhood experience are the basis for the variance between men and women on these dimensions. She asserts that female children are given inadequate parental support for their early efforts at independence and mastery, while boys are encouraged in these pursuits.

The separation of the self from the mother is generally delayed for girls, and emphasis is on maintaining the comfort and safety that relationship implies. As Hoffman explains:

> When little boys are expanding their mastery strivings, learning instrumental independence, developing skills in coping with their environment and confidence in this ability, little girls are learning that effectiveness--and even safety--lie in their affectional relationships. (1972, p. 137)

Hoffman cites studies of preschool and school age children which support her conclusion that female achievement behavior "is motivated by a desire for love rather than mastery. When achievement goals conflict with affiliative goals...achievement behavior will be diminished and/or anxiety result" (1972, p. 136).

Hoffman refers to studies by Oetzel (1966) and Walberg (1969) that support the contention that females have greater affiliative needs than males. She maintains that these affiliation motives cannot be considered entirely dysfunctional, since they do motivate certain types of achievement behavior, and refers to studies by V. J. Crandall (1963), V. C. Crandall (1964), and Garai and Scheinfeld (1968) as lending further support to this argument.

Many other authors agree with these conclusions regarding the implications of a high level of affiliation motivation in women. Morrison and Sebald's (1974) comparison of employed executive and non-executive women showed them to be very similar in affiliation motivation, with the possible inference that this motive does not preclude success in non-traditional fields. Tewari (1978) also found a common level of affiliation motivation among women managers and women in general, thus raising some questions as to the influence this motive has on women's opting for a non-traditional career. Certainly, a reasonably high level of affiliation motivation doesn't seem to keep women from these jobs, or preclude their reaching managerial status.

Not only is it questionable that this affiliation need is detrimental to the achievement of women in non-

traditional fields; there are also some suggestions that high levels of affiliation motivation may be a competitive advantage for women. Tewari (1978) described a 1967 study by Lawrence and Lorsch which led to the conclusion that there was a positive relationship between the affiliation motive and managerial performance. The authors studied 22 managers who were responsible for integrating the work of various people and work units within the company, and found that the more effective managers were the ones with high affiliation needs.

Reif, Newstrom and Monczka (1978) described a review of the literature on women conducted by Knowles and Moore (1970) which led them to conclude that the one difference between men and women commonly noted was women's greater concern for relationships. They further concluded that this was a competitive advantage for women entering management positions:

> About the only testable difference between men and women seems to be women's greater ability in interpersonal relationships...the manager of the future will need to be more people-centered, more able to work with people than to exercise position power.

Heinen, McGlauchlin, Legeros, and Freeman (1975) point to a similar advantage for women, explaining that many companies have recently begun to stress the importance of interpersonal skills in motivating employees and increasing productivity. Relating well to people, and

being able to identify feelings and how they relate to job performance are among the skills a manager needs in today's work place, according to these authors. They feel that the "nurturant orientation" (p. 284) of females can add a new and very important dimension to successful business functioning.

Despite these very positive summations, the fact is that when asked to describe requisite managerial characteristics, men and women alike have tended to describe very achievement oriented constructs (e.g., innovative, aggressive) as was established in Chapter II. With this in mind, the suggestion by Hoffman and others that the female affiliation motive is paramount to the achievement motive in women, and that it is the motive behind women's achievement behavior, may have very far reaching implications for women and their success in a variety of settings. As Murray (1964), cited by Tewari (1978, p. 20) says:

> a person motivated mainly by achievement motivation may make important contributions to society, but may not be the most comfortable person to live with.... he works hard when he gets involved in a problem, whereas a person motivated primarily by affiliation may not be so involved in getting the job done, because people mean more to him than the task. (pp. 101-102)

Hoffman herself observes that

> academic and professional women frequently allow their concern with affective relationships to interfere with the full use of their cognitive capacities. In group

> discussion and in intellectual argument, women often seem to sacrifice brilliance for rapport. (1972, p. 135)

Implicit in this and other statements by Hoffman is the contention that women's strivings are primarily, and possibly even exclusively, focused on achieving affiliative success. Their goals would then be quite different than the achievement-oriented goals of their male counterparts. Consequently, in settings which have been structured by males and are reflective of traditionally male constructs and goals, this difference in orientation, contrary to the previously presented data, could have significant bearing on how, and to what extent, women can effectively function in these structures.

Again turning to Hoffman, we can see further examples of such negative implications. She cites Horner's finding that even in men, the affiliative motive can be linked to diminished performance. Men high in both achievement and affiliation motives, evidently feeling some conflict between these motivations, showed a performance decrement when in competition with another man. Implications for women in traditionally male careers, given high levels of achievement and affiliation motivation, may be similar.

Hoffman concludes that while women tend to succeed in the school setting, this is because performance there

is compatible with affiliation motives, and the resultant success meets their need for affiliation.

> In college, however, and in professional pursuits, love is less frequently the reward for top performance. Driving a point home, winning an argument, beating others in competition, and attending to the task at hand without being side-tracked by concern with rapport require the subordination of affiliative needs. (1972, pp. 136-137)

The discussion as to whether or not a high level of affiliation motivation is beneficial or detrimental to the performance of women in a variety of spheres, has yet to be resolved. At this time, a review of the larger issues involved in this discussion might add perspective to this controversy. For example, it is important to return to some basic questions regarding the affiliation motive in women: 1. Is it actually more operant in women than in men? 2. Does the existence of a relatively strong affiliation motive in women necessarily justify the rejection of the achievement motivation model for women, or the assertion of fundamental motivational differences between the sexes? 3. What else might be operant to account for the observed differences between the achievement functioning of men and women?

In terms of the first question, there are researchers and theorists who reject the contention that the affiliation motive is more operant in women than in men,

and that this need is behind women's achievement-related behavior. An extensive review of the literature by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) has resulted in the conclusions that women are no different from men in the level of achievement motivation, and that girls are not more dependent than boys on the praise and approval of others.

Stein and Bailey (1973), in their literature review on achievement motivation, rejected the hypothesis that female achievement behavior is motivated by the need for affiliation rather than the need for achievement. They supported the existence of a strong achievement-based motivational system in women primarily because studies have indicated that even social arousal of women results in achievement imagery in their written responses.

Dipboye (1978) cited a national survey (Crowley, Levitlin & Quinn, 1973) which indicated that women are just as concerned as men about being able to use their abilities on the job. Jagacinski and LeBold (1981) confirmed this finding in their study of male and female engineers. Neither study showed a difference between men and women as to the value placed on social relations. In their summary of the barriers to women's success in management, Mirides and Cotes (1981) refer to Chapman's (1975) conclusion that women's leadership style, and underlying need structure, are not significantly different from men's,

nor do they have a greater need to foster good interpersonal relations in the work setting.

Perhaps the strongest statement against the assertion that women's achievement motivation differs fundamentally from men's (question two) comes from Fitzgerald and Crites (1980). They point out that numerous studies have shown that a significant number of women do respond in the same way as men to achievement cues. Thirty-five percent of the women subjects in Horner's 1968 study, for example, responded positively to a cue regarding a woman succeeding in a traditionally male field. Fitzgerald and Crites also note that one-third of the women in Tangri's 1974 study fell into the category of Role Innovators, and exhibited achievement motivation patterns similar to those of men. Alper (1974) cites additional studies that showed this type of pattern in highly competitive women (Angelini, 1955), academically achieving high school girls (Lesser, Krawitz & Packard, 1963), and intellectually-oriented college women (French & Lesser, 1964).

Indications are, then, that the achievement motivation model proposed by McClelland et al. (1953) does have some validity for the study of the achievement motive in women and the prediction of achievement-related responses and behaviors. Yet is is also well-documented

that some women respond in an unexpected way to traditional achievement cues, and seem to put a significant emphasis on social or affiliative concerns. In terms of the third question posed in this section, some theorists, accepting the construct of a strong achievement motive in women, suggest that women oftentimes choose to express that motive in sex-typical, affiliative ways.

Seeking sex-role appropriate outlets for achievement motivation. Hyde and Rosenberg (1978, p. 102) explain that what has been thought to be affiliative needs may in fact be achievement needs expressed in a sex-appropriate manner. A woman, for example, might achieve a high level of skill in cooking. However, this does not necessarily indicate that she has done so to win friends or be accepted by others (affiliative need fulfillment). Rather, this skill development may be an expression of her very real and significant achievement strivings that she has chosen to express in a sex-appropriate fashion.

Stein and Bailey (1973) supported this contention in their review of the literature. They explain that women, like men, strive to attain a standard of excellence. The difference is in the area in which they choose to pursue their goals, often choosing one which the culture has deemed sex-appropriate. Social skills comprise a major area in which achievement is identified

closely with females. Thus in studies such as Field's (McClelland et al., 1953), cues regarding social acceptability triggered achievement responses in females (though not in males).

It is generally considered that women choose these sex-appropriate arenas as a result of sex-role conditioning, or because they fear losing social approval. (a discussion of the concept termed fear of success is presented in the following major section of this chapter.) Results obtained in the study by Veroff et al. (1953) and other researchers can then be explained: women don't respond well to cues of females in achievement situations because they have learned through our culture to associate achievement with males. Their achievement strivings are not grounded in typical achievement cues, but rather these motives are stimulated by the more familiar and more appropriate social-oriented cues.

It has also been suggested that some women fulfill their achievement strivings vicariously through identification with another's (i.e., the husband's) achievements. Fitgerald and Crites (1980) describe a study by Tangri in 1974 which showed that certain college women project their achievement needs onto their future husbands. These authors also posit that Horner found evidence of this vicarious achievement motivation among

high ability, traditional women in her review of the literature on fear of success.

Stein and Bailey (1973) refer to Lipman-Blumen's 1972 study of 1000 college-educated married women that showed the majority of the sample received their primary satisfaction from their husband's accomplishments, rather than from their own or from both equally. These authors also refer to the finding that women express more achievement imagery when the pictures or verbal cues that are given are of men, as further substantiation of this concept of vicarious satisfaction of the achievement need. Unfortunately, there doesn't appear to be a great deal of research on the scope of this phenomenon, or much detail as to how it affects or curtails achievement behavior in women.

Thus, two basic and contrary propositions have been explored regarding the nature of achievement motivation in women. The first is that women are dissimilar to men in that they are not motivated by their achievement need, but rather by a powerful need for affiliation. The second proposition presented here suggests that the achievement motive in women functions basically as it does in men, except that it is often displayed in a sex-appropriate fashion, and possibly may be projected onto another significant individual. Fitzgerald and

Crites (1980) have a rather terse response to these premises:

> Hoffman's proposal that women strive for social approval strikes a patronizing role, whereas Stein and Bailey's concept of a desire for social skill stretches the term achievement motivation almost to meaninglessness. The proposition that women achieve vicariously through their husbands and significant others is essentially similar to the notion that it is woman's nature to live for and through others, an idea that has not been well received for some years. (pp. 48-49)

What, then, would be an alternative viewpoint regarding achievement motivation in women, one that does not have the negative connotations described by Fitzgerald and Crites? An exploration of such a proposition is presented in the following section.

Achievement motivation as a viable construct in women. Reference was made in the previous section to the number of women in studies by Horner (1969) and Tangri (1974) who exhibited achievement motivation patterns similar to those expected for, and observed in, male subjects (Fitzgerald and Crites, 1980). Results such as these have led some researchers to theorize that within-sex differences in achievement motivation and related constructs (i.e., affiliation need, performance self-esteem) are greater than between-sex differences in these areas (Orlofsky & Stake, 1981).

Baruch (1967) found in a study of Radcliffe alumni that those who were pursuing careers showed much higher

levels of achievement motivation than those who were housewives. Results from a study by Oliver (1974) establish a link between career orientation in women and a high level of achievement motivation and a low level of affiliation motivation. The opposite motivational pattern was established for homemaking-oriented females.

In their own recent (1980) comparison of women employed in nursing with women in various levels of business management, Moore and Rickel found a great variance in scores on achievement motivation between the two general groups. Those women employed in the traditionally female setting and those on lower occupational levels scored significantly lower in achievement motivation than the respondents from non-traditional settings and higher occupational levels. The authors concluded that women from the latter group do meet the implied and defined criteria for one high in achievement motivation:

> They do seek to excel at what they try and wish to be respected for their opinions and advice. They seek challenging work that requires skill, leadership, and the opportunity to plan ahead and make one's own decision. (p. 324)

Among the other characteristics of this group identified by Moore and Rickel (1980) was the subjects' descriptions of themselves as having characteristics that are generally attributed to men and managers in our society. These women's sense of identification with the

traditional male role points to an important focus of recent research on achievement motivation: the importance of the sex-role orientation of women in predicting their patterns of achievement motivation, achievement-related behavior, career orientation, and career choice.

The position that psychological masculinity or femininity is more important than actual gender differences when discussing achievement motivation and related constructs, was purported by Orlofsky and Stake (1981) as a result of their work with males and females. They found few sex differences on the dimensions measured, yet a very strong influence of masculinity or femininity on the levels of achievement motivation, general and performance self esteem, need for social approval and love, and anxiety over failures.

Their conclusions regarding the general implications of one or the other sex-role identifications are striking. Orlofsky & Stake also indicate why the masculine identifications seem to be significant and visible in women who have chosen and succeeded in traditionally male career domains:

> The results of this study suggest that for both sexes, stereotypically masculine traits are the source of psychological strengths in both the achievement and interpersonal domains. These instrumental, agentic qualities go hand in hand with strivings for excellence and achievement, with relative freedom from debilitating anxie-

> ties over failure, and with a healthy self-confidence in one's abilities to get the job done. This confidence, in turn, is based on a self-perception that one can think clearly and process information without becoming overloaded by distracting ideas, feelings, or external stimuli.....Thus, masculine traits constitute a broad base of personality strengths. Feminine traits appear to have less general adaptive significance, their primary contributions being centered in the affective and interpersonal spheres. Furthermore, when not balanced by at least minimal levels of masculine traits, they may leave the individual vulnerable to achievement-related anxieties and perhaps excessive dependence on others' love and approval. (p. 231)

Considering the conclusions of Orlofsky and Stake, it becomes evident that identification with these typically masculine traits might be important for success in traditionally male careers. The inclusion of achievement motivation among this constellation of traits has been documented by Alper (1973), who found a significant relationship between sex-role orientation and achievement motivation in women.

Major (1979) expanded the term sex-role orientation to include the concept of androgyny, an orientation that embraces both masculine and feminine traits. She found that women who were either androgynous or masculine in orientation scored higher in achievement motivation than women who rejected masculine traits. Oliver (1974) cited various studies which indicated that the need for achievement tends to be more salient in career-oriented

subjects, among them studies by Bardwick in 1971, Hoyt and Kennedy in 1958, and Rand in 1968.

Heilbrun, Kleemeier, and Piccola (1974) added a new dimension, role consistency, to the study of women's sex-role identification and its affect on achievement behavior. They identified four role-achievement patterns among the college women they studied: greater perceived similarity to mother, high role consistent; greater perceived similarity to mother, low role consistent; greater perceived similarity to father, high role consistent; and greater perceived similarity to father, low role consistent. The college women who fell within the first two categories involving identification with the mother did not exhibit a discrete pattern regarding the social and achievement variables being studied by the authors. Thus, few conclusions could be drawn regarding this rather homogeneous group.

The women in the two father-similar categories, however, exhibited some unique patterns of behavior. Those who identified with their fathers and had formed a stable, consistent personal identity, performed extremely well when competing in an all-female setting. They did not, on the other hand, display much confidence in anticipation of competing with males, and showed no increase in performance during such competition. Their female counterparts

who had been less able to consolidate their role behaviors into a consistent personal identity, were found to be highly masculine, rejecting of the traditional female role, and were unresponsive to competition with females. When males were involved, however, their performance increased dramatically.

Among the conclusions presented by Heilbrun et al. (1974) to account for this variance in performance is the suggestion that there might in fact be two ways a girl can identify with her father. One way, that chosen by the high role consistent girls, is to identify with him as a member of a class (males) from which she can achieve vicarious satisfaction, yet still retain some identification with the traditional female role. In this study, they identified with the males' unfavorable competitive position, and restricted their own achievement strivings, level of aspiration, and actual performance.

The low role consistent women in this category, however, have seemingly identified more with the individual attributes of the father, including his competitiveness with other males. They have found these attributes in themselves to be rather contradictory to their knowledge of themselves as women (low role consistency), but the effect of their having internalized these male attributes does include increased performance when competing

with males.

The implications of the finding by Heilbrun et al. (1974) is that the type and nature of sex-role identification must be clarified and specified if it is to be used as a predictor of female achievement behavior or as an explanation for variance in achievement motivation among women. Yet the dramatic effect that low role consistent, male sex-role identification was shown to have on women's performance when competing with men provides even more rationale for the study of this issue of sex-role orientation when discussing or investigating achievement motivation.

Sex-role identification implies an internalization of the attributes and values of the group identified with. It would therefore follow that goals and the value placed on attaining those goals would be similar among those who share sex-role identification. Stein and Bailey (1973) have identified studies that show substantial correlation between attainment value for an area of achievement, and competence and persistence in attaining those goals. Thus it might be said that the goal must be perceived as worth attaining if the individual is going to expend much effort toward achieving that goal.

Herein lies a possible explanation as to why many females seem unresponsive to achievement-oriented cues,

and some clarification as to the effect of sex-role identity in determining women's success in a given type of endeavor. Women with a strongly feminine sex-role identity will not have placed much attainment value on instrumental success or on typically masculine achievements. They will not, therefore, expend much energy or show much persistence in achieving those ends. This is not, however, necessarily a reflection of their level of achievement motivation. It is rather a predictable and reasonable response to years of cultural conditioning, and a sex-role identity that is either chosen by, or ascribed to, the individual.

Conversely, we can deduce that the woman who is characterized by a masculine or possibly androgynous sex-role orientation would put higher attainment value on traditionally male goals. She would probably self-select into a course of study (Wood & Greenfield (1976) and a career (Moore & Rickel, 1980) that would facilitate her achieving the goals she has learned to value. Moore and Rickel (1980) report that Terborg's (1977) review of the literature on career choice indicated that there is a great variance within the female sex in terms of sex-role orientation, and that these orientations do affect career choice.

Whether the relationship noted by Terborg is

causal or interactive in nature, the effect is the same: women who see themselves as possessing masculine characteristics and sharing male goals, are placing themselves in male structures. In light of the discussion presented here, it appears that women are intrinsically capable of succeeding in traditionally male areas--precluding the interference of the structural barriers described in Chapter II, or other psychological constructs.

Summary. In summary, three main bodies of research can be identified in the literature on achievement motivation in women. The first presents the theory that women's achievement behavior is not motivated by the need for achievement, but rather by a need for affiliation. The authors supporting this view have rejected the traditional model of the achievement motive and how it operates, deeming it inappropriate for women. Work by Hoffman (1972) constitutes the basis of this argument. She looks to the effects of child-rearing practices in our culture on the development of a strong achievement motive in males, and a strong affiliation motive in females. She maintains that women are not taught mastery skills, nor are they encouraged to be independent. Consequently, achievement cues mean little to them, and the achievement motive is seldom aroused, and generally

does not motivate behavior. Women are, however, very attuned to social and affiliative cues. Their affiliation motive is easily aroused and, according to this theory, motivates a major part of female behavior.

There is great variance in the implications of such a theory. Some maintain that the alleged emphasis females place on social or affiliative concerns is an advantage to women, even in traditionally male arenas: they feel it brings a new and positive perspective to the very task- and goal-oriented male structures. While data cited in this paper indicates that strong affiliation motivation has not deterred women from attaining and succeeding in high-level, traditionally male positions, it may be rather idealistic to presume that this "new perspective" will be valued as highly as the more task-specific, goal-oriented contributions of the males in the organizations.

Indeed, there is the opposite contention that having a strong affiliation need is a negative factor that women must learn to control and sublimate, especially when functioning in a male structure (i.e., an academic or business setting). A major part of the support for this point of view comes from the data presented in Chapter II of this paper which showed how typically male, non-affiliative characteristics are valued very highly,

at least in business settings.

It is interesting, though, that the basis of this theory and any sex differences it involves is the sex-typing of children in our culture. The difference between male and female achievement motivation, then, is one of experience and learning, rather than something inborn, fundamental and innate. Implicit in this proposition is the tenet that learned behavior can be changed, generally through significant, affect-arousing experiences of a contrary nature. If this is a valid theory of achievement motivation in women, the implication for women's success in traditionally male careers is a relatively positive one. Experiences can be provided by schools and employers that will at least begin to counteract the early training women received. The task, however, is certainly a major one.

The second theory presented in this chapter was that women, like men, have a high level of achievement motivation and that this motive is behind their achievement behavior, a premise for which there is quite a bit of empirical and theoretical support. Even studies which purport that some sex differences exist in terms of achievement motivation and achievement behavior have peripherally documented that there is a large block of women who do not display these sex differences, but who instead

respond according to typically male patterns. The conclusion is that women are not unlike men in their achievement motivation and pattern of achievement behavior; they do, however, tend to seek out sex-appropriate (e.g., social or affiliative ways to express and satisfy their very strong need for achievement.

Whereas in the first theory, social or affiliative concerns were considered the source of women's achievement behavior, in this theory they are presented as the object of that behavior. As in the first theory, social conditioning seems to be the reason for this tendency in women. Consequently, a retraining or reorienting process could again be called upon to help eliminate this proclivity among women to seek out traditionally feminine manners in which to deal with their achievement strivings. A redirection of efforts and a redefinition of goals is called for, if indeed one accepts the premise of the second theory.

The third major body of literature presented in this section supported the theory that some women differ from men in level of achievement motivation and/or manner in which they display it, because of within-sex differences in sex-role orientation. Traditionally masculine traits have been identified as being very important for success in achievement-oriented settings. Consequently, ascribing

these characteristics and the associated values and goals to oneself (masculine sex-role orientation) should bring with it a certain amount of success in these settings. A link has been found between non-traditional, career-oriented women, masculine sex-role orientation, and high levels of achievement motivation.

The conclusion is that a type of self-selection occurs: Those high in achievement motivation and masculine sex-role orientation will seek out, and be quite capable of succeeding in, traditionally male career structures. In the meantime, emphasis on decreasing sex-role stereotyping during infancy and childhood, and helping women to become cognizant of their option to ascribe to masculine, as well as feminine values, are areas which deserve attention.

As in the case with the other two theories, this viewpoint has as its origin the sex-role conditioning in our culture which seems to lock women into a pattern of behavior and mode of response which precludes their success in traditionally male endeavors. Given any of these theoretical positions, focus should be on eliminating or counteracting this conditioning.

Finally, the concept of attainment value, as described in terms of the third theory, has some applicability for all three viewpoints of achievement motivation and achievement behavior in women. Unless and until women

find these achievement-related goals both attainable and appealing, they will not strive towards or persist in attaining those goals. They will refrain from entering the structures which espouse those goals and values, and women already in those structures will fail to rise to the heights of which many are inherently capable. The responsibility, then, lies first with the woman to review the appropriateness of her own value and goal structure. Second, a responsibility lies with the organizations to reexamine their efforts to remove the barriers within the job setting which make those goals seem unattainable from the perspective of women.

Fear of Success

Definition and background. The previous section of this chapter described the construct of achievement motivation, and noted the variance between male and female responses to achievement-oriented cues. In an effort to account for this variance, a University of Michigan researcher, Matina Horner, in 1968, proposed the existence of a motive to avoid success, or fear of success, in women. This motive was conceptualized by Horner as "a latent, stable personality disposition acquired early in life in conjunction with standards of sex role identity" (1972, p.159).

The proposition of such a motive is based on the

the expectancy-value theory of motivation, which states that two factors determining the arousal of a motive are: 1. the expectations held by the individual regarding the type of consequences his or her behavior will result in, and the likelihood of those consequences and 2. the value of those consequences to the individual. Anxiety is aroused when the individual expects negative consequences to his or her behavior. The anxiety will act to inhibit that behavior in order to avoid those negative consequences.

Horner suggested that men and women

> still tend to evaluate themselves and to behave in ways consistent with the dominant stereotype that says competition, independence, competence, intellectual achievement, and leadership reflect positively on mental health and masculinity but are basically inconsistent or in conflict with femininity. (1972, p. 158)

She adds that this image of femininity is the basis for internal psychological barriers that preclude achievement in women.

Levine, Reis, Turner and Turner (1976) describe women as being caught in a double bind. On one hand, success in traditionally male domains may be rewarding, particularly to those high in achievement motivation. On the other hand, women fear that success in these areas, particularly when in competition with men, will bring with it very negative consequences.

According to Jackaway and Teevan (1976), Horner (1969) identified two separate negative consequences feared by women in achievement situations. The first is a fear

of social rejection, expected when the success occurs in a traditionally male context and thus is considered inappropriate for women. The second source of anxiety is internally instigated, and occurs whether or not anyone else finds out about the woman's success. This is the woman's own perception that she has lost some of her femininity, with a resulting negative effect on her self-image and self-esteem.

In order to avoid these negative consequences that women have learned to expect, they will avoid the behavior (in this case the achievement behavior) that will bring with it the negatively-valenced success. Horner makes it clear that women do not <u>seek</u> failure; that is, they do not anticipate or expect positive consequences as a result of failure. Rather, their primary motivation is to avoid the negative consequences of success, and the failure that often results is considered to be a regrettable yet unavoidable by-product of that motivation.

Horner also hypothesized that this motive would be most characteristic of high achievement oriented and high ability women who have the desire and capability to succeed, and for whom the expectancy of negative consequences is particularly relevant. It was further hypothesized that this inhibition of motivation will generally have a debilitating effect on performance in these

situations--particularly when it is a competitive situation and males are involved.

Research findings by Horner and others. To test these hypotheses, Horner developed a method of assessment based on the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) that was similar to the measurement of achievement motivation described in the previous section of this chapter. Horner, however, used verbal leads rather than pictorial cues, and included one which connoted a high level of accomplishment in a mixed-sex, though traditionally masculine, field of achievement. Specifically, the 90 females in her original (1968) study were given the cue "After the first term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class." The 88 males in the sample responded to the lead "After first term finals, John finds himself at the top of his medical school class." The subjects were undergraduate students at the University of Michigan, mostly freshmen and sophomores.

A simple present-absent method of scoring was used: that is, the motive to avoid success was considered present if, in response to the cue regarding achievement by a member of their own sex, the subjects

> made statements in their stories showing conflict about the success, the presence or anticipation of negative consequences because of the success, denial of effort or responsibility for attaining the success, denial of the cue itself, or some other bizarre or inappropriate response to the cue. (Horner,

1972, p. 162)

The results showed a generalized absence of such negative responses among the male subjects. Over 90% of them responded in a very positive way to John's success in medical school, and the remaining 10%, according to Horner, "focussed primarily on the young man's rather dull personality" (1972, p. 162). The female subjects, on the other hand, responded quite differently:

> In response to the successful female cue, 65% of the girls were disconcerted, troubled or confused by the cue. Unusual excellence in women was clearly associated for them with the loss of femininity, social rejection, personal or societal destruction, or some combination of the above. Their responses were filled with negative consequences and affect, righteous indignation, withdrawal rather than enhanced striving, concern, or even inability to accept the information presented in the cue. (Horner, 1972, p. 162)

Thus, Horner's hypothesis that fear of success was more salient in women than in men was confirmed.

She also studied the actual task performance of 30 males and females, first in a large, mixed-sex competitive situation, and subsequently in a strictly noncompetitive but achievement-oriented session. Most of the male subjects did better in the competitive condition, as did most (12 out of 13) of the females who had scored low in fear of success. Of the females who had scored high in the motive to avoid success, 13 out of 17 performed at a significantly lower level in the mixed-sex competitive situation than they showed themselves capable of in a subsequent

noncompetitive condition. Horner considered this to be evidence of the negative effect of fear of success on actual performance.

Numerous studies can be identified which in large part corroborate Horner's findings. Horner (1972) cites three unpublished studies by Harvard Univeristy students which found the fear of success level in undergraduate women to range from 65% to 88.2% (Schwenn, 1970; Watson, 1970; Prescott, 1971), Alper (1974) referred to data gathered in 1970 and 1971 on Wellesley College undergraduates, which indicated that almost 89% of the women told avoidance stories. Caballero, Giles, and Shaver (1975) studied 33 women of varying occupations between the ages of 24 and 40, and found the most evidence of fear of success among nontraditional women, defined as those who favor the women's movement, have more education and hold liberal or radical political beliefs. This confirmed Horner's notion of ambitious, highly achievement-oriented women as those who most often feel anxiety over success.

Caballero et al. (1975) also suggest that the level of fear of success may covary with other variables such as education, achievement motivation, political orientation and social situation, and suggest that those studying fear of success be cognizant of that possibility. They maintain that the introduction of these variables, rather than

detracting from the strength and substance of the concept of fear of success, actually provides an explanation for the variance in level of fear of success noted in the numerous studies that have been done on this issue.

Also cited by Caballero et al. were other studies which generally supported Horner's premise regarding fear of success in women, among them studies by Monahan, Kuhn, and Shaver (1974) and Winchel, Fenner, and Shaver (1974). Spence (1974) generally supports the existence of fear of success as a viable motive in women, although her study indicated a much lower incidence than did Horner's (47% when the stimulus cue was a married woman, 40% when the woman in the verbal lead was described as single). Spence also concludes, as did Caballero et al. (1975), that perhaps the notion of the motive to avoid success needs to be expanded, and attempts to measure it almost necessarily need to include the measurement of other attitudes, expectations, and personal characteristics.

Focusing on the developmental changes in the level of fear of success, Kimball and Leahy (1976) noted that both sexes show an increase in fear of success from grade four to grade 10. In the 10th grade, however, the fear of success level decreases significantly for the males, yet remains consistently high for females, especially those in the college-preparatory program. This finding supported

Horner's contention that fear of success would be greatest among females with the highest capability and for whom success is highly probable.

Fear of success in men. Hoffman (1974) studied University of Michigan undergraduates in the fall of 1971, and found evidence of fear of success in 65% of the women subjects, the same results as those reported by Horner in 1968. Hoffman did find, however, that 77% of the males also exhibited fear of success, a sizable increase over Horner's 1968 figure of 9%.

Similar increases in the number of male responses coded for fear of success imagery were noted by others trying to replicate Horner's original study. Hoffman (1974) cites studies by Horner (1972), Horner and Walsh (1972), and Mausner (1972) as examples. Spence (1974) also found that a large percentage (36%) of the males she studied expressed either mixed or negative responses to the success of the male stimulus figure. In a relatively small scale study of male and female managers, Wood and Greenfield (1976) found that 40% of the men and 30% of the women were scored for fear of success when responding to same-gender cues.

This high incidence of fear of success among male subjects would seem to invalidate the whole concept of fear of success as a motive based on sex-role expectations

and operant mainly in females. Yet Hoffman, Horner, and others do not see it as such. Hoffman (1974), for example, notes that the males' stories seem different in content than those of the women: they seem to question the inherent value of success. She reports that 30% of the males and only 15% of the females scored for the presence of fear of success expressed this type of negative imagery.

High fear of success females, on the other hand, referred 42% of the time to affiliative loss, while only 15% of the males expressing fear of success imagery made such a reference. In his review of over 100 studies dealing with fear of success, Tresemer (1976) notes the same trend, stating:

> It has been found repeatedly that males more often than females wrote cynical, bizarre, pessimistic, hostile and/or joking stories, containing violence, death, devaluation of success and achievement, and doubt about the worth of sacrifice for success. Females more often than males wrote stories depicting (fear of) social rejection, loss of femininity, and affiliative loss. (P. 223)

The conclusion drawn by Horner and her supporters would contend that while male responses have lately shown a greater degree of fear of success imagery, this imagery is of a different nature than that expressed by women. They contend that fear of success in men is merely reflective of the generalized trend in our culture since the late 1960's to question traditional values of hard

driving competition and success at any cost. They would maintain that this occurrence does not have anything to do with, or in any way contradict, the notion of fear of success in women as a motive to avoid the anxiety they have learned to associate with success in traditionally masculine domains.

On the other hand, there are those who would consider the data on increased incidence of fear of success in males as one of many causes for skepticism regarding the veracity of Horner's propositions and the existence of a strong motive to avoid success in women. Studies since Horner's original research in 1968 have almost consistently shown much lower scores in women and much higher scores in men than were reported or anticipated by Horner.

In addition to the studies already cited with these results (i.e., Hoffman, 1974; Spence, 1974; Wood and Greenfeld, 1976), Peplau's 1976 study of 91 dating couples indicated that fear of success was present in the stories of only 30% of the college women she studied, and was present in 44% of the men's stories. Sorrentino and Short (1974) found evidence of fear of success in only 25% of the undergraduate women they studied, and quoted Tresemer's 1974 report on fear of success research as indicating that in some studies, that figure has dipped to 11%.

In a study of British university students, Weinreich-

Haste (1978) found that approximately 50% of each sex was scored for the presence of fear of success, "thus diminishing the power of the argument that motive to avoid success is particularly a consequence of female socialization" (p. 38). She goes on to suggest that the fear of success projective measure is apparently picking up anxiety in males regarding success and failure; yet she adds that there appears to be a qualitative difference between the types of anxiety aroused in males and females, and that this difference needs to be investigated.

Other authors, however, have interpreted high male scores somewhat differently. After administering various measures of fear of success to college juniors and seniors, Sadd, Lenauer, Shaver, and Dunivant (1978), like Weinreich-Haste and others, found that there were no sex differences in the level of concern over the negative consequences of success. In this study, however, contrary to the findings of Weinreich-Haste, the types of negative consequences foreseen by the subjects were the same for both sexes: jealousy, exploitation, social rejection, and excessive pressure and responsibility. The authors' conclusion, however, was ultimately the same as Weinreich-Haste's: that Horner's view of sex role socialization as the cause of fear of success does not adequately explain the phenomenon.

The methodology of fear of success research. There

in some suggestion that the problems with fear of success research "may rest in methodological and not theoretical shortcomings" (Levine, Reis, Turner, and Turner, 1976, p. 390). These and other authors have noted the problems of relying so heavily on projective techniques to measure this or any construct. Certainly the literature is filled with questions regarding the reliability and predictive validity of the verbal TAT in determining the existence of fear of success.

Considering that Horner's theory was formulated in response to some of the findings on achievement motivation in women, it is not surprising that the method she employed paralleled the method most commonly used in the study of achievement motivation (projective techniques). Unlike most researchers in achievement motivation, however, Horner chose to use a verbal rather than a pictorial cue (i.e., "After the first term finals, Anne/John finds herself/himself at the top of her/his medical school class"), a decision which may have added to the many reservations regarding her hypothesis.

Like all projective measures, the method chosen by Horner is difficult to score and has low test-retest reliability (Shaver, 1976). Tresemer (1976) illustrates this problem in his citation of a 1975 study by Moreland and Liss-Levinson in which eight researchers who had

published works on fear of success prior to October, 1974, were asked to score 20 stories written in response to the "Anne" lead. He reports that the average rate of agreement between scorers was .75, not up to the usual standard of .80 for interscorer reliability in thematic measurement.

Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) report a slightly higher level of interscorer reliability, specifically 80-90% in most studies. However, while this indicates that the judges within the particular studies agreed on what did nor did not constitute fear of success imagery, the significant differences between studies in terms of reported occurrence of fear of success (from 20% to 88% in women and from 9% to 76% in men) might, according to Zuckerman and Wheeler, indicate poor intertest reliability.

In support of this contention, they point to the fact that there seems to be no scoring manual for fear of success that is comparable to that designed by Atkinson for achievement motivation. These authors refer to Tresemer's (1974) suggestion that a common coding mistake has been the tendency to label all negative themes in the stories (i.e., references to murder or drugs) and negative events that precede "Anne's" or "John's" success in medical school, as fear of success, when really only negative consequences of success should be labeled as such.

Also cited by Zuckerman and Wheeler was a 1973

study by Robbins and Robbins that indicated that the sex of the judges could affect the fear of success scores. It was found in this study that female judges were more likely to find fear of success imagery in response to the Anne cue than were male judges. There is also a suggestion that when judges can tell the sex of the respondents by the cue they're responding to (i.e., males respond to the John cue and females to the Anne cue), their expectations for the two groups may color how they score the responses. This latter suggestion, however, would not apply to many recent studies of fear of success that have included subjects' responses to cross-sex cues. However, it must be noted that the ramifications of poor reliability are great, implying a lack of predictive validity and inconsistency in results (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975).

Spence (1974), however, sees a highly structured verbal cue like Horner's as even more susceptible than the mildly suggestive TAT stiumulus to the influence of multiple factors, most of which are unrelated to any single stable motive or psychological construct. Because of her belief that fear of success stories in response to Horner's cue are reflective of a variety of factors or phenomena, Spence devised an objective measure to use in conjunction with the projective tests. This measure basically involved a list of objective questions which elicit the same type

of information as the more general verbal TAT cue. Ten multiple choice questions were included, addressing most of the general fear of success themes previously identified in studies (e.g., asking the subjects how they think Anne's husband or classmates would react to her success), and were administered after the projective measure.

An important observation made from the objective test results was in regards to the type of negative imagery present in female responses. Contrary to the findings of Horner and others, there was very little imagery present regarding the fear of social rejection (e.g., the loss of friends or potential marriage partners), or the loss of femininity. Instead, most negative themes had to do with instrumental role conflicts, specifically the demands of family vs. career. Spence concluded:

> These results indicate that the procedure of classifying TAT protocols for presence or absence of negative imagery and treating the resulting percentages as having absolute meaning is a dangerous one. Not only are the percentages influenced by cue content...but the nature of the negative imagery is obscured. A scoring system that permits a description of the manifest content of subjects' responses appears to be mandatory. (1974, p.437)

A potential drawback to Spence's objective measure has been suggested by Shaver (1976). He points out that the specific questions regarding the stimulus figure's marriage plans, attractiveness, etc. are very transparent, and may reveal the purpose of the measure. Shaver does

not see this as a definite problem, however, and suggests that questions that explicitly and directly ask about sex-role stereotypes and role conflicts might elicit answers as valid and truthful as those elicited by the TAT or any associated "veiled" questionnaire.

Shaver (1976) also describes other objectively-scored measures of fear of success, including a questionnaire by Zuckerman and Allison (1976) which has correlated significantly with Horner's measure. Two other measures, one by Pappo (1972) and the other by Cohen (1975) have also been presented, both of which are based on a Freudian conceptualization of fear of success. Shaver adds, however, that neither of these measures has been shown to correlate with Horner's measure, and in fact both seem to be addressing the concept of fear of failure as much as fear of success.

A new empirically based projective measure has been designed by Horner, Tresemer, Berens and Watson (1973) which includes less specific projective cues such as "Betsy seems to be particularly pleased". Shaver (1976), however, notes that it may be suitable only for female subjects, that it has not been cross-validated, and some of its categories seem quite arbitrary. Most importantly, it seems to be measuring something slightly different than the original projective test did, and in fact has been found by Jackaway

and Teevan (1976) to correlate positively and significantly with a well-established measure of fear of failure designed in 1969 by Birney, Burdick and Teevan. This leads to the question of whether or not fear of success is a new construct, or if it is just a part of, or the same as, the widely accepted notion of fear of failure.

The relationship between fear of failure and fear of success. Jackaway and Teevan (1976) have noted some conceptual links between the two constructs. As mentioned in the beginning of this section on fear of success, there are two components or sources of anxiety identified by Horner as the basis of fear of success: fear of loss of femininity and self esteem, and fear of social rejection because of success. These are strikingly similar to two of the three forms failure anxiety can take: fear of having to devalue one's self-estimate, and fear of social devaluation. A third comonent of fear of failure, fear of non-ego punishment (e.g., loss of income, loss of job) is proposed by theorists such as Birney, Burdick, and Teevan, but is apparently not related to fear of success (Kackaway & Teevan, 1976).

Shaver (1976) for one is not particularly alarmed by this similarity, and suggests that Atkinson's model of achievement motivation might be expanded to accomodate both concepts as inhibitors to achievement motivation. He

does, however, look for a clarification of whether they are indeed operationally distinguishable and have the same performance or behavioral consequences.

Sadd, Lenauer, Shaver, and Dunivant (1978) cite Shaver's 1976 argument that the fear of success results obtained by the measures of Cohen (1975), Pappo (1972), and Zuckerman and Allison (1976) can all be just as easily explained in terms of fear of failure. Sadd et al. also referred to the highly significant correlation between Pappo's measure and a scale of the Achievement Anxiety Test (a fear of failure measure) as indicating a similarity between the two constructs. Jackaway and Teevan (1976), comparing the conventional TAT measure of fear of success with Birney et al.'s Hostile Press Scoring System (1969), concluded that "the correlation found between the two measures of fear of success and fear of failure implies a lack of independence between the two motives" (p.289).

Yet Jackaway and Teevan (1976) do note that certain results of their study suggest a more complex relationship between the operation and substance of the two motives than the above statement would indicate. For example, the sensitivity of the fear of success scores to sex and arousal variables might indicate that fear of success measures address a motivational factor that is not being picked up by the fear of failure measures. Jackaway and Teevan also

propose that for women (and men) whose affiliation needs are high and closely related to their achievement needs, fear of success and fear of failure may be equivalent: that is, their fear of social rejection due to success becomes equivalent to what they fear most from failure (affiliative loss).

For those whose affiliation needs are relatively independent of their achievement needs, fear of failure and fear of success may be two distinct components of anxiety over failure. Jackaway and Teevan (1976) describe these components as

> anxiety over objective failure to reach the stated goal, and...anxiety over real or anticipated social rejection stemming from the discrepancy between sex-role standards and the achievement activity. (p. 290)

Thus, the connection between fear of success and fear of failure is a complex one. Most researchers who have compared the two constructs agree with Sadd et al. (1978) that they are "highly related" (p. 405). The extent or nature of this relationship and the resultant implications for the status of fear of success as a viable construct, still needs further study and clarification.

Issues regarding the sample populations used in fear of success research. In terms of issues of experimental design, an additional point has been raised by some of the fear of success researchers. This issue questions the fact that the great majority of research has been done

using college women as subjects, and that the conclusions cannot necessarily be generalized to other, and older, categories of women. There have been studies of other adult women, however, and the results and conclusions are quite varied. Caballero, Giles, and Shaver (1975), for example, studied women between the ages of 24 and 40, and found that generally speaking, Horner's propositions were supported. The proportion of fear of success themes was similar to that found in college students (slightly more than 50%), and in fact some of the stories showed even stronger emotions, including anger. According to Caballero et al., fear of success in these women was based on the threatening conditions they have actually encountered or imagine encountering.

Bremer and Wittig (1980) used volunteers between the ages of 30 and 60 as their subjects, and found that both men and women responded more similarly to success cues than did the younger males and females of the college studies. They explain this as a function of situational perspectives of the two sexes converging with age, or as a function of social movements that affected either the present or older generation.

Claiming that Horner's proposition did not address those women who were already functioning and achieving in competitive situations, Wood and Greenfeld (1976) chose to

study just such women. Like Bremer and Wittig, these researchers found little difference between the fear of success scores of the male and female managers they studied. Wood and Greenfeld attribute this to the womens' learning through experience that success can be very desirable and positive, and that a fear of success is invalid and inappropriate. They state that:

> conclusions based on testing university students cannot be generalized to mature men and women....We need data from a broader representation of men and women who are intensely involved in the dynamics of our social institutions. (p. 387)

Clearly, studies with older subjects have led to some interesting propositions and insight on fear of success, and more such studies should be encouraged.

Alternative explanations for what has been termed "fear of success". There are many researchers who design and interpret their studies based on an acceptance of Horner's view of fear of success as a motive, or stable personality construct. Others seem to have their own ideas about what fear of success really is, and what the projective and objective instruments are actually measuring. Previously discussed was the assertion that fear of success is merely another name for fear of failure, or at least is very similar to it theoretically. Other authors have suggested different explanations, but most of these seem to share some skepticism regarding fear of success as a motive

or intrapsychic variable.

Sorrentino and Short (1974), for example, suggest that the measure of fear of success is actually a measure of ability. Their study of undergraduate women indicated that those high in fear of success, rather than being inhibited by overwhelming anxiety, actually performed better in male-oriented tasks than in female-oriented tasks, contrary to Horner's prediction.

This finding led the authors to hypothesize that Horner's fear of success measure (used in this study) might be picking up some other factor or factors that account for the success of these women on male-oriented tasks. They reasoned that male-oriented tasks are valenced by most women, and society in general, as being more challenging, prestigious, and hard to achieve in than traditionally female tasks. Thus, success at the male-oriented tasks would be more consistent with the self-concepts of high ability women. Consequently, these women would seek out, and do well in, these tasks.

Supporting this contention, Sorrentino and Short describe three ways in which the fear of success measure might actually be tapping ability differences. First, high fear of success women were shown in this study to be more aware of the sex-typing of the tasks than the women low in fear of success. The authors therefore contend that the

negative imagery in their stories, considered evidence of fear of success, is actually a reflection of their sensitivity to the demand characteristics of the verbal cue, and the type of venture described there (i.e., the very real pressures of being at the top of a medical school class).

Sorrentino and Short (1974) further suggest that women high in ability may be writing more creative and unusual stories than women lower in ability, and thus are scored as high in fear of success on the "bizarre response" criterion. Horner found that high fear of success women tended to write bizarre, hostile, or negative responses to a cue as benign as "Anne is sitting in a chair with a smile on her face". She interpreted this as indication that whatever produced fear of success also produced feelings of frustration and hostility. Sorrentino and Short, on the other hand, view this as further evidence that so-called "bizarre responses" have nothing to do with a motive to avoid success, but rather indicate a creativity that is indicative of high ability.

Finally, they suggest that women high in ability may be writing longer stories in response to the verbal cue, and therefore would have a higher probability of mentioning <u>something</u> that would be scored as fear of success. Indeed, Sorrentino and Short (1974) found that women high in fear of success wrote stories that were significantly

longer than those of the low fear of success women. They explained this finding as further evidence that ability, rather than fear of success, is the variable being measured.

While this proposition seems to be a reasonable one, other theoreticians have proposed their own explanations as to what is being labeled by Horner and others as fear of success. Olsen and Willemsen (1978), for example, have indicated that there is no personality trait or characteristic in either women or men that can be termed "fear of success" and cite numerous authors who have made similar conclusions, including Levine and Crumrine (1975), Lockheed (1975), and Monahan, Kuhn, and Shaver (1974). Olsen and Willemsen suggest instead that the focus should be on analyzing the cultural institutions that create conflicting standards of performance, and not on searching for a cause within the individual.

Spence (1974), too, questions the existence of a single psychological construct, more common in women than in men, that causes individuals to fear success and its consequences. She maintains that: "The assumption of a single disposition that is both stable and of early origin can be questioned on both methodological and theoretical grounds" (p. 428) and refers to the way women respond to role incompatibilities as

> a complex interaction among such factors as the personality characteristics of the individual, her current

> values and attitudes, her estimate of the risks associated with a specific set of circumstances, etc. (p. 428)

She suggests that in the discussions of fear of success, "a Procrustean solution is being imposed on a constellation of interwoven factors" (p. 428).

Fear of success as a situational response to cultural expectations. In 1976, Argote, Fisher, McDonald, and O'Neal reported on a study of college men and women who were either accepted or rejected by the partner with whom they had previously competed. Performance on future tasks was most negatively affected when a male partner had either rejected them for succeeding or accepted them for failing. This decrement in performance, termed fear of success behavior by the authors, did not occur when the subjects had previously been accepted after succeeding.

The conclusion by Argote et al. was that it was the anticipation of negative consequences that triggered fear of success behavior rather than some "stable personality disposition peculiar to females" (p. 302). They summarized that "fear of success behavior seems, rather, to be a strategy which may be adopted by members of both sexes in response to environmental contingencies" (p. 302).

This concept of fear of success having a situational, rather than motivational, basis was also supported by the results of Bremer and Wittig's 1980 study. Adult males

and female subjects were given verbal cues that were designed by the experimenters to vary in terms of deviance/non-deviance (that is, the woman was achieving in a traditionally male vs. traditionally female area) and role overload/no role overload (the woman as married with children vs. being single or married with no children.

The results of this study indicated that fear of success imagery for both sexes was much greater in response to cues that involved either deviance or role overload than it was in the non-deviance, no overload situations. Bremer and Wittig (1980) concluded that fear of success imagery is not a function of a psychological barrier to success within the individual. Rather, they suggest that it is a function of how the respondent sees the negative or positive consequences inherent to the woman cue figure's particular situation.

These authors cite previous research which used cross-sex responses (i.e., males responding to a female success figure), including studies by Feather and Raphaelson (1974), Monahan, Kuhn, and Shaver (1974), and Robbins and Robbins (1973). All of these investigators found that male subjects wrote more fear of success stories for female cue figures than for the male cue figures. Since the male subjects presumably did not identify with female cue figures, one general conclusion was reached in all of these

studies: that the fear of success responses in both men and women were a reflection of culturally defined perceptions of female success in competitive situations.

Tresemer's (1976) analysis of fear of success research resulted in the observation that in terms of cross-gender cues, male and female subjects generally respond similarly to cues involving female success, indicating that fear of success might be a reflection of cultural expectations rather than an internal psychological construct. Orlofsky (1981) suggests that fear of success is a response to societal norms rather than a stable internalized motive. He further proposes that the projective measures of fear of success does not measure actual avoidance tendencies, but rather an ambivalence regarding achievement that has its roots in cultural expectations.

In their review of the research that used the projective measure of fear of success, Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) addressed the issue of fear of success as a reflection of cultural sex-stereotyping rather than an internalized need to avoid success. They suggest that the difference Horner noted between the level of fear of success in men and women may have been a function of the sex of the stimulus cue figure (male for male subjects, female for female subjects), and not related to the sex of the subject.

Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) purport that variations in the amount of sex-role deviance implicit in the verbal cues may affect the amount of fear of success imagery that is evoked. These authors cite an unpublished study by Katz (1971) which examines just that. Katz added to Horner's "Anne" cue either the statement that all of Anne's classmates are men, or that half of her classmates are women. The responses of female subjects were not affected by this added information, perhaps because medical school is still a traditionally male domain. The male respondents, however, did show an increase in fear of success imagery when Anne's success was more deviant, suggesting that some cultural influence was involved.

Bremer and Wittig (1980) report that Lockheed in 1975 found results similar to that of Katz. The male students studied by Lockheed expressed more fear of success imagery when the female's success was in a deviant (traditionally male) area as opposed to when the female was in a non-deviant setting. The female subjects, like those studied by Katz, retained fairly stable scores, and were not influenced by the deviancy/non-deviancy of the situation.

In their own study (1980) of older men and women (ages 30-60), Bremer and Wittig found that the results of Lockheed and Katz were not supported. They found that fear of success imagery for <u>both</u> sexes was much greater when

responding to a cue that involved role deviance, than when there was little or no apparent role deviance. Thus, while the extent of role deviance in the stimulus cue appears to be a factor, no real conclusions can be drawn regarding sex differences in response to such cues.

Expanding on the importance of role deviance, Alper (1973) reported that various studies by Wellesley College researchers have shown that dropping the medical school reference from the cue of Anne's being number one in her class, resulted in a significantly lower level of fear of success imagery. She specifically cites an unpublished paper by Grainger, Kostick, and Staley (1970) which showed these results in a study of black and white college women in segregated southern schools.

In addition, Alper in 1974 reported on a study that was in progress at two Eastern colleges. In this study, Alper and her associates altered the stimulus cue to reflect Anne's success in nursing school, rather than in medical school. Preliminary data indicated that the nursing students at the first college responded to the nursing cue with success stories 86% of the time, exhibiting minimal avoidance or fear of success. The female liberal arts students at the other college, however, were unphased by this change, and told success and avoidance stories equally often for both the medical and nursing school cues. This latter

finding, however, may have little to do with fear of success. Instead, Alper explains, it might reflect a devaluing of nursing as a career for women, and a lack of import given to success in that area by liberal arts students.

Hoffman (1974) studied University of Michigan undergraduates, and with half of them altered the cue to indicate Anne's or John's success in a graduate program in child psychology. She found that the variation in the cue did not in any way diminish the amount of fear of success in either males or females. She concluded that this lent support to Horner's original propositions regarding fear of success. Unfortunately, no cross-sex responses were elicited, and may have yielded some intriguing results in terms of the male subjects' views of Anne's success in the two different fields. Because this is lacking, we cannot view Hoffman's results as conclusively denying the theory of fear of success as a reflection of cultural expectations.

The relationship between sex-role identity and fear of success. Beyond more general cultural considerations, the actual link between sex-role identity and fear of success is also unclear. As stated earlier in this section, Horner originally suggested that fear of success would be most prevalent among non-traditional, highly motivated women. She reasoned that these women would desire success,

and that this desire would be something of a prerequisite for any real concern over the consequences of succeeding. Assuming, however, that fear of success inhibits achievement-related behavior, it might be hypothesized that contrary to Horner's premise, women who score high in fear of success may be relatively low achievers and have a traditional sex-role orientation.

Employing both projective and objective measures of fear of success, Orlofsky (1981) found that on the objective measures, fear of success was associated with low masculine, and traditionally feminine orientation. The projective measure in this case, however, showed no difference in the level of fear of success of non-traditional, high achieving women and traditional, low-achieving women.

Orlofsky maintains, nevertheless, that objective tests are the more reliable measures of avoidance, and thus purports that traditional sex-role orientation can be associated with high fear of success. Despite his own inconclusive results with a projective measure, Orlofsky cited a study by Alper (1974) as reporting results which support his conclusions, and in which a projective measure was used. She, too, found a link between women with a traditional sex-role orientation and a high level of fear of success.

Leder (1982) points out that while Horner postulated that the high fear of success women would generally be high

achievers who had successfully competed in the past, it was found in Horner's study that 89% of the girls high in fear of success were majoring in the humanities, indicating some level of traditionality. Contrary to Horner's proposition, the results showed that it was the low fear of success women who seemed to have opted for more non-traditional career fields (56%).

As a result of her own study of fear of success and mathematics achievement, Leder (1982) suggested that there was some tendency among high fear of success high school girls to self-select out of higher level mathematics classes, and to take a course that would make them less obviously successful.

This, however, was not always the case, and thought by Leder to be a function of the girls' developmental and educational stages. For Leder also found that the majority of high fear of success girls did choose to enter and stay in higher level classes, and to perform well in those classes. So while some of the high fear of success high school students chose a traditional, low-achieving path, most of the high fear of success girls did not.

Fear of success was also linked to non-traditional sex-role orientation in a study of significantly older women, ages 24-40, conducted by Caballero, Giles and Shaver (1975). Their study showed fear of success to be

most evident in politically liberal, highly educated females who were sympathetic to the women's liberation movement--in other words, non-traditional women.

Heilbrun, Kleemeier, and Piccola (1974) also found a very high level of fear of success in college women who were highly masculine, identified with their fathers, and expressed a very liberal, non-traditional attitude towards the female role. Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) refer to Tangri's (1974) longitudinal study in which after three years, she reported a positive relationship between fear of success and role innovation (i.e., the choice of non-traditional occupations).

Major (1979) studied the relationship between sex-role orientation and fear of success, and found the androgynous women to be lowest in fear of success, and the sex-reversed (highly masculine) women to be the highest. She suggested two possible explanations for the latter result: these masculine women may have previously rejected traditionally feminine characteristics, may have suffered negative consequences because of it, and now know what to fear; or they may already feel somewhat unfeminine, and may be more anxious about additional loss of that perceived femininity.

Yet some researchers have not found such a clear-cut relationship between traditionality of role orientation

and incidence of fear of success. Peplau (1976), for example, found no relationship between fear of success and sex-role traditionalism or attitudes toward the women's liberation movement. Illfelder (1980) concluded from her study of college women that non-traditional and traditional women were equally likely to be high or low in fear of success, and that there was no evidence of a significant relationship between fear of success and sex-role attitudes. Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) have also found evidence to support this conclusion.

Thus, there seem to be significant questions as to the nature of fear of success, and the situations and persons in which it is most evident. Also of importance is an investigation of the impact of this construct on the behavior or performance of the individual. This, too, is an area of significant controversy.

Behavioral and performance effects of fear of success. Horner (1972) is one who sees the impact of fear of success as far-reaching and very significant. She cites a 1970 study by Schwenn which revealed that high fear of success in college women was linked with a pattern of changing college majors and career plans toward what these women considered to be more traditional, feminine, and less ambitious academic and career programs. Dealing with a relatively small sample, Schwenn found that 11 out of 12

high fear of success women studied had actually changed their aspirations toward a more traditional path, while only one out of the four low fear of success women had done so. Although several of the high fear of success subjects had started out in pre-med programs, at the time of Schwenn's study (their junior year), all of them had changed to traditionally feminine majors like English, foreign languages, history, and fine arts.

Horner (1972) finds this supportive of her observation that of the 90 females in her initial 1968 study, 88.9% of the 59 women high in fear of success were majoring in the humanities, whereas 56% of the 31 women who did not express fear of success imagery were concentrating in the less traditional natural sciences like chemistry and mathematics. Illfelder (1980) cites studies by Fleming (1977), Hoffman (1977) and Spence (1974) as lending empirical support to the proposition that fear of success can influence women's achievement strivings, and in particular their career salience (the centrality of a career in their lives). It seems, then, that fear of success may actually influence the choice of college majors and ultimately the choice of careers in capable young women.

Kimball and Leahy (1976) studied students in the fourth, sixth, 10th and 12th grades, and found that fear

of success increases in both sexes between fourth and 10th grades, and then decreases in males and non-college-prep girls during high school. The girls in the college-prep programs, however, maintain a high level of fear of success through grade 12.

These authors refer to a study by Coleman in 1961 that showed such high-achieving girls as not wanting to stand out academically and tending to get middle range grades. Kimball and Leahy point out that the impact of this presence of fear of success in the most capable and ambitious of high school girls is not only the suppression of their performance in high school; it may also have implications for the formation of their values toward success and the career development process in general.

In terms of goal-setting behavior, Jackaway and Teevan (1976) point to the tendency of females to set lower levels of aspiration and have lower expectations than males. They refer to work by Crandall (1969), Feather (1969), and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) that establishes this pattern. An important implication is the assertion by Jackaway and Teevan that low expectations, quite possibly the result of fear of success and/or fear of failure, have been found to have a negative effect on achievement performance.

Though not specifically addressing the issues of expectations and goal-setting behavior, Horner (1972)

nevertheless hypothesized a similar effect of the motive to avoid success. She proposed that fear of success would inhibit achievement behavior and the tendency to do well, and thus would adversely affect performance, particularly in competitive situations.

In terms of performance, Horner did find that most of the high fear of success females she studied showed a performance decrement when in a mixed-sex, competitive situation. On the other hand, the performance of the females low in fear of success, like that of the males in the study, was enhanced when in the competitive condition. Orlofsky (1981) reports that studies by Makosky in 1976 and Parker in 1972 support this conclusion.

Although their study of fear of success did not include any performance measure, some interesting propositions were presented in the 1975 study by Caballero, Giles, and Shaver. They suggested that although some women high in fear of success may perform well in various types of competitive settings, they might be suffering in areas other than performance (i.e., in terms of health or emotional well-being). This possibility was also addressed by Shaver (1976), who considered such results of fear of success to be extremely serious and ultimately having far-ranging effects on the functioning of the individual.

Yet there has been little, if any, documentation

of such effects, and in general the research on the effects of fear of success has been inconsistent at best. Orlofsky (1981) found that neither objective nor projective fear of success measures could predict performance decrements on a masculine achievement task. He suggests, however, that the results might have been different if male experimenters had been used and the subjects had been asked to perform in a more publicly competitive situation, thereby increasing the salience of sex-role deviant achievement.

Morgan and Mausner (1973) found that high school girls working in non-competitive dyads with male students did lower their performance levels so as not to exceed the boys', or else showed considerable tension over superior performance. Yet such behavior was not linked in any way to the scores from the projective measure of fear of success, leading Morgan and Mausner to warn that generalized traits (i.e., fear of success) cannot justifiably be used to characterize individuals or to predict behavior.

The predictive validity of the fear of success measures was also questioned by Bremer and Wittig (1980). They cited a 1955 study by Pirojnikoff that proposed that persistence, rather than any achievement-related motive, was the best predictor of success in achievement situations. A review of fear of success studies by Condry and Dyer in 1976, as cited by Peplau (1976), concluded that

"there is little support for the contention that Horner's measure differentiates women who will do well or poorly in mixed-sex competitive situations" (p. 67).

Weinreich-Haste (1978) describes the complexity of the issue of predicting behavior from fear of success data:

> Studies of the relationship between competitive behavior and motive to avoid success indicate that there is a complex interaction between the sex of the competitors, the extent to which the area of competition is regarded as male-specific, and the degree of traditional sex-role orientation of the subjects. (Horner, 1970, 1972; Alper, 1973; Heilbrun, Kleemeier & Piccola, 1974; Levine, 1975). (p. 38)

Peplau (1976) is one researcher who also identified the significance of sex-role attitudes in determining women's performance, while considering the effects of fear of success as "small and elusive" (p. 567). She maintains that sex-role traditionality does determine the performance of women in competitive and non-competitive settings; but that fear of success, as a variable independent of sex-role orientation, has no effect on behavior. She concludes that "an image of high fear of success women as intellectually disabled by achievement conflicts is unwarranted. Nor do (these) women...have a generalized fear of mixed-sex competition" (p. 567). Similarly, Illfelder (1980) has noted that only when in conjunction with traditional sex-role attitudes does fear of success suppress career salience in women.

Tresemer (1976) notes the relatively few studies addressing the effects of fear of success on performance, and refers to their results as mixed. Argote, Fisher, McDonald, and O'Neal (1976) observe that there is a lack of reported positive relationships between the projective measure of fear of success and behavioral indices of success (e.g., academic performance). Davis (1976) reports that Karabenick and Marshall in 1974 found no performance differences in women high or low in fear of success, and saw no change when a competitive situation with either men or women were involved.

Beyond references to inconsistent data and lack of evidence that fear of success has a negative effect on performance, there is also some evidence that fear of success has a positive effect: that is, it is linked in some studies to increased performance in competitive situations. Sorrentino and Short (1974), for example, found that the undergraduate women who were high in fear of success performed better in male-oriented tasks, when in competition with an experimentally imposed standard of performance. Unfortunately, however, although some of the tasks were considered to be male-relevant, no males were involved in the competition, and so it is unknown what effect their presence would have had on the results.

Wood and Greenfeld (1974) found that among their

sample of 19 female managers, those high in fear of success were promoted at a slightly faster rate than those women found to be low in fear of success, although the opposite pattern was noted for the high and low fear of success men. Heilbrun, Kleemeier, and Piccola (1974) found that one group of young women shown to be high in fear of success was unresponsive when competing with females, but showed a significant increase in level of performance when competing with males.

Perhaps the most comprehensive argument questioning the negative impact of fear of success, however,is the observation that male subjects have increasingly been scored as exhibiting a motive to avoid success, yet they have continued to succeed, and retain power, in numerous competitive settings. Until this disparity in the effects of fear of success can be explained, it will be difficult to establish any type of causal relationship between fear of success and inhibited achievement behavior.

Summary. In summary, fear of success, or the motive to avoid success, was first posited by Horner in 1968 in an attempt to account for the observed variance between male and female responses to achievement-oriented cues. Horner proposed that women have learned to fear negative consequences of their success, specifically a perceived loss of femininity and a loss of social approval Their

anxiety over these negative effects, according to Horner, would tend to inhibit their achievement motivation and their achievement behavior.

Horner's 1968 study indicated, via a projective measure, that the college women she studied did display some negative thoughts and feelings about a female stimulus cue figure who was described as achieving in a traditionally male field. The male subjects, however, expressed no such negative thoughts regarding a male figure's success. Numerous other studies reported similar results, although studies conducted in the early 1970's began to report a much higher incidence of fear of success in male subjects than originally found by Horner (Hoffman, 1974).

This evidence seemed to contradict the concept of fear of success as a stable, enduring motive in women arising from sex-role socialization. Supporters of Horner, on the other hand, claimed that the males' negative responses were qualitatively different from the females', and that something other than fear of success was being measured in the males. Yet this seemingly contradictory data was only the start of the plethora of studies challenging the existence and significance of this alleged "motive to avoid success".

Significant methodological problems have been identified regarding the measurement of fear of success. The

projective measure used by Horner and the majority of fear of success researchers has been shown to have poor inter-test reliability, since no manual for scoring was available. Beyond the problems usually associated with projective measures, in the case of fear of success measurement sex of the judge and sex of the subject was shown to have some influence on how a subject's responses were scored. Attempts have been made to devise objective measures of fear of success, yet most of these measures have been shown to have little correlation with the projective measure that was the very basis of Horner's original proposition.

Significantly, some of these objective measures of fear of success have been shown to correlate highly with widely accepted measures of the established construct of fear of failure. Analysis of these two constructs by Jackaway and Teevan (1976) and Shaver (1976) have shown them to be slightly different, yet highly related to one another, lending support to those who challenge the existence of fear of success as a new, independent, and viable construct, a generalized characteristic in women that casts doubt on their chances for success in competitive or traditionally male endeavors.

Generally, there seems to be a large and active group of fear of success researchers who question the concept of fear of success as a stable motive or intrapsychic variable

in women, which insidiously affects and often determines their achievement strivings. It has been suggested that what has been identified as fear of success may actually be a high level of ability, or even a realistic awareness of the high price of success in our society (i.e., taking time away from family and friends).

Suggesting that there is no personality trait or characteristic in either men or women that can be termed "fear of success", some have described this phenomenon as situationally determined, a response to environmental contingencies. The variance in data among the studies has resulted in the suggestion (e.g., Spence, 1974) that the way women (or men) respond to competitive or achievement situations that may or may not involve sex-role incompatibility, is not determined by one motive or construct. Rather, it is the result of an interaction of a variety of factors such as current achievement values, personality, sex-role orientation, and perception of risk in a particular situation.

The inability to conclusively link fear of success to such a stable variable as sex-role orientation may be taken as an example of the complexity of this concept. Some studies have shown that fear of success occurs mainly in non-traditional, achievement-oriented women, while others have shown it to be most prevalent in highly feminine, traditional women. Still others have found mixed results,

and no evident correlation between fear of success and sex-role orientation.

The observation that at times these two constructs are linked and at times they are not, lends support to a situational approach to the phenomenon termed fear of success. Studies have shown that the level of fear of success imagery can be altered by experimental manipulation of the stimulus cue figure and the situation in question (e.g., Bremer & Wittig, 1980). This observation would lead to the conclusion that perhaps generalizations cannot accurately be made regarding women and their behavior based on the proposition of fear of success.

In fact, the data on the effect of fear of success on performance and behavior ranges from inconclusive to contradictory. There are those who maintain that fear of success is linked to a lowering of career aspirations and expectations for success in college women. There is also some evidence linking a high level of fear of success to decreased performance on mixed-sex, competitive tasks. On the other hand, several studies have seriously challenged the predictive validity of fear of success measures, and there is even evidence that a high level of fear of success can actually enhance women's competitive performance.

Viewing the research on fear of success in terms of

the initial question posed in this paper, that is the effect of this variable on women's participation and success in traditionally male career fields, the implications are mixed. To some extent, Horner's proposition and the resultant research do imply and point to a characteristic negative response of many women (and men) to stories of a female achieving in a non-traditional endeavor. Yet whether this "response " has implications for the women's own career choices and achievement behavior is so mixed as to defy any attempts to make generalized conclusions.

At times, a "fear of success" or fear of role-inappropriate achievement, does seem to arouse negative thoughts or feelings in certain women. Yet, whether this concern is great enough to be termed anxiety, and whether this fear is powerful enough to subdue very real achievement strivings in women, have not been consistently or conclusively proven, despite a myriad of research.

To maintain that there is a basic and generalized sex difference on this alleged personality dimension has extremely serious implications. In addition, as Olsen and Willemsen (1978) suggest, it tends to put the blame on the victim, and draw attention to the individual--when, indeed, we would best be served by more attention to the cultural and societal influences that seem to be at the core of this phenomenon. As was concluded in the section on

achievement motivation, perhaps the etiology of sex-role conditioning, and the perpetuation of these stereotypes by structures within our culture, would be the most promising areas in which to focus future research on sex differences.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Restatement of Purpose

As originally stated in Chapter 1 of this paper, the purpose of this analysis was two-fold: first, to gain insight into the reasons for women's present status in the work place and second, to draw conclusions as to the possibilities for increased future success in traditionally male career structures. This purpose was to be accomplished through an in-depth analysis of two psychological constructs, achievement motivation and fear of success. Each of these areas has generated much research, a large part of it addressing the purported sex differences on these variables.

Following an examination of the present career status of women, was a survey of historical and socio-psychological perspectives on the issue of women and careers. In Chapter III, a detailed analysis was made of the two constructs, achievement motivation and fear of success, in an attempt to determine their relative impact on women's participation and success in traditionally male, higher level careers. A synthesis and evaluation of that information follows in this chapter.

Achievement Motivation

Discussion and Recommendations. Achievement motivation is a much researched and generally accepted psychological construct. Numerous authors have established positive correlations between level of achievement motivation and such variables as performance on verbal and arithmetic tasks (Lowell, 1952), emergent leadership (Sorrentino, 1973), persistence (Edwards & Waters, 1981; Atkinson & Feather, 1966), and the tendency to attribute success to internal causes, a pattern often linked to success in goal-setting and problem-solving activities (Weiner & Kukla, 1970; Bar-Tal & Frieze, 1977; Bartsch & Hackett, 1979). The implications are that the level of achievement motivation may be an important factor in career success for both men and women.

The question of whether or not there are sex differences in the level or operation of this motive, however, is a more controversial issue. As early as 1950, differences were noted in the way female and male subjects responded to achievement-related cues (Veroff). While more recent studies have addressed and supported such differences, it is important to note that there is still a great deal of research which has focused on, and provided evidence of, very similar need and structures in both men and women.

Some theorists, for example, purport that women's

performance and success behavior is actually motivated by a need for affiliation (love and acceptance) rather than a need for achievement (e.g. Hoffman, 1972). Other studies, however, have provided evidence to the contrary. In some studies, for example, level of affiliation motivation has been found to be equal in men and women (Dipboye, 1978; Jagacinski & LeBold, 1981). Two major literature reviews on achievement motivation (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Stein & Bailey, 1973) have refuted the existence of sex differences in these areas. In both cases, the authors concluded that a strong achievement motive is operant in women and, as is the case with men, this need generally motivated their achievement strivings.

In general, it appears that a great deal of the recent research on the topic (i.e., that done in the late 1970's and early 1980's) has supported the contention that males and females are quite similar in their need to achieve, the value placed on social relationships, etc. One suggestion is that this is a reflection of a difference in the approach, beliefs, or expectations with which the more recent research has been undertken. On the other hand, it may be indicative of a definite change in women over the last 34 years, particularly over the last decade.

The explanation cited by those who emphasize differences between the sexes (e.g., Hoffman, 1972) points to

early childhood experiences as the primary source of a distinctly feminine or masculine need structure. Yet such emphasis on the import of this early experience precludes the effect of other significant life experiences. These experiences may engage the affect of maturing young women, and actually teach them a new manner of responding to traditionally masculine, achievement-oriented cues.

An interesting area for future research would be an analysis of the research to date in an attempt to identify any trend or pattern in the relative levels of affiliation and achievement needs in both men and women from 1950 to the present. Also, a longitudinal study of one group of women, or an ongoing analysis of one category of women (e.g., University of Michigan seniors) might yield some interesting conclusions on these dimensions.

A strong possibility is that these studies, and others done in the future, would point to more similarities than differences between the sexes. Even a number of theorists who have reported women's achievement behavior as often channeled to sex-appropriate areas (homemaking, cooking, etc.) do not deny a powerful need for achievement in women (Hyde & Rosenberg, 1978; Stein & Bailey, 1973). As options become more open for women, and the range of "acceptable" outlets for their achievement strivings increases, it is highly probable that the patterns and expression of

achievement motivation in women will become increasingly similar to those of their male counterparts.

Perhaps one of the most viable premises set forth in recent achievement motivation research is that within-sex differences are greater than between-sex differences. That is, women may vary in terms of their individual motivational patterns, as do men. Non-traditional, career-oriented women, for example, may be high in achievement and relatively low in the need for affiliation. Their counterparts who seek out traditionally feminine lifestyles or careers, on the other hand, may exhibit another pattern.

A possible adjunct to this theory is the idea that significant life experiences can alter these motivational patterns to some degree. In this case, cultural changes (in attitudes, child-rearing practices, etc.) may provide the necessary climate for exploration and acceptance of individualized, often non-traditional need structures in both men and women.

There is a suggestion that the motivational pattern of the individual may be related to his or her sex-role orientation, and further exploring the possibility of such a positive correlation would be another area of interest in terms of future research. Could psychological masculinity, or perhaps androgyny, be related to, or predictive of, a high level of achievement motivation? If so, the

nature of this relationship (e.g., causal, interactive) requires further clarification.

An important and related aspect of sex-role identification is that it implies internalization of the values and goals of the group identified with. Once recognizing the value of attaining "traditionally masculine" goals, women characterized as psychologically masculine (or possibly androgynous) would pursue those goals with energy and persistence. They would probably self-select into courses of study and careers that would allow them to attain the goals they have learned to value. These women would probably be found in traditionally male career structures, and would share the males' chances of success.

Those women who do not see these goals as worth attaining would probably not strive for, or succeed in, a goal structure they have not "bought into" or internalized--regardless of their levels of achievement motivation. They would probably self-select into structures where the goals seem more compatible with their self-images. If they find themselves, e.g., by virtue of intelligence or familial expectations, in career structures that have little personal relevance for them, they probably will be only moderately successful at best, and possibly quite dissatisfied--as will their male associates who have not internalized the goal structure of the dominant group.

In general, then, the following premises have been advanced regarding achievement motivation:

1. There is much evidence refuting the proposition that women's achievement behavior is motivated by a need for affiliation.

2. Recent research has revealed an increasing similarity between the relative need structures of men and women in terms of affiliation and achievement.

3. Within-sex differences in motivational patterns (i.e., achievement, affiliation) are greater than between-sex differences.

4. The tendency among some women to channel their achievement drives to sex-appropriate areas will become less obvious as the range of acceptable options for women increases.

5. Significant life experiences can alter motivational patterns and may, to some extent, counteract the influence of early childhood experiences. Cultural changes, too, may facilitate the adoption of individualized, often non-traditional need structures in both men and women.

6. Sex-role orientation may be highly related to, and possibly predictive of, the individual's pattern of motivation in terms of achievement and affiliation.

7. Once learning to place a high attainment value on traditionally male goals, women with masculine, or

possibly androgynous, sex-role orientations will likely seek out, and successfully compete in, traditionally male career structures.

On the basis of these premises, the following suggestions for future research can be made:

1. Analysis of the achievement motivation research to date in an attempt to identify any trends or patterns in the relative motivational levels of men and women from 1950 to the present.

2. A longitudinal analysis of women, to allow for observation and identification of changing need structures.

3. An ongoing analysis of one category of women (e.g., seniors at the University of Michigan) to determine changing need structures.

4. More research into the relationship of sex-role orientation to the patterns of achievement and affiliation motivation.

5. An investigation into possible remedial programs for women functioning in, or interested in, non-traditional careers.

Conclusions. In light of the stated rationale for, or purpose of, this paper, the following conclusions can be made. First, achievement motivation is a viable, well-documented, and measurable psychological construct. It is almost universally considered to be related to successful

performance on a variety of tasks and in a number of situations.

Contradictory evidence, however, has been presented as to the alleged sex differences in level of achievement motivation, and the question is still being disputed. However, even those researchers who emphasize differences between the sexes generally bring in an ancillary factor to explain those differences, rather than blatantly deny the viability of achievement motivation in women.

For example, one of the major propositions regarding women and this motive that has been advanced in the last decade suggests that a strong affiliation need takes precedence over achievement needs. Yet this assertion, heatedly disputed and not convincingly documented, points to the importance of cultural conditioning, is subject to change during the individual's lifetime, and in principle neither disputes the existence of, nor directly challenges, achievement motivation in women.

A second major proposition submitted by those who have doubts about the efficacy or importance of achievement motivation in women admit that the motive is strong in both sexes, yet purport that women often choose sex-appropriate outlets for their very real achievement strivings. The interesting aspect of this argument, as with the previous proposition, is that the sex differences

noted, besides being contradicted by numerous studies, are based on cultural conditioning, and therefore are subject to change as those influences are modified.

Consequently, it appears that based on the research and analysis presented here, the construct of achievement motivation is not in itself the source of any potential problems for women pursuing careers in higher-level, non-traditional fields. The motive, admittedly associated with success in many endeavors, has generally been shown to be an important, if at times misdirected, part of the female personality. Most of the observed sex differences in this area are symptomatic of years of sex-role conditioning, and are amenable to change.

Changes in the cultural climate regarding sex-appropriate skills and careers will be important, and may already be underway. Also called for is an increased awareness on the part of women in the appropriateness of their value and goal structures, in light of new options available to them. Finally, the male-oriented careers structures must increase their efforts to remove the barriers within the job setting which extinguish female ambitions and preclude women's success within those structures.

Fear of Success

Discussion and Recommendations. Fear of success is a concept that has been the object of much research and

speculation since it was proposed by Horner in 1968. On one hand, it has been heralded as the explanation for observed or alleged sex differences in numerous and varied situations. On the other hand, it has been branded by many as an unfounded, ill-advised and/or redundant concept that does little more than perpetuate the sex role stereotyping that is the real cause for any apparent sex differences. The most correct assessment of this construct is perhaps somewhere between these two points of view. Fear of success is an interesting construct with a fair amount of documentation, yet seems fraught by many theoretical and methodological questions.

Many fear of success researchers, even some of which shared results similar to those of Horner and her proponents, have raised serious doubts as to what is actually being observed or measured. Instead of agreeing with Horner's contention that women are plagued by an anxiety over success that motivates them to a type of self-sabotage, these researchers have drawn other conclusions.

It has been purported, for example, that it is actually a high level of ability that is being labeled as a "fear of success" (Sorrentino & Short, 1974). Others suggest that the concept may merely be a rehashing or elaboration of the recognized construct termed fear of failure (Jackaway & Teevan, 1976; Sadd, Lenauer, Shaver & Dunivant,

1978). Still other authors contend that it is a constellation of variables that is being measured, variables such as current values, perceived risk in a given situation, etc. (Spence, 1974).

The suggestion that fear of success is situational, rather than motivational, in nature is perhaps the most viable explanation for what has been observed in studies by Hoffman, Horner, and others. Rather than saying that fear of success is a personality trait or a stable motive, this proposition implies that it is a situational strategy. That is, effort or energy is held back when the elements of the particular situation imply an exceptional risk of sex-role deviance and cultural censure.

The important part of this concept is the temporal nature of this strategy--that it is, in effect, chosen by the individual and employed selectively. Also important to note is the cultural basis of this learned strategy. The suggestion would be that once cultural expectations of sex-role appropriateness become less rigid, this strategy will lose much of its validity and gradually become extinguished. The entire proposition of fear of success as a situational response to cultural expectations seems quite plausible, and provides an interesing explanation for the types of responses elicited in much of the fear of success research.

One of the most surprising and potentially critical observations made in more recent studies is the ever-increasing number of males who seem to be exhibiting a significant level of fear of success. Although Horner and others explain that the TAT responses elicited in males are qualitatively different from those elicited in females, this has very little empirical or theoretical support. Furthermore, it would tend to cast serious doubt on the reliability of the methodology employed.

What it might indeed indicate is that men, as well as women, are more and more able to recognize the personal costs of success, and are expressing that ambivalence in their responses, just as women have been doing for years. In fact, the percentage of males expressing a high level of fear of success has been documented as high as 77% (Hoffman, 1974), and has typically ranged about 40%. Whatever the figures, they are very often higher than the female students or managers in the same study (Wood & Greenfeld, 1976; Peplau, 1976).

If these results are valid, and the preceding analysis correct, the implications for the construct of fear of success are indeed serious. First, such a suggestion refutes the concept as originally proposed and defined by Horner--that is, fear of success as a stable aspect or motive within the female personality, acquired early in

life and intrinsically linked to sex-role identity.

Also, the males who have scored highly in these studies and supposedly fear success are evidently still able to rise above this "fear", and are continuing to succeed, and retain power, in mixed-sex, competitive settings (i.e., universities or businesses). No suggestion is made to the contrary, and leads to the supposition that women, too, even those high in the fear of success, will not find this factor, condition, or tendency to be at all debilitating, or predictive of any lack of success in a given field or endeavor.

To the extent, however, that some women may feel concern over a perceived loss of femininity as they venture into traditionally male career areas, the premise of fear of success theory opens some interesting possibilities for research. Shaver (1976) and Caballero, Giles and Shaver (1975) have suggested that this "fear" or concern may be taking its toll on women in areas other than performance (i.e., in terms of health or emotional well-being). This is an area that is gaining more research attention, and justifiably so. Perhaps fear of success measures and concepts will play an important role in identifying correlations and trends, and in the development of programs addressing such concerns.

In general, the entire issue of the behavioral and

performance effects of fear of success is a cloudy one. There is some support for the contention that high fear of success in women may be linked to their choosing a more traditional college major and/or career, setting lower aspirations, and inhibiting task or classroom performance when in competition with males. (Horner, 1972; Kimball & Leahy, 1976; Jackaway & Teevan, 1976).

On the other hand, a number of authors have concluded that women's performance on male-oriented or other tasks cannot be predicted by fear of success data. They find no differences in performance, goal setting, etc., that can be traced to high or low levels of fear of success (Orlofsky, 1981; Morgan & Mausner, 1973; Argote, Fisher, McDonald & O'Neal, 1976). There are even those who claim it can be a competitive advantage for both men and women, although data on this point is sketchy (Wood & Greenfeld, 1974; Heilbrun, Kleemeier, & Piccola, 1974).

At any rate, some questions can be raised regarding the type of data being used to make assumptions about fear of success and performance. For example, what type of tasks are being studied (i.e., rote memory, word identification), and how related are those types of skills to actual performance in a higher-level career, or even in a university setting? How do fear of success scores relate to actual college or on-the-job performance in terms of grades

or supervisors' evaluations? Research of this type is quite limited. Finally, how often is job interaction between a male and female co-worker as blatantly competitive as the experimental conditions established in fear of success performance research? Can conclusions be drawn and inferences made regarding career issues from the type of research generally being done on fear of success?

Some contend that the answer to the last question is no--and suggest that the type of studies being done and the subjects being used may not be the most valid for drawing conclusions applicable to older women pursuing careers in non-traditional settings (Bremer & Wittig, 1980; Wood & Greenfeld, 1976). It is suggested that more studies be conducted within the job structure, using older, more experienced subjects with performance records that could then be compared to their fear of success scores.

This is just one of the many methodological issues being raised regarding fear of success research. The verbal TAT cue used by Horner and most fear of success researchers has been the object of much criticism. As with any projective measure, the results are difficult to score and low test-retest reliability is a problem (Shaver, 1976). Poor interscorer reliability has also been identified (Tresemer, 1976), since no scoring manual has been available and ratings are quite subjective in nature.

In an attempt to eliminate some of these problems, objective tests to measure fear of success have been designed, but with rather unsuccessful results. In general, those presented to date have not correlated well with Horner's projective measure, and in other cases have seemed disconcertingly similar to standard fear of failure measures (Spence, 1974; Shaver, 1976). The difficulties in this area may be further indication of some very real problems with the clarity and theoretical soundness of the fear of success construct itself.

In summary, the basic premises regarding fear of success are as follows:

1. There is significant disagreement over what is actually being observed or measured in fear of success research. Suggestions regarding what is being observed have included fear of failure, a high level of ability, or a constellation of variables.

2. Rather than being a stable motive or personality trait, fear of success appears to be situational or temporal in nature.

3. Fear of success as a learned, selectively employed strategy implies the influence of cultural expectations. As these expectations change, so should the validity and frequency of this type of response.

4. The significant increase in the number of male

subjects exhibiting high levels of fear of success presents a serious challenge to the basic definition and premise of the concept.

5. Fear of success in either men or women may indicate an ambivalence about success, based on a realistic appreciation of the personal costs of a high level of academic or career achievement.

6. The reportedly high levels of fear of success in males have evidently not precluded their seeking out, and succeeding in, mixed-sex, competitive settings. The supposition would then be that fear of success in women cannot be considered predictive of their having problems achieving success in these areas.

7. The data on the performance effects of fear of success is contradictory, and cannot be easily generalized to the career setting.

8. The projective test commonly used in fear of success research has been found to present significant problems in terms of scoring and reliability. Attempts to design objective measures of fear of success have been relatively unsuccessful.

Based on these premises, the following suggestions for research can be made:

1. Further investigation into the relationship of fear of success and fear of failure.

2. Continued research into the ways in which fear of success in both men and women may be taking its toll in areas other than performance (e.g., health, emotional well-being.

3. Studies which incorporate a more direct comparison of fear of success data with actual academic and job performance records (i.e., grades, supervisors' evaluations).

4. More research using older (non-college) subjects, conducted within the job structure.

5. Further attempts to develop an objective measure which will correlate highly with the projective test.

Conclusions. Based on the analysis of fear of success presented in this and the preceding chapter, certain conclusions can be made. First, unlike achievement motivation, fear of success has not yet been generally accepted as a motive or stable aspect of the female (or male) personality. The debate continues as to what fear of success research is actually addressing, and a convincing argument has been made regarding the situational nature of this phenomenon.

Although initial fear of success research showed female subjects to score higher than males on this dimension, many recent studies have shown males to have equal or higher fear of success scores. Suggestions that

their fears are qualitatively different from those of women have been directly refuted, and cast a negative light on the specificity of fear of success methodology and the clarity of the theory and definitions.

In general, it is important to consider the paucity of conclusive data on the behavioral and performance effects of fear of success. This is especially evident in terms of the skills most applicable to a professional or semi-professional career (e.g., leadership, persistence, initiative). Few studies have been done within the career structure, and few with non-college subjects. Finally, almost all fear of success research conducted to date is subject to the methodological shortcomings inherent to the verbal projective test, and mentioned previously in this paper.

In conclusion, there is little reason to point to fear of success as the reason why women have moved rather slowly towards equal representation and positions of power within male-dominated career structures. Although they might very well harbor concerns or some sense of role conflict over their positions in these structures, there is just not enough information with which to make evaluations or predictions on the extent or tangible effects of this concern.

This is so despite a tremendous amount of research

interest. Perhaps the implication is that women's concerns and conflicts are not best addressed by searching for sex differences in the psychological makeup of men and women. Rather, research focus might need to be shifted to the etiology of sex-role conditioning, and the role of structures within our culture in perpetuating stereotypes and imposing barriers to the full expression of women's potentiality.

Comparison of the Two Constructs

Discussion and Recommendations. The two constructs of achievement motivation and fear of success are conceptually linked. As mentioned in Chapter III, the hypothesis that women are motivated to avoid success was proposed by Horner in 1968 in an attempt to explain the reported variance between male and female responses in studies of achievement motivation.

Both constructs are generally measured through a projective test, and therefore share some of the same methodological shortcomings, including scoring difficulty and questionable reliability. Fear of success research, however, has more often been the object of criticism. Among the comments made are those regarding the problems encountered trying to correlate the projective measure with an objective measure (Shaver, 1976), the lack of a scoring manual, suggestions of sex-biased judging and below standard interscorer reliability (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975),

and the susceptibility of the highly structured verbal cue to multiple factors beyond the single motive it allegedly measures (Spence, 1974).

Both constructs could benefit from more research of older adult subjects, since in general the conclusions made extend to statements regarding career success and lifestyle issues. It is interesting to note that while fear of success research has been quite prolific through the late 1970's and early 1980's, there seems to have been a relative slackening off of achievement motivation research (Alper, 1974). Perhaps this is because the construct of ahievement motivation has withstood many tests, and has remained theoretically sound and generally accepted as a stable, important motive in both men and women. The concept of fear of success, however, whether because of its relative newness or some important theoretical or methodological shortcomings, is still questioned by many, and seems to defy any conclusive statements or categorization. Its validity, uniqueness and mere existence in either sex is still being questioned.

The respective relationships of these two constructs to the concept termed fear of failure is unclear and warrants additional research. It has been proposed that fear of success might be equivalent to fear of failure, or at any rate is closely linked to it conceptually (Jackaway

& Teevan, 1976; Sadd, Lenauer, Shaver, & Dunivant, 1978). Achievement motivation research, however, seems to lack much analysis of fear of failure and its possible influence on observed data. Perhaps future studies could analyze more closely the role of fear of failure in inhibiting achievement behavior. It is possible that the insight sought by those who initially hypothesized a fear of success may be readily available with existing, well-documented motives or constructs (i.e. fear of failure).

Initial research on both constructs showed significant sex differences in the subjects' responses to pictorial or verbal TAT cues. Yet it is significant that recent research on both constructs seem to be indicating more similarity between male and female responses and motivational patterns (Stein & Bailey, 1973; Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980, Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Further cross-variable analysis of these research results with cultural changes, employment statistics, etc. might yield some intriguing results, and significant insight into the bases of these constructs.

Future research in these two areas might include consideration of the sex-role orientation of the subjects, and how that factor might relate to the observed incidence of the two motives in question. The observation by achievement motivation researchers Orlofsky and Stake (1981) that within-sex differences in level of achievement

motivation may be greater than between-sex differences, might very plausibly be extended to the occurrence of fear of success. If this is the case, sex-role orientation may be the key to predicting or understanding the variance in levels of achievement motivation and fear of success.

Within-sex and between-sex differences in levels of both achievement motivation and fear of success, and the temporal and situational nature of their patterns of occurrence, point to the importance of cultural factors in an analysis of these constructs and their implications. Level of achievement motivation and incidence of fear of success seem to be conceptually linked to expectations and concern over the sex-appropriateness of behavior.

Perhaps as these expectations are eased, and traditionally male success becomes more attainable, accessible, and appropriate for women, researchers will note a lessening in the occurrence of achievement-related conflicts. Correspondingly, any performance decrements or behavioral effects should appear less frequently.

Finally, in terms of this comparison of the two constructs, the following general suggestions can be made regarding future research:

1. Further work attempting to develop objective measures for each of these variables.

2. More use of older subjects, and more studies

done within the job structure.

3. A further analysis of the relationships of these two constructs to fear of failure, and the effects of that variable on achievement-related behavior.

4. Further cross-variable and/or temporal analysis of fear of success and achievement motivation, in an attempt to better understand changes in both male and female scores.

5. Research into the relationships between sex-role orientation and the constructs of achievement motivation and fear of success.

6. An in-depth exploration of other psychological constructs which may have some bearing on the main issue presented in this paper: the likelihood of women succeed-in non-traditional careers. A suggested area of research is that of causal attribution, which, like the two constructs studied here, has been shown to have significant bearing on how women are motivated and how well they perform. Sex differences, too, have been noted in the attributional patterns of men and women, and investigating the etiology of these differences may provide additional insight into the career issues explored in this paper.

Conclusions. The conclusion of this analysis, then, is that neither the level of achievement motivation nor the level of fear of success can adequately explain or predict a woman's chances for success in a higher-level,

traditionally male career. Neither construct has been shown to be consistently linked to performance and/or success, nor can one type of score on either dimension be considered typical of the female response. Based on the data reviewed in this paper, a likely observation in the future will be fewer sex differences on these dimensions, and a turning away from the long held and somewhat questionable premise that women are psychologically quite different from men.

For the indications are that while women (and men) do have some concerns over sex-role expectations, and that these concerns may at times be manifested in their behavior, these concerns do not necessarily signify stable, basic and immutable differences in need or personality structure. Rather, these concerns and the resultant behavior may be precipitated by cultural conditioning and expectations. This conditioning is, in turn, reinforced and validated by family, educational, and career structures, all of which are amenable to change.

As previously suggested, perhaps it is time to direct more research efforts towards an examination of the etiology of culturally imposed sex-role expectations. Focus would then be on investigating, eliminating and counteracting the attitudinal and structural barriers which may hold much of the responsibility for women's present status in non-traditional, higher-level careers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, S. Informal interaction patterns of professional women. In M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, & M. Williams (Eds.), Women in management: Proceedings of the conference "Women and men--Colleagues in management?" Austin, Tx.: Center for Social Work Research, the University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Alper, T. G. The relationship between role orientation and achievement motivation in college women. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 9-31.

Alper, T. G. Achievement motivation in college women: A now-you-see-it--Now-you-don't phenomenon. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 194-203.

American Management Association. Executive personality and job success. (Personnel Series. No. 120). New York: Author, 1948.

Argote, L. M., Fisher, J. E., McDonald, P. J., & O'Neal, E. C. Competitiveness in males and females: Situational determinants of fear of success behavior. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 295-304.

Atkinson, J.W. Recall of successes and failures related to differences in need for achievement. American Psychologist, 1951, 6, 315. (Abstract)

Atkinson, J. W., & Feather, N. T. A theory of achievement motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Bar-Tal, D., & Frieze, I. H. Achievement motivation for males and females as a determinant of attributions for success and failure. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1977, 3, 301-313.

Bardwick, J. M. Psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bartsch, K., & Hackett, G. Effect of a decision-making course on locus of control, conceptualization, and career planning. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1979, 20, 230-235.

Baruch, R. The achievement motive in women: Implications for career development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 260-267.

Basil, D. C. Women in management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Baugher, S. L., & Martin, B. B. Women in the administrative marketplace. Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, 1981, 57, 79-83.

Birney, R., Burdick, H., & Teevan, R. Fear of failure. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1969.

Bowman, G., Worthy, N., & Greyser, S. Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43(4), 14-17; 20; 22; 24-26; 28; 164; 166; 168-170; 172; 174-176; 177.

Bremer, T. H., & Wittig, M. A. Fear of success: A personality trait or a response to occupational deviance and role overload? Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1980, 6, 27-46.

Brenner, O. C., & Tomkiewicz, J. Job orientation of males and females: Are sex differences declining? Personnel Psychology, 1979, 32, 741-750.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Caballero, C. M., Giles, P., & Shaver, P. Sex-role traditionalism and fear of success. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1975, 1, 319-326.

Canavan-Gumpert, D., Garner, K., & Gumpert, P. The success-fearing personality. Lexington, MA.: D. C. Heath, 1978.

Canter, R. J. Achievement-related expectations and aspirations in college women. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1979, 5, 453-470.

Chapman, B. Comparison of male and female leadership styles. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18, 645-650.

Cocks, J. How long till equality? Time, July 12, 1982, pp. 20-22; 23-24; 26; 29.

Cohen, N. E. Explorations in the fear of success (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 1425B-1426B. (University Microfilms No. 75-18, 368)

Coleman, J. S. The adolescent society. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Condry, J., & Dyer, S. Fear of success: Attribution of cause to the victim. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(3), 63-84.

Crandall, V. C. Achievement behavior in young children. Young Children, 1964, 20, 77-90.

Crandall, V. C. Sex differences in expectancy of intellectual and academic reinforcement. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), Achievement related motives in children. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

Crandall, V. J. Achievement. In H. W. Stevenson (Ed.), Child psychology: The 62nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Part I). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Crowley, J. E., Levitlin, T. E., & Quinn, R. P. Seven deadly half truths about women. Psychology Today, March 1973, pp. 94-96.

Davis, L. Fear of success: Myth and reality. In M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, & M. Williams (Eds.), Women in management: Proceedings of the conference "Women and men--Colleagues in management?" Austin, TX.: Center for Social Work Research, the University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Deaux, K., & Taynor, J. Evaluation of male and female ability: Bias works two ways. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 261-262.

Deutsch, F. M., & Leong, F. T. L. Male responses to female competence. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1983, 9, 79-91.

Deutsch, H. The psychology of women. New York: Greene and Stratton, 1944.

Diamond, E. E. Sex-typical and sex-atypical interests of Kuder Occupational Interest Survey criterion groups: Implications for counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28, 229-242.

Dias, S., & Carifio, J. A note on sex differences in achievement motivation. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 513-517.

Dipboye, R. L. Women as managers--Stereotypes and realities. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Dubno, P., Wankel, C., & Emin, H. An empirically keyed scale for measuring managerial attitudes toward women executives. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3, 357-364.

Durkin, J. S. The potential of women: Report of the Human Engineering Laboratory, Johnson O'Connor Research Foundation, Inc. Congressional Record (Vol. 117, Part 23). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 8, 1971.

Edwards, J. E., & Waters, L. K. Relationships of locus of control to academic ability, academic performance, and performance-related attributions. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1981, 41, 529-531.

Epstein, C. F. Institutional barriers: What keeps women out of the executive suite. In F. E. Gordon & M. H. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Falk, W. W., & Cosby, A. G. Women's marital-familial statuses and work histories: Some conceptual considerations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 13, 126-140.

Feather, N. T. Performance at a difficult task in relation to initial expectations of success, test anxiety, and need achievement. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 200-217.

Feather, N. T. Attribution of responsibility and valence of success and failure in relation to initial confidence and task performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 129-144.

Feather, N. T., & Raphaelson, A. W. Fear of success in Australian and American student groups: Motive or sex role stereotype? Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 190-201.

Feather, N. T., & Simon, J. G. Fear of success and causal attribution for outcome. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 525-542.

Feild, H. S., & Caldwell, B. E. Sex of supervisor, sex of subordinate, and subordinate job satisfaction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3, 391-399.

Ferber, M. A., & McMahon, W. W. Women's expected earnings and their investment in higher education. The Journal of Human Resources, 1979, 14, 405-420.

Feuers, S. Shortening the odds. Community and Junior College Journal, 1981, 52(2), 10-12.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Crites, J. O. Toward a career psychology of women: What do we know? What do we need to know? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1980, 27, 44-62.

Fleming, J. Comment on 'Do women fear success?' by David Tresemer. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1977, 2, 706-717.

Fossum, D. Women in the legal profession: A progress report. American Bar Association Journal, 1981, 67, 579-582.

Foster, L. W., & Kolinko, T. Choosing to be a managerial woman: An examination of individual variables and career choice. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1979, 5, 627-634.

Fox, L., Tobin, D., & Brody, L. Career development of gifted and talented women. Journal of Career Education, 1981, 7, 289-298.

French, E., & Lesser, G. S. Some characteristics of the achievement motive in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 119-128.

Frieze, I. H. Women's expectations for and causal attributions of success and failure. In M. T. S. Mednick, S. S. Tangri, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and achievement: Social and motivational analyses. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing, 1975.

Garai, J. E., & Scheinfeld, A. Sex differences in mental and behavioral traits. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1968, 77, 169-299.

Gardner, B. B. What makes successful management? Advanced Management, 1948, 13, 116-125.

Gerrard, M. Women: Their own worst enemies. In M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, & M. Williams (Eds.), Women in management: Proceedings of the conference "Women and men--Colleagues in management?" Austin, TX.: Center for Social Work Research, the University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Gilroy, F. D., Talierco, T. M., & Steinbacher, R. Impact of maternal employment on daughters' sex-role orientation and fear of success. Psychological Reports, 1981, 49, 963-968.

Good, L. R., & Good, K. C. An objective measure of the motive to avoid success. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 1009-1010.

Gralewski, C., & Rodgon, M. M. Effects of social and intellectual instruction on achievement motivation as a function of role orientation. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1980, 6, 301-309.

Greenfeld, S., Greiner, L., & Wood, M. M. The "feminine mystique" in male-dominated jobs: A comparison of attitudes and background factors of women in male-dominated versus female-dominated jobs. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1980, 17, 291-309.

Hart, L. B. Steps to successful synergy. Personnel Administrator, 1980, 25(4), 45-48.

Hay, C. D. Women in management: The obstacles and opportunities they face. Personnel Administrator, 1980, 25(4), 31-39.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr., Kleemeier, C., & Piccola, G. Development and situational correlates of achievement behavior in college females. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 420-436.

Heinen, J. S., McGlauchlin, D., Legeros, C., & Freeman, J. Developing the woman manager. Personnel Journal, 1975, 54, 282-286.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. The managerial woman. Garden City, NY.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.

Heretick, D. M. L. Gender-specific relationships between trust-suspicion, locus of control and psychological distress. Journal of Psychology, 1981, 108, 267-273.

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. F. Social factors influencing problem solving in women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 382-390.

Hoffman, L. W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 129-155.

Hoffman, L. W. Fear of success in males and females. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 353-358.

Hoffman, L. W. Fear of success in 1965 and 1974: A follow-up study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 310-321.

Hooyman, N., & Kaplan, J. New roles for professional women: Skills for change. Public Administration Review, 1976, 36, 374-378.

Horner, M. S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 407B. (University Microfilms No. 69-12, 135)

Horner, M. S. Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In J. Bardwick, E. Douvan, M. S. Horner, & D. Gutman (Eds.), Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, CA.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 157-175.

Hoyt, D. P., & Kennedy, C. E. Interest and personality correlates of career-motivated and homemaking-motivated college women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 5, 44-48.

Hyde, J. S., & Rosenberg, B. G. Half the human experience: The psychology of women. Lexington, MA.: D. C. Heath, 1976.

Illfelder, J. K. Fear of success, sex role attitudes, and career salience and anxiety levels of college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1980, 16, 7-17.

Jackaway, R., & Teevan, R. Fear of failure and fear of success: Two dimensions of the same motive. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 283-293.

Jagacinski, C. M., & LeBold, W. K. A comparison of men and women undergraduate and professional engineers. Engineering Education, 1981, 72, 213-220.

Jelinek, M. Career management and women. In M. Grewe-Partsch & G. J. Robinson (Eds.), Women, communication, and careers. New York: K. G. Saur, 1980.

Kaltenbach, J. E., & McClelland, D. C. Achievement and social status in three small communities. In Social Science Research Council, Report of the committee on identification of talent. New York: Author, 1957.

Kantor, R. M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Karabenick, S. A., & Marshall, J. M. Performance of females as a function of fear of success, fear of failure, type of opponent, and performance-contingent feedback. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 220-237.

Kimball, B. & Leahy, R. L. Fear of success in males and females: Effects of developmental level and sex-linked course of study. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 273-281.

Kistiakowsky, V. Women in physics: Unnecessary, injurious and out of place? Physics Today, 1980, 33, 32-40.

Knowles, O. S., & Moore, B. A. Today's woman executive. Business and Public Administration Student Review, 1970, 4, 57-73.

Kukla, A. Attributional determinants of achievement-related behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 166-174.

Lang, K. A. Suggestions for counseling women who want to enter a nontraditional occupation. Journal of Employment Counseling, 1978, 15, 180-187.

Larwood, L., & Lockheed, M. Women as managers: Toward second generation research. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1979, 5, 659-666.

Larwood, L., & Powell, G. N. Isn't it time we're moving on?: Necessary future research on women in management. Group and Organization Studies, 1981, 6, 65-72.

Larwood, L., & Wood, M. Women in management. Lexington, MA.: D. C. Heath, 1977.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. New management job: The integrator. Harvard Business Review, 1967, 45, 142-151.

Leder, G. C. Mathematics achievement and fear of success. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 1982, 13, 124-135.

Lesser, G. S., Krawitz, R. N., & Packard, R. Experimental arousal of achievement motivation in adolescent girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 59-66.

Levine, A. Forging a feminine identity: Women in four professional schools. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1975, 35, 63-67.

Levine, A., & Crumrine, J. Women and the fear of success: A problem in replication. American Journal of Sociology, 1975, 80, 964-974.

Levine, R., Reis, H. T., Turner, E. S., and Turner, G. Fear of failure in males: A more salient factor than fear of success in females? Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 389-398.

Lipman-Blumen, J. How ideology shapes women's lives. Scientific American, 1972, 226, 34-42.

Lockheed, M. Female motive to avoid success: A psychological barrier or a response to deviancy? Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1975, 1, 41-50.

Lowell, E. L. The effect of need for achievement on learning and speed of performance. Journal of Psychology, 1952, 33, 31-40.

Lublin, J. S. The managers: Mrs. Lowe has to deal with stress and sexism as bank-branch head. Wall Street Journal, April 26, 1977, pp. 1; 36.

Lyson, T. A. The changing sex composition of college curricula: A shift-share approach. American Educational Research Journal, 1981, 18, 503-511.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. Sex differences and their implications for management. In F. E. Gordon & M. H. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Major, B. Sex-role orientation and fear of success: Clarifying an unclear relationship. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1979, 5, 63-70.

Makosky, V. P. Sex role compatibility of task and of competitor, and fear of success as variables affecting women's performance. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 237-248.

Marshall, S. J., & Wijting, J. P. Relationships of achievement motivation and sex-role identity to college women's career orientation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1980, 16, 299-311.

Marshall, S. J., & Wijting, J. P. Dimensionality of women's career orientation. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1982, 8, 135-146.

Mayes, S. S. Women in positions of authority: A case study of changing sex roles. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1979, 4, 556-568.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McClelland, D. C., & Liberman, A. M. The effect of need achievement on recognition of need-related words. Journal of Personality, 1949, 18, 236-251.

Mead, Margaret. Male and female. New York: William Morrow, 1949.

Mednick, M. S., & Tangri, S. S. New social psychological perspectives on women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 1-16.

Mehrabian, A. Measures of achieving tendency. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1969, 29, 445-451.

Midgley, N., & Abrams, M. S. Fear of success and locus of control in young women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 737.

Miller, E. S. Achievement motivation in women: A developmental perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1977.

Minter, J. (Ed.). Faculty salaries 1980-1981 and additional earnings 1979-1980. Boulder, CO.: John Minter Associates, 1981.

Mirides, E., & Cote, A. Women in management: Strategies for removing the barriers. Personnel Administrator, 1980, 25(4), 25-28; 48.

Monahan, L., Kuhn, D., & Shaver, P. Intrapsychic versus cultural explanations of the "fear of success" motive. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 60-64.

Moore, L. M., & Rickel, A. U. Characteristics of women in traditional and non-traditional managerial roles. Personnel Psychology, 1980, 33, 317-333.

Morgan, S. W., & Mausner, B. Behavioral and fantasied indicators of avoidance of success in men and women. Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 457-470.

Morrison, R. F., & Sebald, M. Personal characteristics differentiating female executive from female nonexecutive personnel. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 656-659.

Murray, E. J. Motivation and emotion. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Murray, S. R., & Mednick, M. T. S. Perceiving the causes of success and failure in achievement: Sex, race, and motivational comparisons. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 881-885.

National Research Council. Postdoctoral appointments and disappointments. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1981.

Oetzel, R. M. Annotated bibliography and classified summary of research in sex differences. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Oliver, L. Achievement and affiliation motivation in career-oriented and homemaking-oriented college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 4, 275-281.

Olsen, N. J., & Willemsen, E. W. Fear of success--Fact or artifact? Journal of Psychology, 1978, 98, 65-70.

Orlofsky, J. L. A comparison of projective and objective fear-of-success and sex-role orientation measures as predictors of women's performance on masculine and feminine tasks. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1981, 7, 999-1018.

Orlofsky, J. L., & Stake, J. E. Psychological masculinity and femininity: Relationship to striving and self-concept in the achievement and interpersonal domains. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1981, 6, 218-233.

Pappo, M. Fear of success: A theoretical analysis and the construction and validation of a measuring instrument (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 34, 421B. (University Microfilms No. 73-16, 235)

Parker, V. J. Fear of success, sex role orientation of the task, and competition condition as variables affecting women's performance in achievement oriented situations (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 5495B. (University Microfilms No. 72-9593, 135)

Patterson, R. A. Women in management: An experimental study of the effects of sex and marital status on job performance ratings, promotability ratings, and promotion decisions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 3108B-3109B. (University Microfilms No. 75-27, 183)

Peplau, L. A. Impact of fear of success and sex-role attitudes on women's competitive achievement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 561-568.

Perun, P. J., & Bielby, D. D. Towards a model of female occupational behavior: A human development approach. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1981, 6, 234-252.

Pheterson, G. I., Kiesler, S. B., & Goldberg, P. A. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement, and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-118.

Plas, J. M., & Wallston, B. S. Women oriented toward male dominated careers: Is the reference group male or female? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30, 46-54.

Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 395-403.

Rand, L. Masculinity or femininity?: Differentiating career-oriented and homemaking-oriented college freshman women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 444-449.

Reif, W. E., Newstrom, J. W., & Monczka, R. M. Exploding some myths about women managers. In B. A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Rhea, J. N. The status, training, and future of women in business: Critical questions for research in the 1980's. Journal of Business Education, 1980, 55, 312-314.

Richardson, M. S. The dimensions of career and work orientation in college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 161-172.

Robbins, L., & Robbins, E. Comment on: "Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women". Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 133-137.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. Perceived sex differences in managerially relevant characteristics. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1978, 4, 837-843.

Sadd, S., Lenauer, M., Shaver, P., & Dunivant, N. Objective measurement of fear of success and fear of failure: A factor analytic approach. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 405-416.

Sassen, G. Success anxiety in women: A constructivist interpretation of its source and significance. Harvard Educational Review, 1980, 50, 13-24.

Schaeffer, R. G., & Axel, H. Improving job opportunities for women. New York: Conference Board, 1968.

Schein, V. E. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.

Schuck, M. T., & Weissman, H. J. The psychology of women--selected topics. In S. Cox (Ed.), Female psychology: The emerging self. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976.

Shaver, P. Questions concerning fear of success and its conceptual relatives. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 305-320.

Sorrentino, R. M. An extension of theory of achievement motivation to the study of emergent leadership. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 356-368.

Sorrentino, R. M., & Short, J. Effects of fear of success on women's performance at masculine versus feminine tasks. Journal of Research in Personality, 1974, 8, 277-290.

Spence, J. T. The Thematic Apperception Test and attitudes toward achievement in women: A new look at the motive to avoid success and a new method of measurement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 427-437.

Stake, J. E. The ability/performance dimension of self esteem: Implications for women's achievment behavior. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3, 365-377.

Stake, J. E., & Levitz, E. Career goals of college women and men and perceived achievement-related encouragement. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 4, 151-159.

Stein, A. H., & Bailey, M. M. The socialization of achievement orientation in females. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 345-366.

Stewart, N. The effective woman manager: Seven vital skills for upward mobility. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Tangri, S. S. Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 177-199.

Tangri, S. S. Role innovation in occupational choice among college women. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 12. (Ms. No. 555)

Terborg, J. R. Women in management: A research review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 647-664.

Tewari, H. C. Understanding personality and motives of women managers. Ann Arbor, MI: U. M. I. Research Press, 1978.

Tinsley, D. J., & Faunce, P. S. Vocational interests of career and homemaker oriented women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 13, 327-337.

Topol, P., & Reznikoff, M. Achievers and underachievers: A comparative study of fear of success, education and career goals, and conception of woman's role among high school senior girls. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1979, 5, 85-92.

Tresemer, D. Fear of success: Popular, but unproven. Psychology Today, March 1974, pp. 82-85.

Tresemer, D. The cumulative record of research on "fear of success". Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 217-236.

U.S. Department of Labor. Women in the labor force: Some new data series (Report 575). Washington, D.C.: Author, 1979.

U.S. Department of Labor. Employment and earnings. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1981.

U.S. Department of Labor. Employment and earnings. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 1984.

Veroff, J., Wilcox, S., & Atkinson, J. W. The achievement motive in high school and college age women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 108-119.

Vetter, B. M. Women scientists and engineers: Trends in participation. Science, 1981, 214, 1313-1321.

Wainer, H. A., & Rubin, I. M. Motivation of search and development entrepreneurs: Determinants of company success. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 178-184.

Walberg, H. J. Physics, femininity, and creativity. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 47-54.

Weiner, B., & Kukla, A. An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 1-20.

Weinreich-Haste, H. Sex differences in 'fear of success' among British students. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 17, 37-42.

White, M. C., Crino, M. D., & DeSanctis, G. L. A critical review of female performance, performance training and organizational initiatives designed to aid women in the work-role environment. Personnel Psychology, 1981, 34, 227-248.

Wiegers, R. M., & Frieze, I. H. Gender, female traditionality, achievement level, and cognitions of success and failure. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 125-137.

Williams, M. Women and success in organizations. In M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, and M. Williams (Eds.), Women in management: Proceedings of the conference "Women and men--colleagues in management?" Austin, TX.: Center for Social Work Research, the University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Winchel, R., Fenner, D., & Shaver, P. Impact of coeducation on "fear of success" imagery expressed by male and female high school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 726-730.

Wood, M. M. & Greenfeld, S. T. Women managers and fear of success: A study in the field. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 1976, 2, 375-387.

Work, C. E., Wheeler, J. H., & Williams, J. V. Guidance for non-traditional careers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1982, 60, 553-556.

Yuen, R. K. W., Tinsley, D. J., & Tinsley, H. E. A. The vocational needs and background characteristics of homemaker-oriented women and career-oriented women. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1980, 28, 250-256.

Zacharias, D. W. Women and the informal organization. In M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, & M. Williams (Eds.), Women in management: Proceedings of the conference "Women and men--colleagues in management?" Austin, TX.: Center for Social Work Research, the University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Zuckerman, M., & Allison, S. N. An objective measure of fear of success: Construction and validation. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1976, 40, 422-430.

Zuckerman, M., & Wheeler, L. To dispel fantasies about the fantasy-based measure of fear of success. Psychological Bulletin, 1975, 82, 932-946.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Beverly A. Pulaski has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Marilyn S. Susman,
Assistant Professor, Counseling Psychology and Higher Education, Loyola

Dr. John A. Wellington
Professor, Counseling Psychology and Higher Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

4-11-84
Date

Marilyn Susman
Director's Signature