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CHAPTER ONE
Statement of the Problem

Overview

The utilization and understanding of an individual's personality dynamics is of basic importance in allowing the counselor to institute differential treatments to specific identified problem areas. With respect to personality dynamics, one of the major keys to understanding lies in the life style of the individual. The life style permeates all aspects of an individual's life, offering a person an integrated, teleological, global system by which to operate.

Because of the centrality of the life style, it is vital that the counselor have a clear conception of the client's operating system. In order to assess and utilize the life style, the counselor must: (1) operate within a theoretical frame of reference; (2) assess the various components; (3) develop hypotheses; (4) look for core consistencies; (5) develop a dynamic, global picture; (6) institute differential treatment based on the assessment; and (7) carry out the treatment phase of the counseling process.

This research will focus on the fourth and fifth areas of the above, investigating avoidance of failure as a life style with respect to the following: 1) its generality or pervasiveness on many measures; 2) alternative and more objective measures of life style (than early recollections); and 3) relation of life style to certain outcome
measures, eg. underachievement, dissatisfaction with major, vocational
indecision. Thus, the research will fit into the broader schema
of the counseling process. By first identifying various personality
correlates of avoidance of failure later research can utilize this
base to identify specific treatments that best deal with this life style.

As was pointed out, it is necessary for a counselor to operate
from a theoretical position in order to formulate hypotheses and
locate core consistencies with respect to an individual's personality
dynamics. The theoretical position in this research is the Individual
Psychology of Alfred Adler (1963) and the theoretical approach of
Atkinson and Feather's achievement motivation (1966). The two
theories are mutually compatible, as Atkinson, Feather, and McClelland
have made explicit and concrete hypotheses within the Adlerian's
more general framework. This explicitness thus affords an opportunity
to empirically test and validate the hypotheses more easily than under
the more pervasive, abstract Adlerian theory.

The question then arises of why these theoretical approaches
were chosen to research. This question can best be answered by comparing
two of the major analytic theories, Freudian and Adlerian. The writer
contends that Adler modified serious faults in the Freudian position.
An attempt will be made to point out the various differences between
the two theorists, as well as demonstrate the improvement of Adler's
formulation. This analysis will then be followed with an analysis
of some of the shortcomings of Adlerian theory and the partial improve­
ment of these faults through the theoretical approach of Atkinson,
Feather, and McClelland.
Freudian vs. Adlerian Theory

The complex interrelationships involved in the formation of Freud's theory have been analyzed by many writers. The socio-cultural patterns of that era, the influence of the pioneers of psychology in medicine, his own family background, his intense self-analysis, and other contributing factors have been examined in probing detail. Not only have writers been interested in determining the causal factors involved in Freud's formulations, but also, in the ideological conflicts and the resulting modifications by Freud's followers. The Neo-Freudians, as well as Jung and Adler, have altered or substantially restructured Freudian theory. Each, while paying tribute to the courage and insight of Freud, perceived his work as a beginning, rather than as a final set of irrevocable laws. Freud, while aware of possible fallacies in his theory, preferred to institute revisions within the existing framework, rather than submitting to alterations by other theorists.

However, for Alfred Adler, partial changes within the existing model would not satisfy the intense ideological conflict that had developed between his views and Freud's. Although strongly influenced by many of Freud's ideas, the causality of the libido, as a deterministic force in all sectors of psychic life, proved to be the major factor in Adler's break with Freud. Oriented toward the "will to power" (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, p.111), Adler offered a number of highly challenging counter-proposals to Freud's drive-reduction model. Faran (1953) has conceptualized the main issues of contention between the two theorists as follows: (1) model of the psyche, (2) energy source, (3) theory of neurosis, (4) environmental influences,
(5) the universality of the Oedipal conflict, and (6) methods of treatment. The major focus will be on the first four areas of contention.

**Model of the psyche: Freudian Interpretation**

With respect to the model of the psyche, Freud postulated a triad of intrapsychic conflict. The Id, Ego, and Superego were constantly involved in a state of warfare; the Id always attempted to gain gratification of its instinctual drives at the expense of the other two systems. Operating under the "primary process" and "pleasure principle" the Id engaged in fantasy and wish-fulfillment similar to Sullivan's prototaxic mode of thinking (Richman, 1957, p. 141). The Ego, employing a system of defenses, and operating under the "secondary process" or "reality principle" (Richman, 1957, p. 215), attempted to mediate between the demands of the Id and external reality. Finally, the Superego, divided into the Ego-Ideal and Conscience, attempted to totally suppress the instincts. Introjection of parental values (acting as agents of the culture), led to the formation of the Superego. This introjection presupposed a satisfactory conclusion to the Oedipal conflict.

The implications for this intrapsychic model are quite extensive. Man, an irrational, driven being, constantly seeks reduction of libidinal tension. At the mercy of unconscious impulses, at war with the reality-testing Ego and "moral" Superego, with the employment of defenses (idealized as an army marching through enemy territory), Freud's model of man was highly negative and pessimistic.
Model of the psyche: Adlerian Interpretation

In contradistinction, Adler perceived man as dominated, not by instincts, but by "fictive" goals. Ansbacher and Ansbacher (1956) interpret the importance of values and goals to Adler in the following passage:

Adler's subjectivism, where values, goals, and secondary motives had replaced drives and primary motives in importance, was not a physiological reductionism. If mental events cannot be reduced to physiological events, systematization is possible only by establishing a hierarchy of these mental events, that is, a hierarchy of values and goals. This leads to the philosophical position of teleology and finalism, the determination of final causes (1956, p. 88).

The lifestyle of each individual (fixed in the child by the age of five) was dominated by the "will to power," interpreted as the "fictive" goal of superiority. The interplay of a number of causal factors in the child's environment resulted in the intermediate or relative goals in preparation for the final state of overcoming. The primary causal factors were: (1) attitude toward organ inferiority (real or assumed); (2) the family constellation; and (3) the creative self. Thus, Adler differed greatly in his model of the psyche. He perceived interpersonal relationships (primarily within the family constellation) as of major importance, attributing little causality to intrapsychic conflict. At the present time, the trend seems to be toward understanding and modifying interpersonal relationships rather than intrapsychic. Thus, Adler was the forerunner of much of the current emphasis on environmental contingencies and their implications. However, in fairness to the Freudian position, it is being revitalized by the work of theorists such as Berne (1964) and Harris (1969). They have attempted,
through Transactional Analysis theory, to update Freud's Id, Ego, and Super-ego with their conceptions of the child, adult and parent. However, the transactional approach assigns greater weight to interpersonal than intrapsychic conflicts.

Source of energy for the psyche: Freudian Interpretation

From his mechanistic, biologically determined frame of reference, Freud envisioned the libido, or sexual energy, as the source of all psychic energy. Emanating from the Id, the libido provided energy for both the Ego and Superego; was instrumental in causing neurosis if its direct discharge was blocked, and acted as a closed energy system. Thus, because of the libido model as a closed system, libido cathexation depleted the amount of energy available to the other dependent systems. Therefore, love toward another person (the object-cathexis) would weaken, rather than strengthen, the individual's level of energy (Richman, 1957). In addition, Freud hypothesized that an individual passed through a number of psychosexual stages in his development. Problems occurred at the various stages if the libido was severely blocked, extremely gratified, or suffered from very inconsistent gratification.

Source of energy of the psyche: Adlerian Interpretation

Adler presented three papers before the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, during January and February, 1911. In these presentations, Adler presented a critique of Freud's concept of sexuality (Ansbacher
and Ansbacher, 1956, pp. 56-57), interpreting the major differences in their views. One of the major criticisms was drawing false (to Adler) analogies from physics and chemistry to the psyche, with respect to the energy system of Freud:

"The number of auxiliary constructs which appear in attempts of explanation are exceedingly great, and they often turn out to be unproven, even unprovable. Constructs which, in the most obvious manner, take recourse to an analogy from physics or chemistry by speaking of damming up, increased pressure, fixation, flowing back into infantile paths, projections, and regression must also be mentioned (1956, p. 60).

Adler also took exception to the domination of the sex drive. He felt that the central nervous system controlled the "peripheral functions (sex), rather than the other way around (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, p. 57). Another chief area of contention was that of the causality of the sexual drive in neurosis. As has been stated previously, Freud perceived a blockage of libidinal discharge as the major causal factor in neurosis. In direct opposition, Adler saw sexual difficulties as manifestations of a more general problem, rather than the major cause. Hoch (1953) summarizes the distinction between the two theorists in the following passage:

"It is important to point out that persons with sexual disturbances display disturbed interpersonal relationships before the sexual disturbance appears. They are usually insecure individuals who hesitate before any new adaptation, who remain with any form of performance pattern already acquired. These tendencies combined with the presence of a great deal of social anxiety make them avoid intimate contact with others, and this in-turn fosters their dependency to live in infantile sexual fantasies. The anticipatory fear of sexual failures is preceded by failure in other adaption (1953, p. 57).

Thus, Adler redressed the balance of sexuality, placing it in its proper perspective."
Rather than attempting to impose a biological, deterministic model of psychic energy on the individual, Adler perceived values and goals as its source. The striving for superiority, the "courage" of the individual, and the striving through overcompensation supplied "energy" to the individual (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, p. 88). By not attempting a juxtaposition of a model from the physical sciences onto the individual, Adler avoided many of the pitfalls that Freud encountered.

**Theory of Neurosis: Freudian Interpretation**

Maintaining the importance of sexuality or libido drive, Freud perceived neurosis as an intrapsychic conflict between the Id and Ego, resulting in the blocking of direct discharge of sexual energy. The resulting frustration from the blockage caused repression, leading to distortion and regression to earlier modes of satisfaction in the psychosexual stages. Fenichel (1945) states that the causal factors involved in psychoneuroses are as follows:

"The neurotic conflict by definition, is one between a tendency striving for discharge and another tendency that tries to prevent the discharge... In general it is permissible to equate the tendencies that strive for discharge with drives ('instinctual impulses'); the striving of drives, that is the decision as to whether or not their discharge should be permitted, has been defined as a function of the ego. Therefore, the general formulation should be: the neurotic conflict takes place between drives, that is, the id and the ego, (1945, p. 238).

Thus, Freud's theory of neurosis incorporated intrapsychic conflict, repression, and the resulting anxiety. A schematic picture of causation of neurosis would be as follows:
Sexual Constitution
(ancestral experiences)

Infantile experiences

Fig. 1  Freudian Explanation of Causation of Neurosis (adapted from Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, p. 285)

Theory of Neurosis: Adlerian Interpretation

In direct opposition to Freud's formulations, the neurotic conflict was thought to be between the style of life (personality-ideal) and reality. In the development of a life-plan or life style, the individual conceptualizes a personality-ideal or goal of attainment (later formulated by Adler as self-realization or self-actualization, analogous to Rogers). In Gestalt terminology, neurosis was perceived as the amount of distortion and safe-guarding necessary to achieve congruence between the "fictive" personality-ideal and reality. The more distortion, the greater the amount of safeguarding, and the more unrealistic and unattainable the personality-ideal, the more neurotic the individual. Thus, the amount of neuroticism of the individual developed along a continuum, rather than falling into an absolute category. Adler's view was also holistic, drawing all symptoms into the unifying formulation of striving to overcome inferiority by overcompensation.

Adler's conceptions, with slight modification, would fit the organismic models of Goldstein and Angyal very well. In fact, Angyal (1964)
has accomplished this, juxtaposing his bio-spheric model onto Adler's theory. From another point of view, Patterson (1964) has drawn the conclusion from investigating various holistic theories including Adler's, that the major implication of holistic theory for counselors is the relationship between therapist and client. This relationship is the one central theme running through all of the holistic theories. However, Patterson seems to be rather non-neutral in this regard, since most of his writing proselytizes this view.

A holistic view of the neurotic life-plan according to Adler could be pictured schematically in the following manner, (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, p. 41):

Personality-ideal = Evaluation (Individual + Experiences + Environment) + Arrangement (Experiences + Character + Emotionality + Symptoms)

Thus, in contradistinction to Freud, the creative aspects of the individual personality (in addition to environment and successful past patterns) aid in the determination of the personality-ideal and whether the individual develops a neurosis.

Environmental Influences: Contrast Between Freud and Adler

This concept, along with the causality of the libido, as an energy system, was one of the major ideological differences between Freud and Adler. As has been stated previously, Freud heavily negated the influences of environmental factors, emphasizing intrapsychic conflict as primary.

Adler, on the other hand, saw interpersonal relationships (e.g. the family constellation, peers, the community) as primary. Dreikurs (1950) has attempted to interpolate the theoretical position of Adler into
more concrete terms, specifically in relation to the interaction between the individual and community. The individual's life-plan is envisioned by Dreikurs as a development characterized by constant repetitions of real and imagined difficulties. These are encountered first in the family setting, and later in the external environment. As the individual strives for superiority (self-actualization), he utilizes social interest to aid the community, thereby actualizing himself through interaction for the common good. However, this maximal growth through interaction is not achieved by all individuals. For some, feelings of inferiority prevent this type of movement. The significance and superiority of others is seen as too great an obstacle to overcome. The individual then takes a direction at a tangent from the community, striving to achieve personal superiority before embarking on a course of interaction for the common good. Due to faulty under-evaluation of self, and over-evaluation of others, the individual fails when confronted with a test that challenges his social interest. The individual then strives on the useless side of life, restricting movements and disparaging others.

Summary

This section has attempted to deal with the basic theoretical conflicts between Freud and Adler. The alternative framework that Adler presented was pointed out in four basic areas. The writer, while biased toward Adlerian theory, tried to demonstrate objectively shortcomings in Freud's conceptions. The next section will take the discussion one step further, demonstrating some of the major difficulties facing researchers of Adlerian theory. A case will be made for the theoretical approach of achievement motivation by Atkinson and Feather (1966), and
McClelland with respect to correction of some of these difficulties.

Achievement Motivation and Adlerian Theory

Adler's theoretical assumptions, while offering a framework within which clinicians can operate, has proven very difficult to test empirically through rigorous research efforts. Because of difficulties in reducing Adler's generalizations to specific testable hypotheses, little direct research has been carried out on Adler's assumptions. Rotter (1962) perceives three major limitations of Adlerian theory with respect to research efforts: "(1) Adler's concepts are frequently very general in nature and they lack clear-cut operations for measurement. . .
(2) There are too few lower-order or more specific constructs . . .
(3) The ideas are not fully systematized, particularly with regard to overlapping constructs," (1962, pp. 6-7). Rotter has attempted to deal with these problems as challenges, rather than prohibitive road blocks to research. He, and others, have utilized parts of Adler's theory to develop their own approaches on a more limited, specific level.

Atkinson and Feather's (1966) hypothesized personality correlates of the person motivated to avoid failure have a strong congruence with the more general perceptions of Adler. However, they like Rotter, have operationally defined their concepts in a manner that facilitates research, rather than impeding it. This specificity of constructs, coupled with their systematization, has corrected the limitations contained in Adler's generalized, global approach. Atkinson and Feather have conceptualized achievement motivation as two major orientations: (1) the motive to achieve success; and (2) the motive to avoid failure. The tendency to achieve success is viewed as a function of
motivation to achieve success, the strengths of one's expectancies, and the incentive value of success. On the other hand, the tendency to avoid failure is seen as a function of the motivation to avoid failure, the expectancy of failure, and the incentive value of failure. The resultant achievement-oriented tendency is (1966, pp. 19 and 20):
\[ T_{\text{success}} + T_{\text{avoid failure}} = (M_s \times P_s \times I_s) + (M_{af} \times P_f \times I_f). \]

The following is an explanation of the symbols used in the above formula:

1. \( M_s \) stands for motive for success;
2. \( P_s \) stands for expectancy strength;
3. \( I_s \) stands for incentive value of success;
4. \( M_{af} \) stands for motive to avoid failure;
5. \( P_f \) stands for expectancy strength of failure; and
6. \( I_f \) stands for the incentive value of failure.

Thus, if the motive for success, expectancy for success, and incentive value for success are all very low, the predominate orientation will be avoidance of failure. Through research, they have begun to isolate the determinants of avoidance behavior. One determinant is that if a person is punished when engaged in a behavior, he will avoid it. Another example would be that a person with a \( M_{af} \), not meeting success in a task at a certain level, will reduce his level of expectations for that type of task.

Thus, Atkinson and Feather, complemented by the work of McClelland, have been able to rectify serious shortcomings in Adlerian theory with respect to its applicability to research.

The next section will deal with the specific target area of this research, developing the earlier origins of avoidance of failure as a life style within the Adlerian framework; then showing the adaptation by Atkinson and Feather in their more explicit conceptualizations.
Avoidance of Failure as a Life Style

The specific target of this research is to identify, through empirical measures, personality correlates of avoidance of failure as a life style. Before examining Adler's hypotheses, it is necessary to have an understanding of the term life style. Adler viewed the life style as characterized by purposiveness, goal-directedness, unity, self-consistency and uniqueness, ultimately the subjective determinants of a person's actions (Ansbacher, 1967). In reviewing Adler's derivation and development of the term, Ansbacher (1967) points out how Adler first conceived of a life style as striving toward a fictitious goal, which had been termed a personally guiding image, guiding line, or life plan. In 1929, Adler first used the term life style.

The common properties of life styles were held to be: (1) unifying aspects—organizing a unified approach to the goals of life; (2) unique and creative aspects; and (3) operational, functional, and constancy aspects. Developed in the child by the age of five, the "guiding fiction" of the individual served in a teleological fashion to channel the individual's drive toward his goals.

With these properties of a life style in mind, let us examine the hypotheses of Adler with respect to individuals characterized by fear of defeat. Adler perceived the following as components of this life style: (1) high "fictive" (unrealistic) goals; (2) low self-worth; (3) lack of social interest; (4) lack of commitment to goals; (5) fear of risk-taking; (6) failure to achieve; (7) high anxiety; and (8) striving in "secondary" (non-useful) areas.
Adler conjectured that people with a fear of defeat or avoidance of failure view themselves as possessing an organic or psychological weakness. They hold feelings of low self-esteem. Compensation for these feelings results in "exaggerated goals of self enhancement" (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956). Adler wrote of the hesitating attitude, the back-and-forth, and the fear of commitment of this particular life style. McReynolds (1968), in reviewing the development of the theory to attain success and avoid failure, points out that:

"Adler referred to children born with defective organs, describing them as lacking in social feeling, courage, and self-confidence because they fear a defeat more than they desire a success." (1968, p. 159)

Adler's primary emphasis was on the "non-normal" population of neurotics, psychotics, criminals, etc. with respect to fear of defeat. As an example of this, Leifer (1966) has characterized phobics as utilizing avoidance as a technique of mastery. He posits the avoiding life style as having the following characteristics: (1) repose, caution, and detachment are desirable; (2) possession of self-inhibiting and negating armor; (3) having a paradigm of inferiority; and (4) patterned inhibition.

As was discussed previously, Atkinson and Feather (1966) have attacked avoidance of failure from a different direction. Evolving out of their research on achievement motivation, they have delineated certain characteristics of this type of personality. They hypothesize that the failure-threatened personality is dominated by the following orientations: (1) high unrealistic goals and/or low easily achieved goals (absence of middle range goals); (2) lack of task persistence; (3) mechanical, rigid compliance to a task; (4) chronic decrement on achievement tests; (5) high anxiety in testing and competitive situations;
and (6) fear of ambiguous, problem-solving situations. As can be seen by the specificity of their constructs, Atkinson and Feather avoid the Adlerian pitfall of presenting global concepts not readily operationalized. For this reason, this research will attempt to avoid the same pitfalls by specifying operational measures of Adlerian theory.

Uniqueness of this Research

In their discussion of possible directions for further research, Atkinson and Feather (1966) perceive as most important: "implementation of conceptual integration of the study of personality and the study of basic behavioral processes." (1966, p. 367) They have carried this implementation to the point of hypothesizing the personality correlates discussed previously. However, they, as yet, have not empirically tested their hypothesized correlates. The present research will be based upon their suppositions, but will expand the present knowledge on this area by submitting the hypotheses to rigorous assessment with respect to life styles.

One of the major unique features of this research is the attempt to synthesize the life style of Adler with the hypotheses of avoidance of failure motivation. Thus, this research will be more pervasive, dealing with the central core of an individual's personality, rather than in the more specific area of achievement motivation. This synthesis will be accomplished by utilizing the projective technique of early recollections. While early recollections have been used in research to identify life styles, no research on the subject of avoidance of failure has utilized this tool.

With respect to the importance of this research, the empirical
validation of personality correlates of avoidance of failure is a vital first step toward the goal of its successful treatment. Its importance cannot be minimized due to the pervasive manifestation of this life style in interpersonal difficulties, career indecision, and under-achievement. For example, Tseng and Carter (1970) measured 222 high school students' perceptions of occupational prestige, occupational aspiration, and occupational choices. They found that high need achievement--low fear of failure students had significantly more accurate perceptions of occupational prestige and higher occupational aspirations. In addition, Atkinson and Feather and their students at the University of Michigan have investigated a number of variables in this area, e.g. achievement motive and test anxiety, achievement motivation, expectancy of success, and risk-taking behaviors. They have established significant relationships between avoidance of failure and these variables. Thus, avoidance of failure as a life style, because of its pervasiveness and impact on the individual's functioning, is an important area for research.

The problem of this research, then, is to measure empirically the personality correlates of avoidance of failure as a life style, focusing on its pervasiveness and relation to certain outcome measures. To test this problem, the following general hypotheses are advanced: (1) avoidance of failure as a general life style can be reliably measured by the use of early recollections; (2) this life style has specific personality correlates that can be measured empirically; (3) this life style will have differences between males and females, but will not be affected by ability; (4) this life style will correlate with poor individual and social adjustment; (5) it will have as a
component high anxiety; (6) it will also correlate with low achievement motivation; (7) it will be influenced by sibling rivalry and parental modeling; and (8) it will be related to low achievement and vocational indecision.
CHAPTER TWO

History of the Problem and Related Research

This chapter will focus on three major areas: 1) Adlerian research, 2) achievement motivation research; and 3) underachievement research. Within the first area, the emphasis will be on the family constellation, social interest, inferiority and fear of defeat, and lifestyle coupled with early recollections. An attempt will be made to tie the theoretical basis of this present study to the lines of research discussed. In addition, it will be pointed out where the present study's hypotheses have their basis and/or are strongly connected with the cited research in this chapter.

With respect to (2) achievement motivation, a brief discussion of the four theoretical approaches of McClelland (1961), Atkinson and Feather (1966), Heckhausen (1966), and Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) will be presented. Following this, the research in the areas of vocational choice, performance, level of aspiration and risk preference, personal adjustment, and physiological factors will be discussed. The attempt will also be made to show the relationship between the cited research and the hypotheses of the present study.

Finally, in the area of underachievement, the major focus will be on personality variables as they relate to fear of failure.
Adlerian Theory: Family Constellation

This discussion of Adlerian theory will focus on research in four major areas: 1) family constellation; 2) social interest; 3) inferiority, exaggerated goals, and fear of failure; and 4) lifestyle and early recollections.

With respect to the family constellation, Adler perceived early childhood as a crucial period for the formation of a healthy personality. The child, interacting within the family constellation, projects and generalizes his feelings that he holds toward the family, onto society. He "learns" or is conditioned to react to the external environment as a result of the socializing aspects of the family training.

In addition to the role of the family as a socializing agent, Adler saw certain relationships within the family as crucial developmental factors. The mother plays the key role in identity formation, in socialization, and feelings of self-esteem. Her duties are to: 1) prepare the child for the external world; 2) to orient the child toward, and accept, the father; 3) to develop cooperation among the siblings; and 4) to develop a realistic appraisal of the world and its demands. The mother fails in her job if she engages in an extremely pampering, neglectful, or ambivalent attitude toward the child.

In overburdening the child by excessive pampering, the mother prevents excessive, immediate gratification for his wishes; makes him the center of the family (viewed by the child as "society"); hinders the child's development with the father; prevents adequate socialization with the external environment; and is unduly protective toward sibling competition (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956, pp. 372-376). Because
of this poor preparation, the child fails to develop proper social interest, exhibits feelings of inferiority, and maintains an attitude of fear of failure.

In addition to the key role of the mother, Adler perceived ordinal position and sibling competition as major determining factors. Adler posited a direct functional relationship between ordinal position and predisposition to conflict in later life. Each ordinal position was constructed as molding the character of the siblings in various ways. Because of the eldest position as the forerunner of the siblings, he was seen by Adler as the pace setter, being serious, dependable, conservative, and resistant to change. The second son, on the other hand, would view life as a race, and would be quite competitive in attempting to overtake his older rival. The youngest child has the enviable position of being the baby of the family. Often, the youngest is spoiled, has a complacent outlook, is easy-going, relaxed, and confident.

Based on their ordinal positions, the siblings will compete for the attention of the parents. Alignments with the mother and father will result, with the children identifying with either parent across sex lines. The identification of the children with the parents is also related to the maneuvers of the parents and their interpersonal conflicts. Thus, the concepts of complimentary and symmetrical relationships (used by the Palo Alto school of family therapists such as Satir, Jackson, Beavins, etc.) have an important bearing on the child's life style.

One line of research in the area of the family constellation is
success and conflict in marriage due to ordinal relationships of the couple. Toman (1961) hypothesized that marriage between rank complementary individuals will be more conflict-free than those marriages between couples with opposing rank ordinal positions. For instance, a man who was an older brother with a younger sister will be more compatible with a woman who was the younger sister with an older brother. An incompatible match would be between two eldest siblings, since both would compete for the dominant role. Toman (1969) has developed a rather elaborate series of formulas to deal with the combination of each couple on rank disposition, sex disposition, and total conflict disposition.

In comparing "normal" and "disturbed" marriages, Toman (1961) found that "disturbed" marriages show less rank complementary relationships and that the couples evidence less other-sex disposition than "normal" marriages, at a significant level. Other research finding the same factors operating has been done by Toman (1959a, 1959b).

When others have attempted to duplicate and extend Toman's findings, difficulties have resulted. Levinger and Sonnheim (1965), investigating normal and disturbed marriages with respect to birth-order complementarity, analyzed sixty married couples, using Toman's formulas. In opposition to Toman, they found no significant difference between normal and disturbed marriages with respect to dissimilarity of rank or opposite sex disposition.

On the other hand, Baxter (1965), investigating these same concepts, found support for Toman's hypotheses. Using a five page questionnaire given to all University of Kentucky freshmen, he developed three degrees of complementarity, utilizing both sex and rank matching for both spouses.
He found a significant difference in couples from multiple-child families, while finding no significant difference in couples from only-child families.

Thus, the question of rank complementarity and success in marriage seems to be a complex question, not readily reducible to any simple linear equation. A serious question would also have to be raised as to the designation by Toman of "disturbed" marriages as those with a child referred for therapy. It is very possible that many "normal" couples are equally disturbed, but refuse to obtain help for themselves or their children. It appears that there may be some evidence for rank complementarity leading to more stable marriages, but it is much more complex than Toman's research would indicate. The premise that one maintains the characteristics of one's ordinal position into adulthood has not been adequately demonstrated by the research to be cited later. Therefore, it would seem that a tenuous relationship would exist, but further research of a more sophisticated nature is needed.

As an extension of this type of hypothesizing, Baxter, Horton, and Wiley (1964) studied the effects of differences in mother-father relationships on the process of identification in the child. They hypothesized that if the degree of identification with the father depends on the mother's sanction, then the identification with the father will be adversely affected by conflict between the parents. This concept is related to Adler's theory that the mother is the major socializing agent within the family, turning the interest of the child toward the father first, and later, toward society. Using an analysis of variance of a biographical data questionnaire of all students in introductory
psychology courses at the University of Kentucky, they found that the perception of parental conflict by the student was a significant factor in the student's identification with the father. They felt this was due to the mother's refusal to sanction an identification with the father if parental discord is dominant. However, this simplistic reduction to cause and effect is difficult to accept, since so many other possible confounding variables may be operating.

Another major line of research on Adlerian theory has centered around ordinal position, sibling competition, and its effects on personality functioning and development. Adler posited that eldest children, second children, only children, etc. developed personality characteristics as a function of their ordinal position. While this was not a direct one-to-one relationship, ordinal position was an extremely important factor.

The research in this area tends to bear out some of Adler's hypotheses. With respect to personality differences among siblings, several researchers have attempted to establish correlations between characteristics and ordinal position. Hall and Barger (1967) attempted to factor out important attitudinal areas for older siblings and younger siblings. Using intact Protestant, two child families with male siblings, they found that older siblings had attitudes toward conservatism, organizing activities, preference for seriousness, and activity. On the other hand, the younger siblings possessed positive attitudes in areas of gregariousness, confidence, flexibility, and activity. Oberlander and Jenkins (1967), investigating birth order and achievement, found that:
The hypothesis was tested that first born, including only children, are superior to later born children in school achievement. Among 972 children in grades 5, 7, 8, and 11, from two differing socio-economic levels, the hypothesis was confirmed that first born significantly excelled later borns in I.Q. and achievement. It is concluded that birth order is a sufficiently important variable to merit consideration when investigating school performance, (1967, p. 109).

They thought that the results were due to the increased abstract verbal functioning of the oldest child, stemming from his interaction with the parents. The oldest child would also be more adult-oriented, and more sensitive to adult sanctions.

Cushna, Greene, and Snider (1964), studying characteristics of first-born and last-born children in a child development clinic connected with the State University of Iowa, found several relationships to problems and ordinal position. Among children with congenital defect, there were significantly more last borns than first borns. Among behavior disorders, there were significantly more first borns than last borns. They felt this to be due to the dethroning of the eldest child by the competitive sibling. Finally, when children with behavior disorders were dichotomized into those who were aggressive and those withdrawn, a greater proportion of the aggressive were first borns and a greater proportion of the withdrawn were last borns.

In direct opposition to these findings, Lemay (1968) hypothesized that first-borns should be under-represented among female college students referred for misconduct, while second borns should be over-represented. His hypothesis was supported at a significant level. Lemay interpreted the results as being due to the greater rebellious tendencies of second-born children. It is a little difficult to reconcile these
somewhat contradictory findings.

Eisenman and Taylor (1966), investigating birth order and MMPI patterns, found noticeably different MMPI patterns between the youngest and middle children. Lester (1966) investigated ordinal position and suicidal behavior. He found that eldest and youngest children are over-represented in a group of adolescent suicidal attempts. Actual adult suicides show no relationship to birth order. Lester thought that this may have been due to the loss of significance of ordinal position in later years, after patterns had been stabilized. Others have investigated ordinal position and the vocational area, such as Verger (1968) and Platt, Moskalski, and Eisenman (1968).

In analyzing the research, one would be hard pressed to make any rigid pronouncements from the data. While possible trends may be evident, the results were not longitudinal, to see the effects of sibling position over time. Only Lester (1966) compared adolescent and adult siblings. It would seem that his findings could be useful, that ordinal position loses its importance with increasing age.

In tying the discussion of the family constellation and ordinal position research to the hypotheses of the present study, the biographical questionnaire is intended to measure this influence on the individual's life style. The hypothesis that a rating of the father as very unsuccessful scholastically correlating with avoidance of failure ties in with the theory of the family constellation; and indirectly with the research of Baxter, Horton and Wiley (1964), and Baxter (1965). The hypothesis that a rating of the next eldest sibling as very successful in school correlating with avoidance of failure ties in with the general formulation
of Adler on ordinal position and sibling competition. Thus, these particular hypotheses are directly related to Adlerian theory and indirectly to the research within this area.

Adlerian Theory: Social Interest

As the individual moved outside of the immediate family constellation, he must develop "social interest," moving toward the community, rather than at a tangent. Adler perceived this as a necessary function of all families. Ansbacher (1968) quotes Adler on the importance of social interest:

Social interest is the barometer of the child's normality. The criterion which needs to be watched... is the degree of social interest which the child or individual manifests, (1968, p. 154).

Because of the vagueness of the term social interest, researchers have had difficulty in operationally defining it and submitting it to empirical validation. Stone and Ansbacher (1965) hypothesized that children with more social interest would be more interested in communicating with others. Therefore, their drawings of people should emphasize the eyes, ears, mouth, and nose (the "communicative" organs). Using fourth grade children in Vermont, they attempted to measure social interest with the component tests 2B and 2C of the California Test of Personality. To get a Communicative Organ Score (COS), they purified the head score on the Harris Revision of the Harris-Goedenough Draw-A-Man Test. They found that the COS correlated at a significant level with the test of social interest and had no relationship to I.Q., thus supporting their hypothesis. Aspects of this research are very close to the hypotheses in the present study, with respect to
social interest being unrelated to ability; and more generally, avoidance of failure being related to lack of social interest.

However, Strumpher and Huysamen (1968), using 282 white children, were unable to duplicate the results of Stone and Ansbacher. The difference in results may be due partially to the different instruments used; Stone and Ansbacher used the California Test of Personality (as the writer is doing), while Strumpher and Huysamen used Cattell's High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) to measure social interest.

Moving to the college population, Hartley (1957) investigated the relationship between social interest and acceptance of one's "reference group," as the term is used in contemporary social psychology. She hypothesized that "acceptance" of one's college as the reference group will be: (a) positively related to ease of interpersonal contacts and to individualism, and (b) negatively related to a sense of victimization, authoritarian submissiveness, cynicism, and lack of self-confidence. Using 73 freshmen students at an eastern college, she found that her first hypothesis (a) was significantly supported, but that the second (b) was not (although in the right direction).

Also utilizing a college population, Reimanis (1966) investigated the general hypothesis that: "remembered childhood experiences which do not foster, or interfere with the process of fostering the development of social interest, relate positively to anomie," (1966, p. 56). He felt that the opposite would be true also. Reimanis predicted that anomie would positively correlate with: 1) being brought up in a socially disorganized and anxiety-generating household; 2) a high rate of residential mobility and lack of acceptance of the family in the community;
3) having had cold and rejecting parents who themselves lacked social interest; 4) having a sense of failure through being asked to set achievement goals not consonant with one's abilities, or being discouraged in attempts to set and achieve socially acceptable goals; and 5) failure to establish satisfactory relationships with one's siblings. He obtained his data from the Strole Anomie Scale and Childhood Experiences Questionnaire. His findings supported his general hypothesis, but several of the specific hypotheses were not statistically significant. However, several of his hypotheses relate directly to this present study, specifically (4) and (5). His approach was somewhat different, relying on a questionnaire rather than the projective technique of early recollections. Perhaps he might have had better results if he had utilized the projective instrument, rather than the questionnaire format.

Attacking social interests from another direction, Wright (1965), Wright and Bidon (1966), and Bennis and Peabody (1962) have concentrated on interpersonal attractiveness. The results are quite mixed, with no clear, delineated relationships.

Upon analysis of this research, it is difficult to reach any major conclusion about social interest, other than that there are difficulties in operationally measuring it. The researchers had problems in measuring social interest directly, leading to differences in interpretation of results and problems when attempting to duplicate another's research.

Because of the centrality in Adlerian Theory of social interest as a major criterion of healthy development, it seems important to empirically
measure it. In the present study, the California Test of Personality (CTP) will be used to measure it, as Stone and Ansbacher (1965) did. Thus, the research just discussed bears directly on the hypothesis that avoidance of failure personalities will exhibit poor social adjustment as measured by the CTP.

Adlerian Theory: Inferiority, Exaggerated Goals, and Fear of Defeat

To briefly restate Adler's theory in this area, he saw the struggle of every individual as a fight for superiority, first within the family constellation, and later, in society. The outcome of this struggle depended on a number of complex factors, among which was the "courage" and creativity of the individual. The role of the family constellation, organ inferiority, inherent abilities, and other predisposing factors could be overcome in the courageous child by the mechanism of overcompensation, or overstriving. However, this was difficult to achieve, if the child was not reinforced by the immediate members of his family. The individual facing stiff competition from siblings if overburdened by overconcerned or neglected parents had grave problems in attempting to move toward social interest. The lack of "courage" in facing challenges led to feelings of inferiority. To compensate for this, the individual sets over-sized, unattainable goals, resulting in the dualistic feeling described by Angyal (1964) as: A feeling of godlikeness and its opposite, the feeling of total inferiority. These exaggerated goals, seemingly unattainable, led to strong feelings of fear of defeat. Thus, the person becomes motivated to avoid failure as a life style.
Several researchers have attempted to apply Adler's concept of fear of defeat to schizophrenics. McReynolds and Guevara (1967) hypothesized that schizophrenics, as compared with normals, are motivated to avoid failure more than achieve success. To test this hypothesis, they administered the Success-Failure Inventory (22 item T-F instrument; Guevara, 1965) to 136 hospitalized male schizophrenics, 103 normals, and 52 neurotics. Their findings were that schizophrenics had greater failure avoidance than normals. Also, they found that active schizophrenics had greater avoidance motivation than remitted schizophrenics. In support of these findings, Silverman (1963) found that schizophrenics did better on tests when punished for making the wrong answer, rather than when they were rewarded for making the right answer.

Another area of research developed out of Adler's theory of inferiority and exaggerated goals has been with the self-attitudes of criminals and delinquents. Adler posited the theory that the criminal, because of feelings of low self-worth and poor self-esteem, will have a compensatory highly exaggerated opinion of himself. Utilizing this concept, Worchel and Hillson (1958) investigated the self-concept of the criminal. They used the Self-Activity Inventory to measure this. They hypothesized that: a) the criminal has a relatively high opinion of himself; b) the manifest self-concept of the criminal is significantly superior to that of the normal person; c) the criminal's concept of the other person is less favorable than the normal person's; and d) the criminal depreciates others more, relative to himself, than does the normal person. They found that hypotheses (a) and (b) were supported at a significant level; and (d) was in the right direction, but not
significant. Thus they concluded that the criminal, with feelings of inferiority and low self-worth, compensates with an exaggerated self-concept and disparagement of others.

In support of these findings is Peters' (1958) research on self-attitudes of delinquents. Administering the Osgood Semantic Differential to 160 delinquent boys and girls, and to 160 normal boys and girls, he found that the delinquents had significantly more negative evaluations of self than normals.

The relationship between these research efforts and the present study is less direct because of the non-normal populations involved, i.e. schizophrenics and criminals. However, the general hypotheses of low self-worth coupled with exaggerated goals and fearing defeat correlate quite well with the general hypotheses of the present study. The difference would seem to be one of degree on a continuum. The work done in the area of underachievement and achievement motivation (discussed in following sections) will bear more directly on the questions raised in the present research because of the similarity of the populations used and the focus of the research.

Adlerian Theory: Early Recollections and Life Style

Before considering the research on life style and its measuring instrument, early recollections, a brief review of the theoretical underpinnings will be presented. Adler viewed the life-style as characterized by purposiveness; goal-directedness; unity; self-consistency; uniqueness; and ultimately the subjective determinants of a person's actions (Ansbacher, 1967). Adler also used guiding image, guiding line, or life plan to convey the idea of the life style.
In order to identify the life style of an individual, Adlerian therapists have utilized the projective technique of early recollections. This affords the therapists with a view of the individual's present view of life. The theoretical assumption is that a client selectively remembers those incidents in his past which reinforce the view of life that he holds in the present. The factual accuracy of the recollection is not as important as the specific content. Adler points out that the recollection is advanced by the individual to reinforce and remind him that the world is a threatening, hostile, friendly, or suspicious place, depending upon one's orientation.

In interpreting early recollections, Adler advised looking for the following type of things as important cues: 1) presentation of "we" or "I"; 2) recollection of the mother; 3) recollection of the birth of siblings (dethronement); 4) first visit to school; 5) recollection of dangers and accidents; 6) recollections of sickness or death; etc. (Ansbacher and Ansbacher, 1956).

There have been a number of studies on the use of early recollections with respect to a number of variables, as they relate to life style. Jackson and Sechrest (1962) investigated whether early recollections in four neurotic diagnostic categories would be predictable. They hypothesized that: 1) early recollections of anxiety reaction patients would show obvious fear; 2) early recollections of depressed patients would show memories of abandonment; 3) early recollections of obsessive-compulsive patients recall strong prohibitions; and 4) early recollections of patients with gastro-intestinal disorders will concern gastro-intestinal distress. They found that all their hypotheses were
confirmed. Their work supplemented that of Eisenstein and Ryerson (1951).

Friedman and Schriffman (1962) investigated the use of non-psychologically trained judges to differentiate between schizophrenic and depressed patients on the basis of their early recollections. They found that secretaries with fifteen minutes training could agree on a depressive classification in 31 out of 39 cases. However, the schizophrenic classification was much more difficult. This was based on preliminary work by Friedman (1952) in the same area.

Plottke (1949) investigated differences between life styles of "normal" and delinquent girls using early recollections. He found that delinquent girls' early recollections showed life styles characterized by: 1) more activity; 2) more pessimism; 3) more punishment; 4) greater sense of abuse by parents; and 5) memories occur later in childhood.

Early recollections have been compared with the TAT for stability and accuracy of concurrent validity. Kadis, Green, and Friedman (1953) found a much closer relationship between early recollections and teacher's ratings of high school students' pursuing goals and authority relationships, than with the TAT and ratings of teachers. Hedvig (1963) found that early recollections were much less susceptible to experimental conditions of success-failure or friendliness-hostility than the TAT's. He concluded that early recollections have a much greater stability and seem to tap more enduring traits of the individual. Lieberman (1957) found similar results.

Finally, Kadis (1958) has utilized early recollections as aids in group psychotherapy as: 1) screening devices for placement; 2) overcoming
communication problems in the group; and 3) recognizing the life style of individuals in the group.

Because of the centrality of early recollections in the present study as the basis for assignment to striving for success or avoidance of failure groups, it is necessary to demonstrate their reliability and validity. The writer feels that the previously cited research makes a strong case for their use over a wide range of areas. It has been demonstrated that early recollections can provide valuable insight into the life style of individuals and that they can be judged reliably by people with minimal training in psychological expertise.

Achievement Motivation and Fear of Failure

There are several theoretical positions being advanced at the present time to explain the phenomena of achievement motivation. The major positions in this area are held by McClelland (1961), Atkinson and Feather (1966), Heckhausen (1966), and Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969).

The investigation of achievement motivation began under the leadership of McClelland, who devised a modified TAT scoring system to measure the drive. Growing out of the early work on level of aspiration, McClelland (1951) hypothesized the existence of two directions of motivation, one, striving for success, and the other, avoidance of failure. In attempting to devise a measure of these orientations, McClelland and his co-workers had difficulty in discriminating between affect and that represents failure, and affect (such as hostility) that appears achievement-related, but is actually a fear reaction in a competitive situation.

McClelland (1961) has now become concerned with entrepreneurial
behavior and its motivational components, moving away from the line of research of others in this area. He hypothesized that the economic growth of a nation is dependent on the need to achieve motive of those people. Thus, to maintain our economic growth in the U.S., it is necessary to cultivate the development of individuals with high motivation to strive for success. McClelland characterizes the high striver for success as: 1) an innovator; 2) a moderate risk taker; 3) setter of moderately high goals; 4) recognizes the value of money, not for its own sake, but as a symbol of achievement; 5) enjoys problem-solving, ambiguous, competitive situations; 6) is self-reliant; 7) had parents that positively reinforced his strivings; and 8) relies on one's skill, rather than chance.

Atkinson and Feather (1966), while working closely with McClelland in the beginning stages of their research on achievement motivation, have stayed with the original approach after McClelland's movement toward measuring entrepreneurial behavior. The theoretical position of Atkinson and Feather was discussed in chapter one (refer to pages 12 and 13). Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969), in discussing the major theoretical difference between McClelland and Atkinson and Feather, point out that Atkinson "...moved away from the earlier definition of McClelland's et. al. (1953) which emphasized anticipated change of affect rather than striving for it" (1969, p. 118). Thus, Atkinson (1957) defined motivation as a combination of Motive, Expectancy of Incentive, and Incentive.

Upon analysis of Atkinson and Feather's model, Birney, Burdick, and Teevan felt they could improve upon its limitations by certain alterations.
The major differences seemed to lie in the rigidity or looseness of the theoretical postulates. While accepting Atkinson and Feather's basic suppositions, Birney, Burdick, and Teevan wanted to expand the view of achievement beyond the task-orientation of Atkinson and Feather. As Birney, Burdick, and Teevan state:

"Rather than treat Incentive and Probability as task-defined, we wanted to explore which aspects of achievement situations caused variation in the attributes of the Incentive influencing the subject...What we question here is the wisdom of confining the definition of the chief variables in the situation to the task attributes alone." (1969, p. 172)

Finally Heckhausen (1966) has taken a somewhat broader view than Birney, Burdick, and Teevan. Working with a German population, Heckhausen has attempted to work with the basic ideas of goal discrepancy, psychological distance, and psychological time as they relate to achievement motivation. For Heckhausen, fear of failure is the fear that one will not meet the standards of excellence for the task at hand. He has also worked out a different scoring system for TAT responses, using empirical methods of item analysis.

In summation of the major differences between the four approaches, each seem to supply a variation on the common theme. McClelland has placed his major emphasis on entrepreneurial behavior. Atkinson and Feather have the most highly restricted model, but also the most tightly controlled with respect to variable relationships. Birney, Burdick, and Teevan have tried to expand Atkinson and Feather's work, using drive-reductive, reinforcement terms. Finally, Heckhausen utilizes the most general set of guidelines, but is most concerned with situational and psychological variables not covered by the others.
With respect to research on fear of failure achievement motivation, it would fall into the following categories: 1) vocational and probability of success choice; 2) performance; 3) conformity; 4) level of aspiration and risk preference; 5) personal adjustment; 6) memory, and 7) physiological indicators.

In the area of vocational choice and achievement motivation, Tseng and Carter (1970) used a modified TAT (for Nach) and the Mandler-Sarason Test Anxiety Questionnaire (for anxiety measurement) to investigate the relationship between those variables and perceptions of occupational prestige, occupational aspiration, and occupational choices. Using 222 high school students as a population, they found that high need achievers combined with low fear of failure had significantly more accurate perceptions of occupational prestige and higher occupational aspirations than subjects with low need achievement and high fear of failure. Related to this research, Mahone (1960) found that those low in need achievement had more unrealistic vocational choices. In addition, Burnstein (1963) found that occupational aspiration was more directly a function of fear of failure than need achievement. Morris (1966) and Issacson (1964) have found supporting results.

In the area of performance, a number of studies have been carried out on a wide variety of tasks. Feather (1966) found that fear of failure motivated students (96 female college students) make more "typical" probability of success changes following failure than success. This would go along with findings of McReynolds and Guevara (1967) and Silverman (1963) in their work with schizophrenics. However, the schizophrenics exhibited a more exaggerated fear of failure motivation.
than college students would. In the area of competition, Ryan and Lakie (1965) found that fear of failure motivated male college students (35 in sample) were superior on a mirror maze task under solitary, rather than competitive, situations. In support of this, Bartmann (1963) found that fear of failure motivated high school students to solve fewer problems under time pressure than those students motivated to achieve success. However, several studies (Teevan, 1962; Teevan and Smith, 1964; Teevan and Custer, 1965) found a positive relationship between academic performance and fear of failure motivation.

With respect to level of aspiration and risk preference, the major finding is that striving for success motivated individuals chose middle range risks and goal settings, while fear of failure individuals chose the extremes of very high or very low risk and aspiration levels. The striving for success people also tend to be more internal while the fear of failures are much more external (within Rotter's framework). Consistent with these findings would be the work of DeCharms and Dave (1965), Hancock and Teevan (1964), Thomas and Teevan (1964), and Brody (1963).

In the area of personal adjustment, fear of failure motivated people have much poorer self-concepts than striving for success individuals. Teevan and Smith (1964), investigating discrepancy between real self-concept and ideal self-concept, found that a sample of 49 male college students with fear of failure motivation had a positive relationship to the discrepancy between real and ideal self-concept. Teevan and Fisher (1966), investigating internal vs. external orientations in achievement situations, found that fear of failure individuals were much more external. The findings of Kassirjian (1963) also support the above findings.
Finally, with respect to physiological differences, the research results are somewhat conflicting. Raphaelson (1957) investigated GSR responses of avoidance of failure and striving for success individuals during a task. His findings were that fear of failure individuals exhibited the highest GSR responses during the task. However, Raphaelson and Moulton (1958) were unable to duplicate these results.

The relationship between the hypotheses of the present study, avoidance of failure as a life style, and the previously cited research on achievement motivation is fairly direct in certain areas. One direct relationship is between the findings of poor personal adjustment of fear of failure individuals and the hypotheses that this life style will exhibit poor social and personal adjustment on the California Test of Personality. Another relationship exists between the research on vocational choice and the hypothesis that fear of failure life style individuals will exhibit vocational indecision and dissatisfaction with his present major. However, the research doesn't necessarily support the hypothesis that avoidance of failure people will be significantly greater underachievers than those striving for success. The important variable seems to be the amount of stress and/or competition felt with respect to the academic task.

The last relevant area is male-female differences in achievement motivation. The present study hypothesizes that differences will exist between male and female on fear of failure as a life style. However, most of the previously cited research did not examine sex as a variable. Rather, the designs utilized male only or female only subjects, controlling for this variable. Most of the early work was with male subjects, with
the female being considered very little.

From the little research that has been done, Birney, Burdick and Teevan (1969) feel that sex differences do exist:

"In three of our technical reports, we have found that the female results are quite often in the opposite direction to the male results and quite often these differences are significant. We do not have enough data, nor have we spent enough time thinking about the data we have, to know what these results mean." (1969, p. 231)

Therefore, the present study could expand the knowledge in this area of sex differences with respect to avoidance of failure.

Achievement: Focus on Underachievement

The history of research and innovation in the area of achievement has been dominated by several key figures. One of the major pioneers was Sidney Pressey (1920, with L. Cole Pressey, 1930, with Robinson and Horrocks, 1959). Pressey was instrumental in developing innovations in laboratory methods, educational workbooks, intelligence testing, programmed instruction, etc. His wife Luella Cole Pressey (1928) also carried out important research on achievement, demonstrating the efficacy of the study skills course at Ohio State University.

Another innovator was Francis P. Robinson (1941, 1943, 1945, 1970), noted for his development of the SQ3R method of study. Robinson is also known for his emphasis on "higher level adjustment skills", congruent with the guidelines of Seashore (1939) and his research on work methods.

In addition, several men have developed inventories for assessment of academic methods and adjustment. Borow (1947) wanted to assess the non-intellectual factors in academic success. To accomplish this, he prepared the College Inventory of Academic Adjustment (1949). This
was followed by Brown and Holtzman's *Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes* (1967).

At the present time within the field of achievement, there is a tremendous emphasis on underachievement. This waste of potential of underachievers is difficult to accept. When thinking of the tremendous misuse of ability that exists, as low achievers fail to utilize their potential, researchers have attempted to analyze the component of personality of low achievers as an aid in understanding the problem. One of the major purposes of the present study is to utilize the past findings in this area as a base in order to expand the existing knowledge by looking at low achievers with avoidance of failure as a life style. The major focus in this review of research will focus on personality variables of low achievers, as it ties in more directly with the present study.

Keimowitz and Ansbacher (1960) utilized Adler's observation that the child who does well in arithmetic is one who shows independence and social interest, whereas the underachiever reflects a pampered life style. They correlated grades and achievement scores in mathematics for eighth grade boys who were overachieving, with scores on the California Psychological Inventory. They then compared these with underachievers in mathematics. They found that the overachievers in mathematics showed more favorable personality characteristics on the CPI than did the underachievers.

Pierce (1961) extended these findings, asking whether this type of personality correlation would hold true for all overachievers and underachievers. He hypothesized that a high achieving boy will score higher on social adjustment, be more highly motivated, more
responsible, and more often engaged in achievement-oriented tasks. Using tenth and twelfth grade boys of superior ability, Pierce found that: 1) on the California Psychological Inventory, the high achievers had more positive characteristics; 2) with respect to school-related interests, the high achiever had more frequent positive identification with fathers, desire for higher grades, etc.; and 3) mothers of high achievers scored lower in authoritarian controlling attitudes than those of low achievers. The findings of these two studies lend direct support to the hypothesis of the present study that underachievers will show poor adjustment, both personal and social, on the California Test of Personality.

Taylor (1964) presents an excellent view of the major areas of personality differences between over-and underachievers. He found seven major categories: 1) activity patterns; 2) goal orientations; 3) authority relationships; 4) interpersonal relationships; 5) independence-dependency conflicts; 6) self-value; and 7) academic anxiety. With these theoretical constructs as a basis, Taylor and Farquhar (1965) attempted to compare them with empirically identified factors derived from personality items of the Human Trait Inventory. The following figure demonstrates vividly the results of their factor analysis:
### Extracted Factors (Males) vs. Theorized Constructs (Taylor, 1964) vs. Extracted Factors (Females)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracted Factors (Males)</th>
<th>Theorized Constructs (Taylor, 1964)</th>
<th>Extracted Factors (Females)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agitation</td>
<td>Academic Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic compulsivity</td>
<td>Activity patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Negativism</td>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapunitive</td>
<td>Authority Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td>Self Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aggressive, confident)</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Social Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependency conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2 Graphic Relationship Between Extracted and Theorized constructs with Respect to Personality Motivation and Achievement (Taylor and Farquhar, 1965)**

In this graph, the extracted factors represent loadings on the Human Trait Inventory, while the theorized constructs were developed by Taylor (1964) out of a review of the literature of past studies in this area. The areas of the theorized constructs would be quite close to the areas of the major hypothesis of the present study. For example, with respect to authority relationships, it is hypothesized that fear-of-failure individuals will rate their fathers as very unsuccessful in his present occupation.

McKeachie and Lin (1970) approached the problem from a somewhat different perspective. In analyzing the relationship between aptitude, anxiety, study habits, and academic achievement, they hypothesized that significant differences in academic performance between extreme anxiety groups may be largely due to differences in ability. This was confirmed at a significant level for males and females. They found also that student study habits do make a contribution to achievement independent of ability.
Oakland (1969) used the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to measure personality correlates of under- and overachievers in high school. He found that underachievers had poorer study skills, poorer attitudes, and poorer motivation than overachievers in men of average aptitude.

Brunkan and Shen (1966) found that good readers (high rate and comprehension) tended to show better personality adjustment on the Adjective Checklist than poor readers. The results of Joseph and McDonald (1964) also support this finding.

Horrall (1957) investigated academic performance and personality of highly intelligent over- and underachieving college students. He found that the high achieving brilliant students had the best adjustment, whereas the low achieving brilliant students had: 1) poorer overall adjustment (TAT); 2) poorer reaction to the environment; and 3) more conflicts in general.

Todd, Terrell, and Frank (1962) also studied differences between achievers and underachievers of superior ability. They found that for male students underachievers: 1) had less need for academic achievement; 2) were less decided on specific vocational goals; 3) were less able to see relationships between courses and attainment of goals; and 4) had lower expectancy for success in academic pursuits. These results are supported by the findings of Wilson and Morrow (1962).

In analyzing the results of the previously cited studies, it is evident that several of the personality variables that have been delineated as characteristic of underachievers or low achievers are also hypothesized correlates of avoidance of failure individuals. The work
of Taylor and Farquhar (1965) is especially noteworthy in this respect. The interpersonal conflicts, agitation and/or anxiety, problems with authority relationships, etc. have a close parallel with the predicted correlates of the present study.

Summary

This chapter has focused on the research in the three major areas of Adlerian theory, achievement motivation, and underachievement as it relates to avoidance of failure as a life style. Each of these areas has directly relevant research that acted as a partial basis for the hypotheses of the present study.
CHAPTER THREE

Procedure

The purpose of this research, briefly restated, is to identify empirically, correlates of avoidance of failure as a life style with respect to the following: 1) its generality or pervasiveness on many measures; 2) assessment of the individual components of this life style; and 3) relation of this life style to certain outcome measures, e.g. underachievement, vocational satisfaction. Thus, this present research on avoidance of failure as a life style will fit into the broader schema of the counseling process. By first identifying various personality correlates of avoidance of failure, later research can utilize this base to identify specific treatments that best deal with this life style.

To test this problem, the following general hypotheses are advanced (the specific hypotheses will be stated at the end of the chapter): 1) avoidance of failure as a general life style can be reliably measured by early recollections; 2) this life style has specific personality correlates that can be measured empirically; 3) this life style will have differences between males and females, but will not be affected by ability; 4) this life style will correlate with poor individual and social adjustment; 5) it will have as its component high anxiety; 6) it will also correlate with avoidance of
failure achievement motivation; 7) it will be influenced by sibling rivalry and parental modeling; and 8) it will be related to low achievement and vocational satisfaction.

Population and Sample

The population from which the sample of this study was drawn consists of students from Psychology 100, the introductory general psychology course at OSU. The selection was on a purely voluntary basis for this study, with students signing up on a general board listing many experiments. However, the students are required to participate in four hours of experiments during the quarter or to write a paper. Therefore, while the experiments that they participate in are on a voluntary basis, they are required to participate in experiments or to write a paper.

The number tested to get the final sample was 170. The final sample consisted of 40 males and 40 females. They were divided into two general groups (with two divisions within these groups) on the basis of: 1) life style (striving for success and avoidance of failure); and 2) ability (high and low average). The life style was determined by judges' ratings of the individual's early recollections (this will be discussed in the next section). The level of ability was determined by ACT scores. In order to have equal numbers in each cell, selection into the final sample was done on a random basis, using all subjects from the population tested that met the criteria for inclusion in particular cells.

The one exception to this random assignment of subjects, was in the cell of females high ability, striving for success. Since only nine persons were available for this cell, the writer put in a "phantom"
subject. Using the mean of the other nine scores in the cell, the writer filled in the tenth place in the cell.

The rationale for using this approach of the "phantom" score, of the mean of other scores in the cell (rather than a table of random numbers) is that the variance is less likely to be effected than by an extreme random number. The average score is also quite representative, and will not bias the results in either direction.

The design was a 2 x 2, with eight cells, ten people in each cell, with the following characteristics necessary for inclusion into each cell: 1) male, high ability, striving for success life style; 2) male, high ability, avoidance of failure life style; 3) male, low average ability, striving for success life style; 4) male, low average ability, avoidance of failure life style; 5) female, high ability, striving for success life style; 6) females, high ability, avoidance of failure life style; 7) female, low average ability, striving for success life style; and 8) female, low average ability, avoidance of failure life style. The division into cells was to control for the variable of sex, ability, and life style. The results of the males and females were analyzed separately. With this design, it was possible to analyze the main effects and the interactions of the major variables.

Measure: Independent Variables

Early recollections

Early recollections were used to judge whether the person's life style was more representative of striving for success or avoiding failure.
Because of the necessity of assessing life styles, early recollections were the major instrument to carry out this task. The research on early recollections has borne out its usefulness across a wide range of diagnostic categories. Its reliability and validity have been demonstrated through research to be quite adequate (the reliability and validity of early recollections are discussed later in this chapter on p. 52).

In addition, this is the major diagnostic tool of Adlerian therapists. Therefore, the tie-in to the assessment of Adlerian theory in the present research necessitates the use of early recollections.

Each subject was asked to write down three of the earliest incidents he could remember. The written directions were as follows:

Please write down (one on each sheet) three of the earliest separate incidents that occurred to you as a child. To aid in recalling specific details (such as who, what, when, where, how), close your eyes, visualize the scene, and then write down as much detail as possible. In addition, please write down the feelings and/or emotions that accompanied the incident.

The judging of the early recollections was done by the writer and Dr. Mary Alice Price, a clinical psychologist employed at the Ohio State University Counseling Center. The guidelines for judging the recollections were developed in a pilot study, involving 40 Psychology 120 students. Utilizing Adlerian theory, the writer developed guidelines for striving for success and avoidance of failure as a life style. A total of six hours was spent in training the other judge, as to the interpretation of early recollections, using the recollections of the pilot study subjects. The guidelines are contained in the appendix.

With these guidelines, Dr. Price and the writer agreed on a set of principles similar to those of Kadis, Green, and Freedman (1953)
and Friedman and Schiffman (1962) for judging the early recollections. The principles were: 1) consider actions emanating from the subject as he or she remembers himself or herself; 2) focus on the beginning and outcome of the episode recalled; 3) focus on the affect or lack of it associated with the incident; 4) if all three incidents don't agree, but two out of three do, those two will decide what category to put the person in; 5) if all three are different, weigh the first recollection the heaviest; and 6) if there is still no major orientation toward a life style of striving for success or avoidance of failure, score it neutral or unscorable.

Dr. Price and the writer then proceeded to separately judge the early recollections. They had agreement on 153 out of 170 early recollections. The judges, then, had 90% agreement between them on the blind analysis. After the blind analysis, the judges discussed the subjects' early recollections where differences occurred and resolved the differences in all cases. The categories for scoring and their respective frequencies were: 1) striving for success (50); 2) avoidance of failure (106); 3) neutral (8); and 4) unscorable (6). As an explanation of the last two categories, neutral meant that the life style was not strongly one way or the other; unscorable meant that too little information was available to put it in any category.

With respect to the seventeen early recollections that the judges differed on after the blind analysis: 1) four ratings were changed from avoidance of failure to neutral; 2) five were changed from avoidance of failure to striving for success; 3) four were changed from neutral to striving for success; 4) two were changed from avoidance of failure to
unscorable; 5) one was changed from unscorable to avoidance of failure; and 6) one was changed from striving for success to avoidance of failure.

One of the major reasons for changing of several of the early recollections to striving for success out of another category was due to a problem in interpreting anger in the recollection. Initially, before judging, anger was to be categorized as failure avoidance. However, in these cases, the judges decided that the outcome of the incidents indicated striving for success, even though the affect was anger.

With respect to the reliability and validity of early recollections, several studies cited in Chapter 2 (pp. 32-35) point to fairly high reliability and validity. For example, Kadis, Greene, and Freedman (1953) found that early recollections could be judged more reliably than TAT's with respect to twenty female high school students' relationships to authority and pursuing goals. In support of this, Hedvig (1963) found that early recollections had more stability than TAT's when written after experimentally induced conditions of friendliness, hostility, etc. toward the subject. Friedman and Schiffman (1962) found that two secretaries with fifteen minutes of training could successfully differentiate (and agree upon that differentiation) between early recollections of depressed patients and schizophrenic patients in 31 out of 37 cases. For further evidence of the reliability and validity of early recollections, the reader is referred to chapter two pp. 32-35.

Thus, the early recollections were used to delineate the two life styles of striving for success and avoidance of failure.
Achievement Motivation: The Modified Success-Failure Inventory

To measure the tendency to strive for success or avoid failure as an achievement motive orientation, a modified Success-Failure Inventory was utilized. A copy of this inventory is included in the appendix.

The rationale for the use of this particular inventory is that:
1) it's short; 2) it's easily scored; 3) it measures achievement motivation orientation; and 4) it is partially based on Guevara's (1965) more established instrument; and 5) it has a reliability coefficient of .71, which is reasonably high.

The other alternative was to use one of the modified TAT formats that McClelland (1961), Atkinson and Feather (1966), or Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) have developed. The problem with that approach is that although those researchers have established fairly standardized scoring procedures for their projective technique, the present writer felt that the primary intent of this research was to utilize more easily administered and scorable measurements of personality.

The original Success-Failure Inventory was developed by Guevara (1965) as part of his doctoral dissertation. McReynolds and Guevara (1967) used the inventory in comparing schizophrenics and normals on Adler's concepts of striving for success and avoidance of failure motivation. They found that schizophrenics exhibited a significantly greater amount of avoidance of failure motivation than did normals.

The inventory consists of 22 items, answered True or False by the subject. The scoring of overall orientation was based on the difference score between the number of items answered in the avoidance
of failure direction and the number of items answered in the striving for success direction. McReynolds and Guevara (1967) report a reliability of .76 for the inventory.

The present writer perceived several problems with the use of that inventory, however. First, it was used to distinguish between normals and schizophrenics, rather than within the normal range. Second, the True-False answering system did not seem to allow great enough differentiation of responses to items for the subject. Third, the writer felt that several filler items should be included to partially mask the intent of the questions.

Therefore, the writer developed a modified version of Guevara's inventory. First, the scoring was expanded to a seven-point self-rating system to allow more differentiation to take place (as opposed to indicating only True or False). Second, the inventory was expanded to 44 items, using the original 22 items, plus 10 additional items related to achievement motivation, plus 12 items not specifically related to the topic of achievement motivation.

After the completion of the modified inventory, it was tested out on 70 Psychology 120 (an introductory personal effectiveness and learning skills course) students.

The scoring of the modified inventory (in the appendix) is as follows: Total score (or difference score)=Number of Ss items minus the number of avoidance of failure items. In order to get a base of zero and have positive numbers for the statistical analysis, a +9 was added to each score.
Measures: Dependent variables; ability

ACT

The American College Test (ACT) was chosen to provide measures of the students' abilities. With respect to the rationale for choosing the ACT, there were several reasons. One reason was the tremendous amount of work done by the ACT central office and the Ohio State University Office of Evaluation in developing norms for the classes and for prediction of academic success. Another reason was the availability of the scores, allowing the testing session to be shortened.

A third reason was the reliability and validity of the ACT. As was stated before, the ACT program has developed extensive predictive validity tables for grade point averages; in conjunction with the Ohio State University Office of Evaluation. As an example, predictive validity coefficients for estimated grade point average based on ACT scores and high school ranks range from .5 to .6 (Office of Evaluation, O.S.U. 1968).

Because of these assets, the ACT was chosen. However, one of the drawbacks of using the ACT scores was the loss of anonymity of the subjects. Because they were identified by their student identification numbers (given to the student upon his entry into the university), they may have been somewhat inhibited in responding openly to the self-report questionnaires and tests. In weighing the substantial benefits against the possible danger of inhibition through identification, the writer decided that the strengths of using the ACT scores far outdistanced the weaknesses.

The ACT scores for each subject were obtained by taking the student identification numbers (obtained upon entry to the university),
that were written on the Biographical Questionnaire; and looking up the
ACT score on the list put out by the Ohio State University Orientation
and Testing Center. The scores are listed under the quarter and year
that the student entered the University. Those ACT scores not listed
in the Orientation and Testing Center's publication were obtained by
contacting the Admissions Office, which has a separate listing for
transfer students.

The American College Test (ACT) composite score of the subjects was
used to determine whether the subject was placed in either the high
ability or low average ability group. Although the ACT has scores on
English Usage, Mathematics Usage, Social Studies Reading, and Natural
Science Reading, only the composite score of all four was used.

For the males, a composite score of 26 and above placed the
subject in the high ability group, while a composite score of 25
or below placed the subject in the low average group. For the females,
a composite score of 21 or above placed the subject in the high ability
group, while a composite score of 20 or below placed the subject in
the low average ability group. Table 1 provides a comparison of means
of males and females in this study as compared with the university
freshmen of 1968.

Because of the noted disparity between the means of the males and
females, the writer analyzed the results for each sex separately.
However, as can be seen in Table 2 (p.57), the means between the various
cells within each sex being compared are very similar.
### TABLE 1
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ACT COMPOSITE SCORES
OF SUBJECTS IN THE PRESENT STUDY COMPARED WITH 1968
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY FRESHMEN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Study</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>6549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's mean</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's mean</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
ACT MEAN COMPOSITE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR EACH CELL OF THE PRESENT STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean ACT Score</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.--Abreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability.
ACT scores have also been used in several studies to identify specific underachievers, i.e. Walsh and Smith (1968). However, that use will not be made of the ACT in the present study. Upon investigation, the writer found that the ACT prediction tables (for identification of specific under- and overachievers) were much too low with respect to predicted grade point averages. It made it very difficult to identify specific underachievers in the present study. Therefore, instead of identifying specific underachievers, the cumulative grade point averages of the striving for success subjects will be compared to that of the avoidance of failure subjects. It is hypothesized that avoidance of failure subjects will have significantly lower cumulative grade point averages than equal ability subjects who are striving for success. Thus, the ACT will be used only to place subjects into cells according to their composite scores.

**Personality: Personal Worth, Personal Adjustment, and Social Adjustment**

The California Test of Personality (California Test Bureau; 1953 revision, Secondary level, form AA) was used to assess personal worth, personal adjustment, and social adjustment.

In light of its strengths and weaknesses, the major reason for choosing the California Test of Personality (CTP) was because of its ability to measure social adjustment and personal worth (both major components of Adlerian theory). Expanding upon this reason, very few personality tests have any measures for social
interest. Since this is one of the major thrusts of the present research, the personality test chosen needed to have a measure in this area; hence, the choice of the CTP. In addition, the two major scores, personal adjustment and social adjustment, have fairly high reliability and validity.

With respect to sub-scores, only the personal worth score was considered. However, its validity is open to question due to the fairly high intercorrelations of the subscores.

The test consists of two major scores, personal adjustment and social adjustment. Underneath the category of personal adjustment are six sub-scores: 1) self-reliance; 2) sense of personal worth; 3) sense of personal freedom; 4) feeling of belonging; 5) withdrawing tendencies; and 6) nervous symptoms. The category of social adjustment also contains six sub-scores: 1) social standards; 2) social skills; 3) anti-social tendencies; 4) family relations; 5) occupation relations; and 6) community relations. The raw scores of personal worth, personal adjustment, and social adjustment will be used in analysis.

The norms were developed by testing 3,331 students in grades 9 to 14 inclusive in schools in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and California. One problem with the norms is that they were developed prior to 1953 and haven't been revised. Because of the changing cultural norms among young people, lack of social adjustment may have a different meaning today than when the norms were developed. Therefore, caution is in order when interpreting the social adjustment scores. This will be discussed in chapter four. Another problem with the test is the fairly high intercorrelations between
The intercorrelations of the sub-tests to the whole score for personal adjustment and social adjustment range from .34 to .91. The manual cautions that: "since some sub-test scores are also included in certain other summary scores against which they are correlated, these coefficients are spuriously high" (California Test of Personality Manual, p. 6, 1953). Therefore, one should use caution in interpreting the subscores. The manual lists the reliability coefficients of the test for the secondary level as ranging from .70 to .93.

With respect to validity, supporting evidence comes from Taylor and Combs (1952). Investigating self-acceptance and adjustment, they found that the better adjusted (as measured by the CTP) half of 168 sixth grade subjects checked significantly more damaging statements about themselves on a self-descriptive checklist than the more poorly adjusted half. Thus, the better adjusted seem more open and self-accepting.

**Level of Anxiety**

The Institute for Personality and Ability Testing Anxiety Scale Questionnaire was chosen as the instrument to determine the level of anxiety of the subject.

The reason for choosing this particular instrument, rather than something like the Alpert-Haber Anxiety Achievement Test, is that a measure of the general level of anxiety was needed, rather than a situation-specific measure. This, in turn, was due to the purpose of this experiment, to attempt to get at components of life style rather than in a specific area such as achievement. If the major thrust of the research had focused on personality correlates related to
achievement, then the Alpert-Haber would have been more appropriate. An additional factor to consider was the ease of administering the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire.

The scale consists of 40 questions, with five sub-scores, and one overall score of level of anxiety. The five sub-scores are: 1) defective integration; 2) lack of ego strength; 3) paranoid insecurity; 4) guilt-proneness; and 5) frustration tension. The overall score indicates general level of anxiety (it can be divided into general overt anxiety and general covert anxiety if desired). Raw overall scores are used in the analysis. The higher the raw scores, the higher the level of anxiety.

The reliabilities of the overall score are quite good, ranging from .80 to .93, as reported in the manual (Cattell and Scheir, 1963, p. 8). However, the manual cautions that the sub-score reliabilities are fairly low (.26 to .60). Therefore, the sub-scores are intended as suggestive leads, rather than as reliable diagnostic categories. For this reason, only the overall score of level of anxiety is being used.

With respect to validity (external concrete validity), the manual reports that the IPAT Anxiety Scale sharply distinguishes between normals and high anxiety cases (based on clinical judgments) at a statistically significant level (Cattell and Scheir, 1963, p. 9). As another example 795 normals averaged 5.5 on a sten scale (from 1 to 10), 174 anxiety cases averaged 8.1 stens (Cattell and Scheir, 1963, p.9).

The IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire has been utilized to establish relationships with a number of variables. Some of the major areas have been birth order and family environment; learning, scholarship and training;
religious experience; groups of clinical interest; and the effects of drugs on anxiety. A general trend in learning would be that very high or very low levels of anxiety seem to correlate with low grades in coursework (Fein, 1963).

The primary general hypothesis connected with this instrument is that avoidance of failure subjects will have significantly higher levels of anxiety than striving for success subjects.

Biographical Information

The Biographical Questionnaire was developed by the writer to obtain information and self-ratings by the subject in the areas of parental modeling, sibling competition, level of achievement, and satisfaction with his or her present major. A copy of this questionnaire is included in the appendix.

The reason for obtaining the information contained on the questionnaire was the direct tie-in to Adlerian theory and achievement motivation theory as regards hypothesized avoidance of failure personality correlates.

With respect to parental modeling, it was hypothesized that subjects who rated their fathers as unsuccessful in school would be over-represented in the avoidance of failure population. Rating of the father's success in school was scored by circling a number from 1 to 9 on a 9 point scale (see example below):

Your rating of your father's success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very unsuccessful average very successful
In the area of sibling competition, it was hypothesized that avoidance of failure subjects' closest sibling in age would be rated as being successful in school. This was also rated on a nine-point scale (see below):

Your rating of his/her success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very unsuccessful average very successful

In other words, a person with strong sibling competition above or below him or her will be more likely to have an avoidance of failure orientation than a person without this competition.

A self-report on grade point average (up until the present quarter) was used to determine high and low achievement.

Finally, in the area of career planning, it was hypothesized that avoidance of failure subjects will exhibit more dissatisfaction with their present major than striving for success subjects. This self-rating was done on a nine point scale (see below for an example):

Your rating of satisfaction with your present major:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

very unsuccessful average very successful

The second general hypothesis in the area of career planning, that avoidance of failure subjects will have fewer declared majors as a group than those in the striving for success group, was not able to be tested because of the small number of undeclared majors in the whole population. In other words, there would have been only one or two undeclared majors in each cell.
Data Collection

The subjects were able to complete all of the tests within one session of two hours. The numbers tested during each session ranged from 5 to 31, depending on how many people had signed up out of forty possible places. The sign-up sheet gave the title of the experiment as: "Personality Assessment through Testing Inventories". The purpose of the title was to give prospective subjects an idea of what was involved, without biasing their responding during the experiment.

The general directions for the testing session were as follows:

"You are asked to complete a series of questionnaires and inventories as they relate to you. There are no time limits on any of the inventories and no right or wrong answers. You should answer the questions only as they relate to you. Please try to be as open and honest as possible in answering the questions. All of the materials are strictly confidential and are being used for my dissertation. You are asked to put your student ID number on the Biographical Questionnaire. This is to obtain your ACT score. While this detracts from the anonymity of your responses, it was seen as a better alternative than giving a test of ability that would be less suitable. Since there is no deception involved in this experiment, there will not be a debriefing at the end of the session. However, for all those interested, I will explain the purpose of the research and the use of the instruments. For all those interested, a general explanation will be given on May 17, from 7:00-8:00 p.m. in Room 100 Botany Zoology Building. At that time, I will have partial results, which I will give to you. Are there any questions?"

"The first instrument is a biographical questionnaire. You are asked to fill out each of the items as honestly as you can. Please be careful to write down your student ID number correctly. If you cannot remember it, would you please just put your name on the form? Again, this material is strictly confidential and the ID number is only used to obtain your ACT score. There is no time limit and no right or wrong answers."

When everyone had completed the questionnaires, the tests were collected.
The directions for the Attitude Inventory were as follows:

"The second instrument is an attitude inventory. It consists of 44 items to which you respond by circling the number from 1 to 7 that best represents how you feel the statement fits you. As you can see, the number 1 represents strong disagreement with the statement, while the number 7 represents strong agreement with the statement as it relates to you. Again, there is no time limit on this inventory and no right or wrong answers."

When everyone had completed the inventory, the papers were collected.

The directions for the early recollections were as follows:

"On the third instrument, you are asked to write down the three earliest separate incidents that you can remember in which you were involved. You are asked to give the who, what, when, where, and how of the incident, as well as the feelings or emotions that accompanied it at the time. Use as much of the paper as you would like. In order to aid in recalling these incidents, would you close your eyes for several minutes, picture the incident in your mind, and then write down the details and emotion involved. Are there any questions?"

When everyone had completed the recollections, the papers were collected.

The directions for the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire were as follows:

"The fourth instrument is a self-analysis inventory consisting of 40 questions. You are asked to mark the boxes 'always', 'sometimes', or 'never' as the question relates to you. Again there is no time limit and no right or wrong answers. Any questions?"

When everyone was finished, the questionnaires were collected.

The directions for the California Test of Personality were as follows:

"The last and final instrument is the California Test of Personality. It consists of a series of statements to which you respond by indicating yes or no as they relate to you. Again, there are no time limits and no right or wrong answers. Any questions?"
The tests were collected when everyone had finished.

For all those who were interested or could stay, an explanation of the purpose of the research and the instruments was given. In addition, a general meeting was held on May 17 from 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. to explain the research and answer any questions.

Analysis of Data

The major emphasis in the present study is the comparison between the life styles of striving for success and avoidance of failure for both male and female college students. Each sex was examined separately throughout the analysis. The factor of ability will also be examined to assess its effects on the variables of personal worth, social adjustment, etc., independent of life styles. In a majority of cases, it is hypothesized that ability does not have a significant effect on the variables under consideration. The interaction of life style and ability will also be tested. It is hypothesized that no interaction will occur on any of the variables. In other words, it is predicted that life style and ability are acting independently of one another in the present study with respect to those variables being tested.

Hypotheses

1. It is hypothesized that: a) there will be a significantly greater frequency of striving for success as a life style than avoidance of failure as a life style within the total population of this present study; and b) there will be a significantly greater frequency of females than males with a life style of avoidance of failure within the total population of this present study.

The rationale for hypothesis (1a) is that our culture, dominated
by the "work ethic", is strongly success oriented. The culture reinforces competitive, overstriving, and goal-oriented behaviors. These behaviors seem to be major components of the striving for success life style.

The rationale for hypothesis (lb) is that the abilities and roles of women in the American culture have been traditionally down-graded. Adler (1963) writes of the "masculine protest" of women, of the females' feelings of inferiority. This phenomenon has recently been explored by a number of writers, such as Millet (1970). In addition, men seem to be threatened by bright women, but don't like "dumb" women. This may create a problem for women that leads to the development of avoidance of failure as a life style.

With respect to statistical analysis, the attempt will be made to refute the null hypothesis. Both parts of the hypothesis (la and lb) will be tested by a chi square, with one degree of freedom.

2. It is hypothesized that: a) **males** with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than **males** with avoidance of failure life style; **males** with high ability will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than **males** with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability, with respect to achievement motivation.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that people with life styles of striving for success and avoiding failure should maintain their orientations with respect to achievement motivation. This hypothesis
will serve as a validity check for the two life styles being researched.

The hypothesis will be tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The two factors were life style and ability. Both factors had two levels: a) life style--striving for success and avoidance of failure; and b) ability--high and low average. Thus, the variable of achievement motivation was analyzed with respect to the two factors, life style and ability. Each of the next succeeding hypotheses involving analysis of variance will be tested with respect to these two factors.

The test of significance is an F-test with 1,36 degrees of freedom. Any significant interactions will be tested by the Scheffe' method. It's uses are: 1) it is easy to apply; 2) it uses the F-test; and 3) it is more rigorous than the other a posteriori methods of comparison with respect to Type I error.

3. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than females of low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life styles and ability for females.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for men under hypothesis two,
This hypothesis will be tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance is an F-test with 1,36 degrees of freedom. Any significant interactions will be tested by the Scheffe' method for a posteriori analysis.

4. It is hypothesized for the whole sample of this study that:
   a) a significant positive correlation will exist between the life styles in this study (striving for success and avoidance of failure) and achievement motivation scores (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory); and b) a significant positive correlation will exist between achievement motivation scores and cumulative grade point average for both men and women (for the relationship between life style and grade point average, see hypotheses seventeen and eighteen).

The rationale is similar to hypothesis two. This hypothesis will also serve as a validity check on the two life styles.

Hypothesis 4a was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was a point biserial correlation coefficient. The test of significance is a "t" test, with 78 degrees of freedom. Hypothesis 4b was tested by a Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient. The test of significance was a "t" test, with 78 degrees of freedom.

5. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the
California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that both Adlerian theory and achievement motivation theory posit low self-worth or low self-esteem as a hypothesized personality correlate of avoidance of failure. In addition, ability should not have a significant affect on personal worth. Since college students as a population are relatively homogeneous with respect to ability, the major factor is difference of personal worth should be life style, rather than ability.

The hypothesis will be tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions, if any, were tested a posteriori by the Scheffe method.

6. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is similar to that of hypothesis five.
This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic is multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA computer program). The test of significance is the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions (if any) were tested a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

7. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as hypothesis five.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions (if any) were analyzed posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

8. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between
life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for hypothesis five.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions (if any) were analyzed posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

9. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that social interest is one of the major tenets of Adlerian theory. The striving for success person should exhibit higher social interest or social adjustment, according to the theory. In addition, for a select group with relatively homogeneous ability, such as the college population, differences in social adjustment should be due to life style, and not ability.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions (if any), were analyzed a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.
10. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as hypothesis nine.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions (if any) were analyzed a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

11. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that both Adlerian theory and achievement motivation theory emphasize higher levels of anxiety for avoidance of failure persons. However, achievement motivation theory is more concerned with test anxiety than generalized anxiety.
With respect to ability, the research of McKeachie and Lin (1970) supports the hypothesis that high ability students have less anxiety (in McKeachie and Lin's study it was test anxiety) than students with low average ability. The rationale for hypothesis 11b is therefore related to research on achievement.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions, if any, were analyzed a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

12. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for hypothesis eleven.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. The significant interactions, if any, were tested a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.
13. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success lifestyle will have significantly higher rating of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure lifestyle; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure lifestyle; and c) there will be no significant interactions between lifestyle and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that Adlerian theory views the family constellation as a very important factor in development of an individual's lifestyle. Within the family constellation, the father is a major figure in modeling success. He also should encourage his children to strive in the world outside the family. Therefore, if the father is perceived as successful in school, he provides adequate modeling and goals for the children in their scholastic endeavors.

Ability was not hypothesized to be significantly related to rating of father's success in school. Too many variables operate in the family constellation for a son's or daughter's ability to have an influence on this rating. The research on family constellation dynamics in chapter two points to sibling competition, birth order, etc. as major factors, rather than ability level of the children.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (BMD_08V Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test with 1,36 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions
14. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for hypothesis thirteen.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance for unequal cell frequencies (BMD O8V Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,34 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

15. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.
The rationale for this hypothesis is that Adlerian theory views sibling competition within the family constellation as a major factor in formation of the person's life style. Therefore, a person facing stiff competition from a sibling will be more likely to have an orientation of avoiding failure than striving for success. With respect to ability, the rationale is similar to hypothesis 13.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (BMD O8V Computer program). Because not all subjects had siblings, the frequencies were unequal in the cells. The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,34 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested a posteriori by the Scheffe' formula.

16. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower ratings of their siblings success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for hypothesis fifteen.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (BMD O8V Computer program). The test of significance
was the F-test, with 1.33 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested by the Scheffe' formula.

17. It is hypothesized that: a) **males** with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than **males** with an avoidance of failure life style; b) **males** with high ability will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than **males** with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life styles and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that research on achievement points to low grade point averages for persons with the personality characteristics of the avoidance of failure life style. However, the research on achievement motivation is somewhat contradictory in this area.

With respect to ability, much of the research literature in this area supports hypothesis 17b that ability and grade point average are significantly related.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1.36 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions were tested by the Scheffe' formula.

18. It is hypothesized that: a) **females** with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than **females** with an avoidance of failure life style; b) **females** with high
ability will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as that for hypothesis seventeen.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was multivariate analysis of variance (BMD MANOVA Computer program). The test of significance was the $F$ test, with 1,36 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested by the Scheffe' formula.

19. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that achievement motivation research supports the view that avoidance of failure people tend to be more dissatisfied and indecisive with respect to career plans.

Ability was not hypothesized to be related to ratings of satisfaction with one's present major because it is probable that high ability students will have greater expectations and will therefore be just as unsatisfied as low average ability students. In addition, Adlerian theory presents
the premise that unrealistically high vocational goals are related to low self-worth, rather than low ability.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (BMF O8V Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,26 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested by the Scheffe' formula.

It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions of the life styles and ability.

The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for hypothesis nineteen.

This hypothesis was tested by attempting to refute the null hypothesis. The statistic used was analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (BMD O8V Computer program). The test of significance was the F-test, with 1,35 degrees of freedom. Significant interactions (if any) were tested by the Scheffe' formula.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

The general format of this chapter will be to: 1) present the hypothesis being tested; 2) present a table with the means and standard deviations of the data in each cell; 3) present a table with the results of the statistical analysis; and 4) discuss the meaning of the results, as well as examine possible alternative explanations, if the null hypothesis failed to be rejected at a statistically significant level.

The following notations will be used in the chapter:

1) m=male
2) f=female
3) SS=striving for success life style
4) AF=avoidance of failure life style
5) Hi=high ability
6) LoA=low average ability

Hypothesis one deals with overall frequency of life styles; in addition, it examines any sex differences in the frequency of the two life styles. Hypotheses two to four deal with achievement motivation, and are intended as validity checks on the two life styles. Hypotheses six through twelve deal with personality correlates of the two life styles.

Hypotheses thirteen to sixteen examine the effects of the family constellation. Finally, hypotheses seventeen to twenty test the relation-
ship of life styles to the external criteria of achievement in school through grades and vocational satisfaction.

Hypothesis one: Frequency of, and sex differences between, life styles

1. It is hypothesized that: a) there will be a significantly greater frequency of striving for success as a life style in the total population of this present study; and b) there will be a significantly greater frequency of females than males with a life style of avoidance of failure in the total population of the present study.

The data and results of the statistical analysis are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The significance of the difference in frequency between life styles and life styles within each sex were tested by a chi square.

One of the major findings of this study is that avoidance of failure as a life style is significantly (0.001 level) more frequent than striving for success as a life style for the population of this present study. While this finding fits Adlerian theory, it is contradictory with the predicted cultural stereotype that everyone should strive for success.

There are several alternative interpretations of this finding. Because of the lack of research on frequency of occurrence of achievement motivation orientations, it is somewhat difficult to compare this present finding with achievement motivation research.

However, the theoretical position of Erich Fromm (1941, 1955), a noted psychoanalyst and social philosopher, bears on these findings. Fromm perceives man in the American culture as alienated from other men and himself. He feels that this alienation is caused by man's inability to handle freedom, with its ambiguity and resulting anxiety. Fromm feels
### TABLE 3

**FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF LIFE STYLE FOR THE TOTAL POPULATION, AND FOR EACH SEX, OF THIS PRESENT STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Life Style</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*--Abreviated: SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style.

### TABLE 4

**RESULTS OF THE CHI SQUARE TESTS ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FREQUENCY OF LIFE STYLES (1a) FOR THE TOTAL POPULATION AND LIFE STYLES FOR EACH SEX (1b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that tremendous pressure exists on the individual in this society to conform to authority, with accompanying feelings of powerlessness and isolation. The individual then acts compulsively, rather than spontaneously.

The analogy between Fromm's view of an alienated, powerless, conforming, compulsive man is somewhat exaggerated, but related to the hypothesized personality correlates of the person characterized by an avoidance of failure life style. Both have low self-worth, feel that life is to be feared, and perceive others as more important, more powerful. The compulsive carrying out of a task (rather than spontaneously enjoying a challenge) is consistent with the hypothesized correlates of Atkinson and Feather's avoidance of failure personality.

Thus, a tentative interpretation of the finding that the life style of avoidance of failure is significantly more frequent than striving for success, is that our present culture tends to foster and reinforce this life style. Again, this seems to be contrary to generally held cultural stereotypes that the major orientation in this culture is striving for success. It would be necessary to follow up the present finding with a larger, more heterogeneous population sample, before making more definite pronouncements.

With respect to sex differences and frequency of life styles (hypothesis 1b), the results were statistically non-significant, but in the predicted direction, i.e. females had a greater frequency of avoidance of failure as a life style than men. It would be necessary to test a larger sample in a replication of the present experiment, before concluding about the existence of sex differences. One of the reasons for the lack of present research on sex differences between striving for success and
avoidance of failure achievement motivation orientations is that the theory was established exclusively on males. Only recently, have researchers begun to analyze the results for different sexes separately. Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) have found some sex differences with respect to achievement motivation, but as yet have not accumulated enough data to hypothesize about the differences in responses between men and women.

While no sex differences with respect to frequency were found, later hypothesis tests will show that males and females did differ in their results with respect to many of the variables analyzed, i.e. social adjustment, level of anxiety, cumulative grade point average. These differences will be discussed at the conclusion of the chapter. As will be seen then, quantitative differences were found with respect to sex differences on the variables,

Hypotheses Two, Three, and Four:
Life Styles and Achievement Motivation

2. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the modified Success-Failure Inventory) than males with avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability, with respect to achievement motivation.

3. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than females
with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will have significantly higher scores of achievement motivation (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory) than females of low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability for females.

4. It is hypothesized that: a) a significant positive correlation will exist between the life styles in this study (striving for success and avoidance of failure) and achievement motivation scores (as measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory); and b) a significant positive correlation will exist between achievement motivation scores and cumulative grade point average.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 2 and 3 are given in Tables 5 and 6. With respect to life styles, as can be seen from Table 6, hypothesis 2a (males) was supported at the .079 level of significance. However, the females' results on hypothesis 3a were not statistically significant and were actually in the opposite direction from that predicted.

With respect to ability, hypotheses 2b and 3b the differences were not statistically significant. Again, the male differences were in the predicted direction, but the females' results were in the opposite direction from that predicted. There are two tentative alternative conclusions to be drawn from these results. One conclusion is that ability doesn't seem to affect achievement motivation.

Another alternative conclusion would be that there wasn't enough difference between the means of the high ability groups and the low average group of this sample. It can be seen from Table 1 that the
TABLE 5
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CELLS WITH RESPECT TO ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION (AS THEY RELATE TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS= striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
### TABLE 6

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION (MODIFIED SUCCESS-FAILURE INVENTORY) WITH RESPECT TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.225</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.225</td>
<td></td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
difference between means for men with respect to the high ability and low average ability groups is six points, and the same difference for women is seven points out of a range of 30 points on the test's Ohio State University norms. Perhaps with a larger difference between means, ability would have been a more significant factor.

With respect to hypothesis four, dealing with the validity of the life styles and achievement motivation orientations, the results tend to be somewhat inconclusive. The point biserial correlation coefficient between life styles and achievement motivation (hypothesis 4a) for both men and women was .17. It's "t" test value was 1.645, with 78 degrees of freedom. The level of significance was .105. Thus, while the correlation is fairly low, because of the degrees of freedom, it approaches a level of statistical significance. This result would lend tentative support to the validity of the life styles. In comparison to this correlation, the results of the analysis of variance (Table 6) on this variable were more supportive for men and less supportative for women.

Hypothesis 4b, tested by a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, for both men and women, between achievement motivation and cumulative grade point average, was intended to check the validity of the Modified Success-Failure Inventory. The results tentatively supported the validity of the inventory. The correlation coefficient was .219. The "t" test value was 1.848, with 78 degrees of freedom. The level of significance was .04. Thus, while the coefficient was fairly low, because of the large number of degrees of freedom, it was statistically significant.

With respect to the reliability of the Modified Success-Failure Inventory, a split-half (odd-even items) Spearman-Brown reliability test was done. The reliability was .71. This is in contrast to the reliability
of .76 of the original inventory, reported by Guevara (1965).

In conclusion of this section, there is partial support for the relationship of the life styles to achievement motivation orientations. On the positive side, the results of the analysis of variance between life styles and achievement motivation orientations for men were at the .079 level of significance, and the reliability of the Modified Success-Failure Inventory was .71. On the negative side, the correlations between life styles and achievement motivation and between achievement motivation and cumulative grade point averages were quite low (.17 and .21). This would cast some doubts on the validity of the inventory.

Hypotheses Five, Six, Seven, and Eight:

Personal Worth and Personal Adjustment

5. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

6. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal worth (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.
7. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

8. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of personal adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 5 and 6 are contained in Tables 7 and 8, while the data and statistical analysis for hypotheses 7 and 8 are contained in Tables 9 and 10. For the males, there was a difference in the predicted direction at the .085 level of significance between life style on both personal worth (hypothesis 5a) and personal adjustment (hypothesis 7a). This tends to support the Adlerian theory that avoidance of failure persons have lower self-worth than those striving for success.

With respect to the females, there was a difference in the predicted direction at the .078 level of significance between life styles for
TABLE 7
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE CELLS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL WORTH (AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLES AND ABILITY).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHHi</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHLoA</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.107</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: CTP=California Test of Personality; other abbreviations same as Table 7.
### TABLE 9

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CELLS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT (CTP) AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHHi</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: CTP=California Test of Personality; M=Male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability.
TABLE 10

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT (CTP) AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLES AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>372.097</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.146</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.099</td>
<td></td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.599</td>
<td></td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>483.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.285</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>198.024</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>172.226</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abreviated: Same as for Table 9.
personal adjustment (hypothesis 6a), but the personal worth (hypothesis 8a) level of statistical significance was quite low (.27). However, as was stated in the manual of the California Test of Personality, the major scores (personal adjustment and social adjustment) tend to be more valid than the sub-test scores (personal worth), because of the high intercorrelations among the sub-test scores and their lower reliability. Therefore, the writer felt that the personal adjustment score was more accurate than the personal worth measure. Again, these results are fairly sound support for the theoretical position advanced in the hypotheses.

As a tentative generalization, these results seem to point to different levels of self-worth according to one's life style for both males and females. Since this is one of the major tenets of Adlerian theory, it seems to be a fairly important basis for further research.

With respect to the effect of ability on personal worth and personal adjustment, none of the hypotheses (5b, 6b, 7b, and 8b) approach the .05 level of statistical significance. Again, as was discussed in the last section, there are several alternatives to be reached. One conclusion is that ability doesn't seem to affect the level of personal worth and/or personal adjustment. The second is that there may not have been enough difference between the high and low ability groups to allow the proper effect of ability to take place.

With respect to interactions between ability and life style, none approach the .05 level of significance. A tentative conclusion would be that life style and ability are acting independently of each other with respect to these variables.
Hypotheses Nine and Ten: Social Adjustment

9. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

10. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher scores of social adjustment (as measured by the California Test of Personality), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interaction between life style and ability.

The data and statistical analysis for hypotheses 9 and 10 are contained in Tables 11 and 12. With respect to differences between life styles related to social adjustment, neither the males (hypothesis 9a) nor the females (hypothesis 10a) supported the theory at a statistically significant level, i.e., .05 level.

Some thought might be given as to why the females' difference more closely approached statistical significance, i.e., .11 level. This may simply be a chance difference. Another alternative is that the women with striving for success life styles are better adjusted than the women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFHi</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>13.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLoA</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>11.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.---Abbreviated: CTP=California Test of Personality; M=males; F=females; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
### TABLE 12

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT (CTP) 
AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>202.502</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>129.598</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>330.627</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: Same as Table 11.
with avoidance of failure life styles. Another alternative is that the test actually measures conformity to social norms, rather than social adjustment. It may be that the women in this sample were more conforming to social cultural norms than the men.

As was stated in chapter two, researchers have had a difficult time in getting consistent results when attempting to measure social interest. Stone and Ansbacher (1965) used the California Test of Personality, but others have used a number of other instruments. It is necessary to replicate the present research before any stronger conclusions could be drawn.

With respect to ability (hypotheses 9b and 10b), there seems to be little difference between responses of high and low ability males and females on social adjustment. The same would be true for interactions between life style and ability (hypotheses 9c and 10c). Ability and life style seem to be acting independently of each other for this present research on the variable of social adjustment.

Hypotheses Eleven and Twelve: Level of Anxiety

11. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.
12. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will have significantly lower levels of anxiety (as indicated by lower scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interaction between life style and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 11 and 12 are found in Tables 13 and 14. With respect to predicted differences of levels of anxiety related to life styles of SS and AF (hypotheses 11a and 12a), neither the results of the men or women supported the theory. The men's results were slightly in the opposite direction from that predicted, while the women's results were in the predicted direction, but at the .30 level of significance.

In explanation of these results, it may be that the writer should have used the Alpert-Haber Achievement Anxiety Test (1960) in addition to the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire. The Alpert-Haber, by attempting to differentiate between facilitating and debilitating anxiety, might support the theory. It would have been hypothesized that the striving for success life style has a correlate of high facilitative anxiety, while the opposite would be true of the avoidance of failure life style.

Neither of the differences in ability for men or women had a statistically significant affect on anxiety, although the difference in anxiety level for male ability groups more nearly approached statistical significance, i.e. .09 level. This finding is supported by the research
### TABLE 13
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CELLS WITH RESPECT TO LEVEL OF ANXIETY (IPAT ANXIETY SCALE) AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.---Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability.
TABLE 14
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF LEVEL OF ANXIETY
(IPAT ANXIETY SCALE) AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND
ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs.AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>336.40</td>
<td>2.986</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>176.40</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.89</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>260.10</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: Same as Table 13.
of McKeachie and Lin (1970). They found that the major variable contributing to test anxiety was lack of ability.

The females (hypothesis 12b), on the other hand, seem to have little relationship between ability and generalized anxiety. Again, it would be necessary to compare the results of the Alpert-Haber with the IPAT Anxiety Scale before drawing any definite conclusions.

With respect to interactions between life style and ability (hypotheses 11c and 12c), it appears that they are acting independently of each other on the variable of level of anxiety for the sample in this research.

Hypotheses Thirteen and Fourteen: Parental Modeling

13. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

14. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of their fathers' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of their fathers'
success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interaction between life style and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 13 and 14 are found in Tables 15, 16, and 17. The results of the ratings of both sexes of father's success in school with respect to differences between life styles (males: hypothesis 13a; females: hypothesis 14a) tend to support the theory. The males had a difference between life styles in the predicted direction at an acceptable level of statistical significance, i.e. .04. The females had a difference between life styles in the predicted direction at the .11 level of significance. Thus, a tentative interpretation would be that the father acts as an important influence on children's life style orientation. A father rated as successful in school would possibly reinforce positive striving in the academic setting, as well as provide adequate modeling for the children. This supports an important tenant of Adlerian theory.

Neither of the comparisons on ability grouping for men and women show a statistically significant effect with respect to parental modeling (hypotheses 13b and 14b). Further, the results were in the opposite direction from that predicted (as seen in Table 15), when combining men and women. Specifically, both the male and female avoidance of failure high ability groups had unusually low ratings of father's success in school.

There are several interpretations of these results. One interpretation is bright avoidance of failure students project failure onto parents. Another interpretation is that bright avoidance of failure students who have failing parents generalize that they, too, will fail and
TABLE 15

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CELLS WITH RESPECT TO RATING OF THE FATHER'S SUCCESS IN SCHOOL AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability.
**TABLE 16**

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH UNEQUAL CELL FREQUENCIES
OF RATINGS OF FATHER'S SUCCESS IN SCHOOL, AS RELATED TO LIFE
STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.099</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.400</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.334</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.755</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB (interaction)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.916</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: Same as Table 15.

*p < .05.
actively seek to avoid it.

With respect to interactions (hypotheses 13c and 14c), there was a significant interaction for women between life styles and ability on this variable. Table 17 contains the results of the statistical analysis of this significant interaction.

The Scheffe' method for making a posteriori analyses was used to assess the significant interaction. This method consists of: 1) obtaining the means of the four groups and the within group variance for all four groups; 2) calculating F ratios; 3) obtaining the F value at the .05 level for 1,34 degrees of freedom (4.15); 4) calculating $F'$, which is $k-1$, or 3 times the F value (12.45); and 5) comparing the values of F and $F'$; for differences between the groups to be significant, F must be greater than or equal to $F'$ (Ferguson, pp. 296-297). The Scheffe' method was chosen because it is easy to apply, uses the F test, and is more rigorous than other a posteriori methods of comparison with respect to Type I error.

As can be seen from Table 17, the significant interactions were between high and low ability on avoidance of failure as a life style, and between striving for success and avoidance of failure as life styles on high ability. Thus, for females, life style and ability do not act independently of one another with respect to ratings of father's success in school.

In conclusion, the males' results supported the theory at a significant level (.04), while the females' results had a significant interaction between life style and ability. The females' results between life styles also supported the theory at the .11 level of significance.
TABLE 17

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERACTIONS BETWEEN LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY ON FEMALES' RATINGS OF FATHER'S SUCCESS IN SCHOOL USING THE SCHEFFE'S METHOD FOR A POSTERIORI ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( F' ) (3xF at .05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSHi vs. SSLoA</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHi vs. AFHi</td>
<td>17.45*</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHi vs. AFLoA</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSLoA vs. AFHi</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSLoA vs. AFLoA</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFHi vs. AFLoA</td>
<td>21.6*</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; LoA=low average ability; \( F' \)=three times the critical ratio \( (F) \) required for significance at the .05 level (for any difference between groups to be significant at the .05 level, \( F \) must be \( > F' \)).

\( * \) \( p < .05 \).
Hypotheses Fifteen and Sixteen: Sibling Competition

15. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

16. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly lower ratings of their siblings success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly lower ratings of their siblings' success in school (as measured by self-ratings on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 17 and 18 are found in Tables 18 and 19. The results for males and females for hypotheses 15a and 15b were non-supportive of the theory. There seems to be no statistically significant difference between life styles, between ability levels, and no interactions between the two with respect to rating of siblings' success in school.

One explanation of these lack of statistically significant results is the lower numbers in each cell. Because all of the subjects did not have siblings to rate, the cells had lower frequencies than the other
### TABLE 18

Means and standard deviations of cells with respect to ratings of siblings' success in school, as related to life styles and ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
### TABLE 19

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH UNEQUAL CELL FREQUENCIES OF RATINGS OF SIBLINGS' SUCCESS IN SCHOOL, AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLES AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1943</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.223</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—Abbreviated: Same as Table 18.
variables. Thus, the smaller numbers could have had an effect on the results.

Another explanation would be that the instrument (rating on the Biographical Questionnaire) was faulty. It may have been too simplistic an approach for a complex variable like sibling competition. Another problem was that the siblings were not always in close proximity (with respect to age) to the person doing the rating. The research on birth order emphasizes holding the age differences constant (ideally one or two years difference for siblings being compared). However, this was not possible in the present study, because many of the persons didn't have siblings within one or two years of them, in age.

Another possibility is that the sibling being rated by the person was not in competition with him or her. To ascertain whether the person was in competition with the rated sibling, the writer should have had a short interview with the person. In this interview, questions would have been asked to ascertain more accurately the dynamics of the family constellation.

In conclusion, it would seem that the lack of results may have been due to: 1) faulty instrumentation; 2) a lack of accurate assessment of the dynamics of the family constellation; 3) a lack of control over the age differences between the person and the sibling being rated; and 4) the smaller numbers in each cell.

Hypotheses Seventeen and Eighteen; Academic Achievement

17. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance
of failure life style; b) males with high ability will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life styles and ability.

18. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will have significantly higher cumulative grade point averages (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 17 and 18 are contained in Tables 20 and 21. The results for males with respect to differences between life styles on cumulative grade point average (hypothesis 17a) were statistically significant at the .049 level of significance. This result provides fairly strong support for the validity of the life styles with respect to academic achievement for males.

However, for the females (hypothesis 18a), the results were not statistically significant. These differences between males and females on the results of cumulative grade point average comparisons seem to substantiate the tentative conclusion that males and females differ with respect to the affect of life styles. The males with a striving for success life style had significantly higher cumulative grade point averages than the males avoiding failure, while the females avoiding failure had,
### Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations of Cells with Respect to Cumulative Grade Point Average, As Related to Life Style and Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.157</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.999</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: Same as Table 20.

*p < .05.
if anything, somewhat higher averages than the females striving for success.

Since grade point average was also significantly correlated with achievement motivation orientation (although a low correlation), it would seem that both life style and achievement motivation orientation may be useful in predicting general academic achievement of men.

With respect to ability, there was a difference in the predicted direction between high ability males and low ability males on cumulative grade point average (hypothesis 17b) at the .092 level of significance. However, the results of the females, comparing cumulative grade point average with high and low ability (hypothesis 18b), was not near the level of statistical significance, i.e. .05.

With respect to interactions, the results of the comparison of ability and life style were not statistically significant for males or females. Thus, ability and life style seem to act independently of one another on this variable.

Hypotheses Nineteen and Twenty: Vocational Satisfaction

19. It is hypothesized that: a) males with a striving for success life style will have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with an avoidance of failure life style; b) males with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than males with low average ability; and c) there will be no significant interactions between life style and ability.

20. It is hypothesized that: a) females with a striving for success
life style will have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with an avoidance of failure life style; b) females with high ability will not have significantly higher ratings of satisfaction with their present major (self-reported on the Biographical Questionnaire), than females with low ability; and c) there will be no significant interaction of life styles and ability.

The data and results of the statistical analysis for hypotheses 19 and 20 are found in Tables 22 and 23. With respect to differences between life styles on the variable of satisfaction with one's major (hypothesis 19a), the males supported the theory at the .10 level of significance. The differences for women (hypothesis 20a), on the other hand, were nowhere near a level of statistical significance. The findings of the males are supported by the results of Tseng and Carter (1970), Mahone (1960), and others cited in chapter two.

Ability seems to have little impact on the results of satisfaction with one's major (hypotheses 19b and 20b) for both sexes in this study. Again, this could be due to the lack of difference of means of the high ability groups, or it could mean that ability just isn't an important factor on this variable.

There is also no statistically significant interaction effect between life style and ability on the variable of satisfaction with one's present major.

Conclusions

Table 24 contains a listing of the hypotheses, predictions, and findings for each of the variables to aid in obtaining a generalized
### TABLE 22

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CELLS WITH RESPECT TO RATINGS OF SATISFACTION WITH ONE'S PRESENT MAJOR, AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSSHi</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSLoA</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFHi</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFLoA</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSHi</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSLoA</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFHi</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFLoA</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abreviated: M=male; F=female; SS=striving for success life style; AF=avoidance of failure life style; Hi=high ability; and LoA=low average ability.
### TABLE 23

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH UNEQUAL CELL FREQUENCIES WITH RESPECT TO RATINGS OF SATISFACTION WITH ONE'S PRESENT MAJOR, AS RELATED TO LIFE STYLE AND ABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Sq.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.406</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(SS vs. AF)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(Hi vs. LoA)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB(interaction)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td></td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Abbreviated: Same as Table 22.
picture of the results of the present study.

The first major conclusion of this study is that an avoidance of failure life style is more prevalent than a striving for success life style (hypothesis 1a). While contrary to cultural stereotypes, there seems to be some validity for this conclusion with respect to the population of the present study.

Second, while finding no statistically significant differences between men and women with respect to frequency of avoidance of failure as a life style (hypothesis 1b), other results show sex differences on the variables between life styles.

With respect to the men, of the nine predictions of positive relationships of life styles to the variables, two predictions were statistically significant, and four were close to statistical significance. With respect to the women in the present study, of nine predictions of positive relationships between life style to variables, none were statistically significant, three were close to statistical significance, and six were non-significant (sometimes in the opposite direction to that predicted). Therefore, there is general support of the hypotheses for men, but much less for women.

With respect to predictions of lack of interaction of ability to life styles in relation to other variables in the study, the predictions were supported in sixteen of eighteen comparisons, with one comparison statistically significant and one questionnable.

From these results, the writer draws a tentative conclusion that the higher ability, achieving woman may be characterized by an avoidance of failure orientation. On the other hand, her achieving male
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>SS more frequent than AF</td>
<td>opposite direction; sig. at .001 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>females more frequent AF</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on Nach m</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>MHi &gt; MLoA on Nach m</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on Nach m</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>FHi &gt; FLoA on Nach m</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>positive correlation of total group between life style and Nach. m</td>
<td>?; correlation of .17, sig. at .10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>positive correlation of total group between Nach m and g.p.a.</td>
<td>supported correlation .21, sig. at .04 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>MSS=MAF on personal worth</td>
<td>?; sig. at .085 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>M ability not related to personal worth</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>FSS&gt;FAF on personal worth</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>F ability not related to personal worth</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Number</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on personal adjustment</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;?, sig. at .085 level&lt;/sup&gt; not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>M ability not related to personal adjustment</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on personal adjustment</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;?, sig. at .078 level&lt;/sup&gt; not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>F ability not related to personal adjustment</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on social adjustment</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>M ability not related to social adjustment</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on social adjustment</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;?, sig. at .11 level&lt;/sup&gt; not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>F ability not related to social adjustment</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>MSS &lt; MAF on anxiety level</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>MHi &lt; MLoA on anxiety level</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;?, sig. at .09 level&lt;/sup&gt; not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>FSS &lt; FAF on anxiety level</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>FH1 &lt; FLoA on anxiety level</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on Fa. success</td>
<td>supported, sig. at .04 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>M ability not related to FA success</td>
<td>?&lt;sup&gt;?, related at .11 level&lt;/sup&gt; not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Number</td>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on Fa. success</td>
<td>?*, sig. at .11 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>F ability not related to Fa success</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>rejected at .03 level of sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>MSS &lt; MAF on siblings' success</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>M ability not related to siblings' success</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>FSS &lt; FAF on siblings' success</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>F ability not related to siblings' success</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on g.p.a.</td>
<td>supported, sig. at .048 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>MHi &gt; MLoA on g.p.a.</td>
<td>?, sig. at .09 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>?, sig. at .11 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on g.p.a.</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>FHi &gt; FLoA on g.p.a.</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>MSS &gt; MAF on vocat. Satisf.</td>
<td>?, sig. at .10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>M ability not related to vocat. satisf.</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>FSS &gt; FAF on vocat. satisf.</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>F ability not related to vocat. satisf.</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20c</td>
<td>no interaction effect</td>
<td>not rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, Abbreviated: M = male; F = female; SS = striving for success; AF = avoidance of failure; Hi = high ability; LoA = low average ability; Nach = need achievement motivation; Fa = father's; g.p.a. = grade point average
counterpart would seem to be oriented toward striving for success. Partial support for this supposition comes when examining the cumulative grade point averages of men and women in this sample. While the striving for success male had significantly higher (.04) cumulative grade point averages than the avoidance of failure males, the avoidance of failure females had higher cumulative grade point averages than the striving for success females (2.65 to 2.39), although not at a statistically significant level. Thus, the males and females differed quite a bit between life styles and achievement.

Another major conclusion would be that ability had little affect on most of the variables under study. This was true for both males and females. As was stated previously, part of this lack of affect could be due to the lack of difference between means on the ACT for the various groups. It would be necessary to replicate the present study before coming to any definite conclusions in this area.

**Limitations**

With respect to limitations of the present study, there are several possibilities. One limitation would be the lack of direct comparison of males and females on the variables. Another limitation would be in the instrumentation. The Modified Success-Failure Inventory had low validity. It could be replaced by the modified TAT format developed by McClelland, Atkinson, and Feather to measure achievement motivation. The IPAT Anxiety Scale could be replaced by the Alpert-Haber Achievement Anxiety Test. Another replacement would be the California Test of Personality with another test to measure social interest. Finally, a more complex, valid measure of the family constellation would have to be developed to replace
the self-rating scales on the Biographical Questionnaire.

With respect to ability, it would be advantageous to have larger differences between the means of the high and low average groups.

The final limitation was the size and content of the sample. It would be good to enlarge the sample size, and to draw from other populations (some within and outside of the university setting) to establish the validity of avoidance of failure as a life style.

Implications

With respect to the validity of the life styles (at least for the males), school-related achievement seems to be statistically significantly related to one's life style, i.e. higher grade point average related to a striving for success life style. This has important implications for counselors and teachers in attempting to work with low achievers. The hypothesized correlates of the avoidance of failure life style could act as guidelines in attempting counseling with low achieving students. Again, with males, satisfaction with one's present major also seems to be related to one's life style. This could be of aid to the counselor in dealing with indecision and/or dissatisfaction on the part of the student with respect to his vocational plans. One tentative guideline that the vocational counselor could explore would be the possible extremely high or extremely low vocational goals of the avoidance of failure oriented person. If the person's vocational goals are very high, the goals may compensate for a lack of personal worth (according to Adler). However, these goals become insurmountable obstacles that provoke withdrawal, avoidance behavior, and/or anxiety within the person. Therefore, the counselor must deal with these goals, attempting to adjust them to more realistic levels.
Finally, with respect to the personality variables of this study as related to the hypothesized personality correlates of the avoidance of failure life style, there seems to be some validity in Adlerian theory. One of the major implications for teachers and counselors is that people with an avoidance of failure life style seem to have low personal adjustment (both males and females). Thus, the counselor or teacher must initiate activities and/or insight that will raise the level of the individual's personal adjustment and feelings of self-esteem. The writer feels this to be one of the basic tasks confronting the counselor or teacher.

Another basic task of the counselor or teacher is to successfully identify differential treatments for males and females, as the sexes seemed to differ considerable in this study on their responses to the variables. There seems to be a "female psychology" that should be further researched and understood. This seems to be especially important, at the present time, in light of the women's liberation movement.

With respect to implications for further research, one of the basic areas is comparing the life styles of males and females directly. As was pointed out previously in this section, females seem to respond differently from males on the avoidance of failure life style.

Another implication for research is to replicate the present study, attempting to further validate the hypothesized correlates of avoidance of failure as a life style and to validate the use of early recollections in its identification. Three possible changes might be to: 1) use the Alpert-Haber Achievement Anxiety test to differentiate between facilitating and debilitating anxiety; 2) to use the modified TAT format developed by McCelland (1961) and Atkinson and Feather (1966) to measure
achievement motivation; and 3) attempt to measure social interest in a way other than the California Test of Personality.

It would seem important to attempt to replicate the finding that the avoidance of failure life style is significantly more frequent than the striving for success life style. This could have important cultural implications.

A further implication would be to identify specific underachievers, and to test the general hypotheses of this study for avoidance of failure as a life style with them. The present study was unable to identify specific underachievers, but, rather, identified low achievers.

Finally, after the hypothesized personality correlates of avoidance of failure have been established as valid, it would be necessary to investigate differential treatments to change this life style in counseling or in the classroom. This may be the most important and most difficult area to research, that of a successful change of a person's life style.
The present research was intended to investigate avoidance of failure as a life style with respect to: 1) its pervasiveness and generality; 2) its empirical correlates; and 3) its relation to certain external criteria, i.e. grade point average and satisfaction with one's present major. The general hypotheses under investigation were that avoidance of failure as a life style: 1) could be identified reliably by early recollections; 2) had differences with respect to males and females; 3) had no relation to ability; 4) was positively related to achievement motivation; 5) had personality correlates of low self-worth, low social adjustment, high levels of anxiety, poor parental modeling, and sibling competition; and 6) was related to school achievement and vocational planning.

The research from which these hypotheses were drawn was based on Adlerian theory and achievement motivation theory. Most of the hypotheses had their basis in this research on these two theories. The third major source of the present hypotheses was research on underachievement. The attempt was made to synthesize Adlerian theory (based on a non-normal population) with respect to avoidance of failure as a life style. This was part of the uniqueness of the research, as well as the attempt to identify personality correlates of that life style. These personality correlates had been hypothesized by Atkinson and Feather (1966), but not tested. Further, early recollections had not previously been used to
identify avoidance of failure as a life style.

The design of this study was a two factor \((2 \times 2)\), with two levels for each factor. The two factors and their corresponding levels were: 1) life styles (striving for success and avoidance of failure); and 2) ability (high and low). The results for males and females were analyzed separately.

The independent variables were life style (measured by early recollections), and achievement motivation orientation (measured by the Modified Success-Failure Inventory). The dependent variables were: 1) ability (measured by ACT composite scores); 2) personal worth (measured by the California Test of Personality); 3) personal adjustment (measured by the CTP) 4) social adjustment (measured by the California Test of Personality); 5) level of anxiety (measured by the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire); 6) parental modeling (measured by self-rating on the Biographical Questionnaire); 7) sibling competition (measured by self-rating on the Biographical Questionnaire); 8) achievement (measured by self-report of grade-point average on the Biographical Questionnaire); and 9) satisfaction with one's present major (measured by self-rating on the Biographical Questionnaire).

These questionnaires, inventories, and tests were administered to 170 students in an introductory psychology course at Ohio State University, Psychology 100. Out of the population of 170, 79 were chosen for inclusion in eight cells. The eightieth case was a "phantom" score, the averages of all the other scores in that cell on that variable. The cells (with ten subjects in each cell) were: 1) males, striving for success life style, high ability; 2) males, striving for success life style, low average ability; 3) males, avoidance of failure life style,
high ability; 4) males, avoidance of failure life style, low average ability; 5) females, striving for success life style, high ability; 6) females, striving for success life style, low average ability; 7) females, avoidance of failure life style, high ability; and 8) females, avoidance of failure life style, low average ability.

The results were tested by analysis of variance for two main effects and their possible interaction. One main effect was the difference between the two life styles on the variables. The other main effect was the difference between high and low ability on the variables.

The results for the men generally supported the hypotheses. Six of nine results with respect to differences between the life style were statistically significant or verging on it. Thus, the results for the men support Adlerian theory. However, the results for the women were generally less often significant, i.e. only three of nine results with respect to differences between life styles verged toward significance.

Thus, one of the major conclusions (and implications for further research) was that males and females differ with respect to factors related to life styles. Another conclusion was that ability did not seem to play a major part on these variables with respect to life styles. A third conclusion was that, contrary to cultural expectations, avoidance of failure was a more frequent life style than striving for success.

The implications for further research are several: 1) test the difference between males and females on sex differences; 2) replicate the present study with different instruments; 3) look at possible age differences in life style, with different populations; and 4) identify specific under-achievers and assess their life styles.
APPENDICES
MODIFIED SUCCESS-FAILURE INVENTORY

Circle the number after the statement that is the most true for you. Circling number one means you strongly agree with the statement; circling number three means you agree; circling number five means you disagree with the statement; and circling seven means you strongly disagree with the statement.

1. I tend to get along well with many different types of people.

2. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.

3. I like to form new friendships.

4. I like to fool around with new ideas even if they later turn out to have been a total waste of time.

5. When things go wrong for me, I feel that I am more to blame than anyone else.

6. I am ambitious.

7. I like to read about the lives of great men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's better to stick by what you have than try new things you don't really know about.

I like to criticize people who are in a position of authority.

Failure is not a disgrace when one has tried his best.

I like to feel free to do what I want to do.

It is better to be an observer than a participant because one learns more and gets into less trouble.

I like to ask questions that I know no one can answer.

Strong ambitiousness usually brings strong accomplishments.

I like my friends to encourage me when I meet with failure.

One of my primary or major aims in life is to accomplish something that would make people proud of me.
17. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I like to keep working at a puzzle or problem until it is solved.

18. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
Any man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.

19. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I like to be regarded by others as a leader.

20. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I would rather remain free from commitments to others than risk serious disappointment or failure later.

21. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I like to talk about my achievements.

22. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
When I am in a group or organization, I like to be appointed or selected for office.

23. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I feel timid in the presence of other people I regard as my superiors.

24. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I have a very strong desire to be a success in the world.

25. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    strongly agree
    strongly disagree
I like to put in long hours of work without being distracted.
26. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I like to follow routines and avoid risks.

27. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I like to argue for my point of view when it is attacked by others.

28. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
Success is too transient an experience for a person to sacrifice much to obtain it.

29. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I like to analyze the feelings and motives of others.

30. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I don't like to work on a problem unless there is a possibility of coming out with a clear cut and unambiguous answer.

31. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I like to form new friendships.

32. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I dislike failure and try to avoid competitive situations.

33. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I like to be called upon to settle arguments and disputes between others.

34. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose patience with me.

35. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly agree strongly disagree
I feel like telling other people off when I disagree with them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I used to like it when my work was mentioned in class in high school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I like to be generous with my friends.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I keep out of trouble whenever possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I like to be loyal to my friends.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I enjoy competitive sports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I feel better when I give in and avoid a fight, than if I tried to have my own way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>It is better never to expect much; in that way you are rarely disappointed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I like to praise someone I admire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44.</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>I like to avoid responsibilities and obligations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCORING KEY FOR MODIFIED SUCCESS-FAILURE INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance of Failure</th>
<th>Striving for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. 1-3</td>
<td>2. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 5-7</td>
<td>4. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1-3</td>
<td>5. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 5-7</td>
<td>6. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1-3</td>
<td>8. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 1-3</td>
<td>9. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 1-3</td>
<td>10. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 5-7</td>
<td>11. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 5-7</td>
<td>14. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 1-3</td>
<td>15. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 5-7</td>
<td>16. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 5-7</td>
<td>17. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 5-7</td>
<td>18. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 5-7</td>
<td>19. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 1-3</td>
<td>20. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 5-7</td>
<td>21. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 5-7</td>
<td>22. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 1-3</td>
<td>23. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 5-7</td>
<td>24. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 1-3</td>
<td>26. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of Failure</td>
<td>Striving for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 5-7</td>
<td>27. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 1-3</td>
<td>28. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 1-3</td>
<td>30. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 1-3</td>
<td>32. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 5-7</td>
<td>34. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 5-7</td>
<td>35. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 5-7</td>
<td>36. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 1-3</td>
<td>38. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 5-7</td>
<td>40. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 1-3</td>
<td>41. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 1-3</td>
<td>42. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. 1-3</td>
<td>44. 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of scoring**

If 1, 2, or 3, or 5, 6, or 7 on the scale for each item indicated is circled, it is counted as one response toward avoidance of failure or toward striving for success. The number 4 on the scale for each item, if circled, is not counted. The achievement motivation orientation is determined by adding up the scores for avoidance of failure and striving for success, then subtracting the total avoidance of failure score from the total striving for success score. If the difference score is negative, it indicates a tendency toward an avoidance of failure achievement motivation orientation. If the difference score is positive, it indicates a tendency toward a striving for success achievement motivation orientation.
BIографICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Student ID Number __________ Year entered OSU __________

FAMILY DATA:

Your age ________

Brothers and Sisters over 15 years of age:

Age ________

In school at present? ________

Last grade attended ________

Your rating of his/her success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very Unsuccessful Average Very Successful

Age ________

In school at present? ________

Last grade attended ________

Your rating of his/her success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very Unsuccessful Average Very Successful

Age ________

In school at present? ________

Last grade attended ________

Your rating of his/her success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very Unsuccessful Average Very Successful

PARENTS:

Father's occupation __________________________

Father's last grade attended in school or last degree __________________________
Your rating of your father's success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Unsuccessful Average Very Successful

Mother's occupation (if housewife, indicate that as occupation)

Mother's last grade attended in school or last degree

Your rating of your mother's success in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Unsuccessful Average Very Successful

SCHOOL DATA:

Year in school
Grade point average this quarter
Cumulative grade point average (up until the present quarter)

Grade point average you should have by graduation
Present major in college
Number of times changed major in college

Your rating of satisfaction with your present major:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Unsatisfied Average Very Satisfied

Vocation and level in vocation you would see yourself in after
10 years
Early Recollections

Please write down (one on each sheet) three of the earliest separate incidents that occurred to you as a child. To aid in recalling specific details (such as who, what, when, where, how), close your eyes, visualize the scene, and then write down as much detail as possible. In addition, please write down the feelings and/or emotions that accompanied the incident.

This sheet and the other two are for your recall of the three separate incidents.
Guidelines for Judgment of Early Recollections

Striving for Success

Activity level—actively, rather than passively engaged in task that ends in success.

Social Interest—involves with people, positive feelings toward those involved, lack of self-centered scene

Goals—middle range, rather than high or low

Self-concept—positive value of self, feeling of confidence in early recollection

Cooperation—engages in cooperation, protection, rather than competition with those involved, positive feelings toward authority

Anxiety—low or average level, lack of overt fear during incident, views world as non-threatening

Achievement—positive striving, zest for incident, feeling of accomplishment at end of incident

Risk-taking—shows courage, willing to make commitment to people and/or tasks, moderate risk taker

Internal-external—internal, looks for control in self, incident caused by self, outcome determined by one's own actions

Examples: Activities like camping out, enjoying exploring, taking care of bullies, carefree play, building things and enjoying it, enjoying security of friends and parents, feelings of warmth toward siblings and parents.

Avoidance of Failure

Activity level—passive rather than active things happen to one, rather than person causing it to happen

Social interest—lack of social interest, disturbed when not the center of attention or wants to be alone
Goals--very high or very low

Self-concept--negative, low self-worth, anticipation that person will be punished, will fail, will mess up whatever is involved

Cooperation--competition, negative feelings toward those involved, lack of cooperation, hostility toward authority

Anxiety--manifest fear, scared, storms, world is a dark, fearful place in which people are hurt

Achievement--lack of accomplishment in incident negative striving, others control what is going on, roadblocks exist to prevent accomplishment

Risk-taking--very little or very great risks, ends in failure, lack of "courage" to pursue risks, lack of commitment to people or tasks, people let person down, fail him in his expectations

Internal-external--external, things caused by fate or luck, things outside of self control outcomes, being lost, lacking a sense of security

Examples: fear of drowning, getting in over one's head, breaking something, being in a cellar that's dark and frightening, being scared of a bully, getting shocked, hurt, engaging in self-defeating activities.
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