CADER, Carolyn Elizabeth, 1947-
NEEDS FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND AFFILIATION
AS A FUNCTION OF AGE AND CAREER SALIENCE
IN WOMEN COLLEGE STUDENTS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1977
Psychology, general

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
NEEDS FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND AFFILIATION
AS A FUNCTION OF AGE AND CAREER SALIENCE
IN WOMEN COLLEGE STUDENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By
Carolyn Elizabeth Carder, B.A., M.S.

The Ohio State University
1977

Reading Committee:  
Samuel H. Osipow, Ph.D.
Nancy E. Betz, Ph.D.
W. Bruce Walsh, Ph.D.

Approved by:
Adviser
Department of Counseling Psychology
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my adviser, Dr. Samuel H. Osipow, for his time, acceptance and confidence in me during my graduate endeavors. Dr. Nancy E. Betz and Dr. W. Bruce Walsh as my committee members also contributed to the final accomplishment of this task.

I want to recognize the efforts and patience of my statistical consultant, Keith Widaman. We both came a long way during the last few months.

A special word for Nancy, who was there as consultant, source of limitless support, a calm in the storms of the last year - thank you.

I also want to acknowledge here the special caring and friendship of Anne Crimmings. From dyadic partners to Ph.D. - it wouldn't have been the same without you.
VITA

July 16, 1947  ..........  Born - St. Louis, Missouri
1969 .................  B.A., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina
1969-1973 ............  Social Worker, Division of Social Services, Wilmington, Delaware
1975 ..................  M.S., University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware
1974-1975 .............  Coordinator, Career Planning Center, Baker Hall, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
1975-1977 .............  Psychology Intern, Counseling and Consultation Service, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Rotated Factor Matrix of Career Salience Measure............ 21
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations on Dependent Measures According to Subject Group................................. 25
Table 3: Standardized Discriminant Weights for Dependent Variables ................................................. 26
Table 4: Frequencies for Correct and Incorrect Classification into Age Groups ........................................... 27
Table 5: Demographic Characteristics of Women Students According to Age Groups .................................. 31
Table 6: Expressed Reasons of Women Over 28 for Returning to College ................................................. 31
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................ ii
VITA .............................................................. iii
LIST OF TABLES ..................................................... iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION ........................................... 1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ...................................... 7
III. METHODOLOGY ............................................... 18
    Subjects ................................................... 18
    Procedure ................................................. 18
    Instruments ............................................... 19
    Data Analyses ............................................. 23
    Hypotheses ................................................. 23
IV. RESULTS ................................................... 25
    Discriminant Analysis .................................... 26
    Step-Wise Multiple Regression ............................ 27
    Hypothesis I ............................................... 28
    Hypothesis II ............................................. 28
    Hypothesis III ............................................ 28
    Hypothesis IV ............................................. 28
    Hypothesis V ............................................. 29
    Hypothesis VI ............................................. 30
    Hypothesis VII ............................................ 30
V. DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS ............... 32
    Hypothesis I ............................................... 32
    Hypothesis II ............................................. 33
    Hypothesis III ............................................ 33
    Hypothesis IV A, B, C ..................................... 35
    Hypothesis V ............................................. 36
    Hypothesis VI and VII ..................................... 37
    Discriminant Analysis .................................... 37
    Limitations ................................................ 38
    Implications .............................................. 39
TABLE OF CONTENTS Continued

VI. SUMMARY ................................................... 42

APPENDIX

A ............................................................. 44
B ............................................................. 46
C ............................................................. 50

LIST OF REFERENCES ................................................. 53
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The organization and attributes of the human personality have been widely studied by social and behavioral scientists. A primary construct utilized in understanding the relationship between personality and behavior is that of motivation, or need. Motivation refers to the factors that "incite and direct an individual's actions" (Atkinson, 1964), and has been used almost interchangeably with the concept of need when describing human behavior (Sanford, 1965).

Extensive research has focused on the need for achievement, or achievement motivation, as a significant factor in human functioning (e.g., McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell, 1953; Atkinson, 1964). Achievement motivation, as defined by McClelland et. al. (1953) in their theoretical proposal, is present when an individual perceives her performance in terms of "standards of excellence." In this paper, the terms "achievement motivation" and "need for achievement" will be used to refer to McClelland's conceptualization, and will be used interchangeably. The relationship between motivation and subsequent behavior is expressed succinctly by Atkinson (1964) who refers to the theory of "achievement-oriented performance." Historically need for achievement has been inferred from responses to various projective measures as well as behavioral criteria.
Recently, however, attention has been directed toward the particular problems involved in studying need for achievement in females (Alper, 1974). Alper stated that the confused and often conflicting research results dealing with achievement motives in females are more a function of methodological differences than any instability of the motive itself. The need for further investigation of this conclusion is thus related not only to the paucity of achievement studies using female subjects, but also to the lack of clarity as to the role need for achievement plays in the development and behaviors of girls and women. In an attempt to organize the evidence that is available, Crandall (1963) proposed that females strive to meet their needs for affiliation or approval through achievement, rather than being motivated primarily by a need for achievement per se. Affiliation is thus defined as a constellation of feelings and behaviors directed toward interpersonal contact with and approval from others. While Crandall's view may not be an accurate interpretation of the dynamics of female achievement, such a view has influenced interpretations of achievement data relating to girls and women. Bardwick (1971) assumed that needs relating to affiliation are dominant for women, and Barkwick and Douvan (1972) stated that anything threatening women's relationships with others will create anxiety and internal conflict, and will be avoided in reality or in psychological denial.

A relationship in the literature between women's need for achievement and affiliation can thus be seen, although the exact nature of the interaction is open to debate. A more recent interpretation of existing data is that of Stein and Bailey (1973), who propose that social
skills and interpersonal relationships, rather than an affiliation motive per se, may be an important area of achievement for some women. While affiliation as an important motivating factor in some females cannot be denied, Stein and Bailey also discuss the likelihood that cultural sex role definitions lead many females to exhibit their motivation in sex appropriate areas. Contemporary changes in women's roles have contributed to reexamination of the longstanding conceptualization of achievement as a "masculine" endeavor and affiliation as a "feminine" motive. Along with the reevaluation of the validity of such a generalization has come the recognition of the importance of including need for achievement in any attempt to understand women's behaviors, self concepts and career patterns (Alper, 1974).

Need for achievement has traditionally been viewed as a primary motivating factor in women's career commitment or employment, while need for affiliation has been seen as promoting involvement in marriage and child-rearing (Baruch, 1967). It has been proposed that different needs are satisfied by different roles, and that preference for the traditional homemaking orientation is associated with low need for achievement or high need for affiliation (Bardwick, 1971). A career oriented woman may thus be characterized by a high need for achievement or low need for affiliation. Similar differences in personality variables between career oriented and homemaking oriented women have been explored at length in the career development literature (e.g., Levitt, 1972; Matthews and Tiedeman, 1964; Rand, 1968). The populations studied, however, have been primarily college students who indicated future plans. In order to validate or reject any of the
theoretical proposals as to the interaction of achievement and affiliation motives in women, data on adults beyond the college years are needed. Women's orientation to future roles have been found to fluctuate with time (Angrist, 1972), raising questions about assumptions of comparable factors underlying career or homemaking preferences at age 18 and similar preferences at age 35 or 40.

While a bipolar concept of career versus homemaking orientation has been used almost exclusively in studies relating to career patterns of women, such bipolarity no longer seems to represent the reality of women's lives. A distinction between work or employment and career is also noticeably absent when discussing the activities of adult women. The concept of career salience, or the importance of work and career in one's total life (Greenhaus, 1971), appears to be a more viable construct than career - home orientation in understanding the processes involved in women's career development. "Homemaking oriented" women can thus be viewed as "low career salient," which focuses more on the values relating to work and career rather than one's presence in the labor force at any point in time. The construct of career salience has rarely been used in research on women, but an effort will be made here to interpret results dealing with career - home orientation in terms of levels of career salience.

The possibility of changes in type and levels of motivation during the life cycle is addressed by Bardwick (1971), who stated that until women become completely secure in their family (affiliative) relationships, they are not psychologically free to pursue work achievements. A logical corollary of such a viewpoint is that differences exist
within the nature of women's achievement motivation relative to her level of involvement in marriage and childrearing. Baruch (1967), in one of the few studies of women after college graduation, obtained cross-sectional data that indicated an increase in women's achievement motivation after childrearing years. The level of need for affiliation, on the other hand, was assumed to remain constant during this period. A behavioral manifestation of increased need for achievement in Baruch's study was return to paid employment. It would appear that, for a population of non-college graduates of ages similar to Baruch's sample, return to college would constitute a comparable expression of increased need for achievement. The factors of achievement oriented performance with respect to standards of excellence clearly apply to such behavior. A comparison, then, of older college students and students attending college shortly after high school would be expected to yield differences in achievement motivation between the two groups.

Recognizing the possibility for such variance in achievement motivation according to age and family situation, questions arise concerning possible developmental differences within levels of achievement motivation. Referring to a theory of overall personality development (Erikson, 1963), the issue becomes whether a unitary "level" of need for achievement adequately describes the dynamics at different ages. As the individual attains greater personality integration and creates her identity independent of others, the nature of her achievement striving would also seem to become more self-determined, less in response to standards of excellence provided by others. Thus, a comparable level of achievement motivation at age 18 years and at 35 years
may be characterized by conformance in the first case and independence in the other. Such a description of achievement motivation within a developmental framework requires empirical testing to move beyond the point of being an interesting hypothesis.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationships among the variables of need for achievement, need for affiliation, age and career salience in women college students. It is expected that, within the college population, women over 28 years of age will exhibit higher levels of achievement motivation than women of normative college age (18 to 22). Levels of affiliation, however, are not expected to vary across different age groups. High career salient women, regardless of age, are expected to exhibit higher levels of achievement motivation than low career salient women. When achievement motivation is analyzed according to factors of conformity and independence, it is expected that the achievement motivation of college women over 28 will be characterized more by independence than by conformity. On the other hand, the achievement motivation of college women under 22 will be characterized more by conformity than by independence. In general, older women will express their need for achievement via independence to a greater extent than will younger college women.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature relevant to the study under discussion can be divided into two major groups: studies dealing with the general phenomenon of achievement motivation in adult women, and studies exploring the relationship between career orientation and achievement variables. While methodological and population differences among studies restrict the generalizations that can legitimately be made, certain trends in the results will be cited.

As mentioned previously, Stein and Bailey (1973) reviewed research on achievement motivation in girls and women, limiting their review to studies utilizing behavioral indices of need for achievement rather than projective instruments. They documented the pattern of early academic success for girls, with somewhat lowered achievement in adolescence. They proposed that women shift their achievement efforts into the social arena at this time, rather than the achievement motive per se declining in importance. This proposal must be considered speculative at this point, awaiting further research in this area.

Hoffman (1972), on the other hand, suggested that affective relationships are paramount for females, and much of their achievement behavior is motivated by a desire to please. If achievement threatens affiliation, performance may be sacrificed or anxiety may result.
Crandall (1963) also supported this general position, stating that achievement behavior in girls is motivated not by mastery strivings but by affiliation motives. The possibility of any variation in such a pattern due to age was not discussed by either author, and their research was limited to girls under 18 years of age.

In direct opposition to Crandall's position, Friedrich (1976) investigated the relationship between achievement and affiliation motivation in college women, and developed scoring procedures to give equal weight to achievement imagery in areas defined as traditionally feminine rather than classifying such data as affiliative or ignoring it altogether. She distinguished between Intellectual nAch and Women's Role nAch, and provided support for Alper's (1974) contention that traditional nAch measures are not particularly useful or meaningful with women. Friedrich concluded that a motivation-performance relationship existed in her sample despite differing value orientations of women when the feminine goals and social skills expressed in achievement fantasy are scored. Women's Role nAch related positively with a performance task and with grade point average with ability held constant.

Lubetkin and Lubetkin (1971) investigated achievement motivation of women across age groups using a behavioral rather than a projective measure. Their sample was five groups of volunteer college students: undergraduate males and females less than 21 years old, graduate males and females less than 30 years old, and graduate females with a mean age of 40.6 years and a mean lapse in education of 15.8 years. The measure of achievement motivation was based on percentage of
incompleted and completed tasks recalled by subjects. The older female graduate students evidenced a significantly higher achievement motive than younger graduate or undergraduate women, but not higher than the males. The lack of control for differences in ability limits the generalizability of the results of this study.

Eyde (1968) also investigated factors of motivation across ages of women. She studied alumnae of the classes of 1953 and 1958 from a small liberal arts college. Her measure of motivation, a "Desire to Work" scale, did not yield differences between the two classes. When "work values" were considered, however, differences between the two groups were noted. For younger women, values of dominance and recognition were related to high motivation; for older women, "masculine" values of mastery and interest were related to high motivation.

While extensive research has followed Horner's (1972) conceptualization of and work on "fear of success" as a factor affecting women's achievement motivation, critique and limitations of her research have also been extensive. For purposes of the present review, a general summary of the criticisms will highlight the relevant issues. Horner's instrument is a version of the Thematic Apperception Test, designed to elicit stories that reveal level of achievement motive and the level of anxiety associated with achievement. The measure was derived from McClelland's (1953) work, which was based entirely on the achievement striving of men. Fear of success appears to increase with age from puberty to early adulthood, but generalizations beyond these ages are clearly suspect (Westervelt, 1975). Criticisms relating to the use and scoring of projective instruments are also relevant here.
Homer (1968) herself introduced the question of the relationship between motive to avoid success and need for affiliation. In her original study, women's motive to avoid success showed no relationship with the strength of their affiliation motive, nor did the latter predict the performance of the subjects. Caution must be exercised in extrapolating from this data, however, due to the nature of Homer's sample (undergraduate females) and the experimental task itself.

Tomlinson-Keasey's (1974) study using the fear of success construct will be discussed as a representative sample of the work in this area. Her sample consisted of 160 female undergraduates enrolled in a regular university program and 80 female undergraduates enrolled in an evening program. The mean ages of the groups were 20.07 years and 31.72 years, respectively. Stories were written in response to sentence cues designed to elicit fear of success imagery. Results indicated higher levels of fear of success for the regular college sample than the evening college sample. The author maintained that lower levels of fear of success were expressed by women who were wives and mothers than those who were not performing these roles. An alternative explanation of the results in this sample, however, is that of age, due to the considerable overlap between the wife/mother group and the older student group.

Baruch (1967) also investigated the relationship between women's family situation and need for achievement, although she restricted her analysis to married women. Radcliffe graduates in the classes from 1938-1959 wrote stories in response to pictures from the TAT, which were scored for need for achievement. For analysis, the alumnae were
divided according to the number of years since their graduation: 5, 10, 15, 20 or 25. There was a significant decrease in need achievement scores between the 5 year and 10 year groups, and a significant increase between the 10 year group and those out of college for 15 years or more. Baruch's replication study found that patterns of achievement according to age depended upon educational level. For women with less than a high school education, need achievement showed a steady decline with age rather than a resurgence after childrearing years. While the cross-sectional data from the Radcliffe sample alone cannot support an hypothesis of a developmental trend in women's achievement motivation, the results point to the need for further investigation in this area.

A select population of women were also investigated by Shelton (1968): 50 Stanford alumnae and 51 professionally employed women. All the women were married, had children, and were categorized as from the upper-middle socio-economic class. They completed the TAT test of achievement motivation and the French Test of Insight, also measuring achievement motivation. No significant differences were found on the TAT, but a greater number of professional women than homemakers scored above the mean on the Test of Insight. While the sample and the use of projective measures severely limits the generalizability of these results, the trend toward differences in achievement motivation merits additional exploration.

Maehr (1974) offered one explanation for conflicting and unclear results such as those reported above. He proposed that situational variables may play a critical role in achievement motivation as it
manifests itself within different racial and cultural groups. Katz (1973), for example, found women had less "fear of success" when responding to cues that presented women in socially sanctioned achievement situations. Increased understanding of women's achievement motivation may thus depend on researchers paying more attention to the environmental variables than has been the case up to this time.

Turning now to the area of career orientation and personality variables, one finds a diversity of instruments, methods and operational definitions. The concepts of "career salience," "career orientation," "career commitment," "homemaker orientation," "traditional," and "pioneer" are unique to each study and make comparisons difficult. Within this limitation, it can be said that across studies women classified as career oriented tend to be high achievers and high scorers on need achievement scales.

Hoyt and Kennedy (1958) found in their sample of college freshmen that career oriented women scored significantly higher than homemaking oriented women on the achievement, intraception and endurance scales on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Homemaking oriented women scored higher on the succorance and heterosexuality scales. Hoyt and Kennedy proposed that homemaking oriented women are motivated by a need for affection, which can be satisfied through marriage and a family. While the results of this study merit consideration, social changes over the last 18 years necessitate caution when generalizing. The EPPS has been used in many studies of career orientation to measure need achievement. Due to the ipsative nature of this instrument, comparisons of group means are questionable, although the literature contains numerous
examples of this practice. The questions that pertain to Hoyt and Kennedy's use of the EPPS can thus be applied to subsequent studies mentioned here utilizing this instrument.

Using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) with high school seniors, Tyler (1964) found that the career group scored significantly higher on scales relating to achievement \( (A_i \text{ and } A_c) \) than did the non-career group. There was little difference between the groups in scales relevant to social relationships or the femininity scale. On the EPPS, the career group scored significantly higher on the need for achievement scale, while the non-career group scored significantly higher on the need for heterosexuality scale.

In Rand's (1968) study of the masculinity - femininity dimension, she defined her career oriented and homemaking oriented college freshmen by extreme scores on her measure. While this is common practice in studies using measures of orientation with a range of response choices, the selection of extreme groups for analysis eliminates information concerning most of the sample, in addition to the concern over statistical regression being pertinent. The results are valuable data about these extreme groups, but the majority of the population must be considered in order to develop a useful theory of career choice of women. Rand also used the CPI as her personality measure, and found that career oriented women scored higher on the achievement scales, while the homemaking oriented women were higher on nurturance and succorance.

Oliver (1974), on the other hand, did not find significant main effects due to achievement or affiliation in her population of career oriented and homemaking oriented college women. A significant
interaction between achievement and affiliation, however, was found to
differentiate career and homemaking oriented women, but the direction
of the interaction was not discussed. Achievement and affiliation
motivation were measured by the achievement and affiliation subscales
of the Adjective Check List, and career orientation was defined by the
subjects' postcollege plans. Three items were pooled to define "career
oriented," three defined "homemaking oriented," with one item indicat­
ing undecidedness. The results of this study have implications for
further investigations of achievement motivation as a factor in career
orientation. When the middle range of the career - homemaking dimension
is included in analysis, information provided by the level of achieve­
ment motivation alone may not be adequate to differentiate among groups
with different choices. If, in a period where the "cultural impera­
tive" may be becoming marriage plus career (Rand and Miller, 1972),
configurations of personality variables may be necessary to understand
women's behaviors.

The concept of career orientation was examined by Kriger (1972)
using a behavioral definition. In her study of middle-aged married
women, she investigated need for achievement of women in male domin­
ated occupations, women in female dominated occupations, and home­
makers. Using the EPPS, she found that the three groups differed in
need for achievement. Women working in male dominated occupations had
higher scores than women in female dominated occupations, who in turn
had higher scores than homemakers. While the study is limited by its
use of the EPPS, it represents an important step in extending concepts
of career orientation and achievement motivation beyond the college
population.

In a recent article exploring the interaction between achievement and career motivation, Farmer (1976) referred to her work with different age groups of girls and women. Of importance to the present study were comparisons between college women and older women returning to school after at least five years. She found that high career motivation, as defined by the type of occupations one expressed interest in, was associated with non-traditional sex role orientation for the older women. Scores on the fear of success measure in this population were exactly the opposite of earlier findings (Horner, 1972) in a sample of college age women. Farmer found older women with high career motivation were high in fear of success and women low in career motivation were low on this factor. These results suggest the need for caution when attempting to apply research results obtained with younger women to older populations, as well as the possibility of developmental differences in factors which influence career motivation in women.

The research previously discussed has explored the nature of the relationship between career orientation and need for achievement, without addressing the issue of causality. A test of causal sequence was provided by Sedney and Turner (1975), which can provide a framework for further investigation in this area. Using the Simon-Blalock procedure for causal inference, which involves computing correlations between factors under consideration, they compared two models for development of career orientation in women. Briefly stated, the compensatory model holds that lack of heterosexual affiliative success leads to high need for achievement which in turn facilitates a high
degree of career orientation. The enrichment model, on the other hand, proposes that high need for achievement facilitates a high degree of career orientation which in turn leads to a de-emphasis upon heterosexual affiliative behaviors. Using a sample of 92 college seniors, greater support was provided for the enrichment model. The EPPS was used to measure need for achievement, and a significant negative correlation between need for affiliation and need for achievement was found. The authors stated that this may have been due to the instrument itself, as noted previously in this review. Thus, they utilized a measure of affiliative behaviors in computing their correlations, rather than a paper-and-pencil instrument. Career orientation was defined according to the time a woman expected to devote to, and the satisfaction she expected to derive from, a career as opposed to family relationships. This definition is another example of the recent trend in the literature away from relatively dichotomous characterizations of the career-homemaking dimension.

An extensive investigation of career orientation was undertaken by Richardson (1974) in order to clarify the meaning of the term. Analysis of 14 presumed measures of career orientation yielded two relatively independent clusters which Richardson labelled career orientation and work orientation. The central dimensions were the extent to which a woman viewed a work role as central in her future life, and the kind of work role to which she aspires. This viewpoint incorporates the increasing tendency of women to express an interest in both career and marriage roles (Oliver, 1974). The utilization of the career-work dimension as described by Richardson has the potential for integrating
the multitude of operational definitions of career orientation, and
appears to express more accurately the current nature of women's career
choices.

The concept of career salience as investigated by Greenhaus (1971,
1973, 1976) also offers potential for increased understanding of the
role of work in women's lives. A factorial investigation of career
salience (Greenhaus, 1973) yielded the following three factors: 1)
relative priority of a career, 2) general attitudes toward work, and
3) concern with career planning and advancement. In a comparison of
male and female undergraduates on several occupational variables,
Greenhaus concluded that the assumption that careers are more important
to males than females is too simplistic. Females in his study showed
more positive attitudes toward work (Factor 2) than the males. This
suggests that the global results of many career orientation studies,
regardless of the sex of the sample, may reflect, in part, the neglect
of examining separate dimensions of career salience. Achievement
motivation in women may thus be associated with one or more factors
of career salience more clearly than has been the case in studies of
career-home orientation.

In general, the literature dealing with female achievement moti-
vation beyond the college years is scarce, and suffers from methodo-
logical limitations. The relationship between need for achievement
and career orientation is clearer, but recent studies indicate that
the career-home dichotomy no longer reflects the reality of women's
preferences for their lives. Further investigation is necessary to
expand and clarify existing conceptualizations.
Subjects

Subjects for this study were 79 female undergraduates, 40 of whom were between 18 and 22 years of age, and 39 of whom were over 28 years of age. The majority of the women 18 to 22 years old were members of introductory psychology classes and received course credit for their participation in the study. In order to represent junior and senior women in this sample, additional women were recruited from university residence halls. Due to the minimal number of women over age 28 in introductory psychology during the time of data collection, subjects in this group were obtained from other academic courses, groups for returning women students, and responses to a notice in the campus newspaper.

Procedure

Subjects from introductory psychology classes completed the research instruments in group sessions, while the remaining subjects completed the inventories individually and returned them to the experimenter. The instruments consisted of a demographic data sheet (Appendix A), the Adjective Check List (Gough and Heilbrun, 1957), the Achievement via Independence and Achievement via Conformity scales of the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957) (Appendix B),
and a measure of career salience (Greenhaus, 1971) (Appendix C).

Follow-up contacts were made when necessary to insure return of the questionnaires.

**Instruments**

The Adjective Check List (ACL) consists of 300 adjectives commonly used to describe attributes of a person. The subject was directed to read them quickly and indicate each one she considered self-descriptive. The achievement and affiliation scales are classified as need scales, representing dimensions within Murray's need-press system. Achievement is defined in the ACL manual as "to strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance." Affiliation is defined as "to seek and sustain numerous personal friendships."

Test-retest correlations over a ten week period for a sample of college females were .74 on the Ach scale and .84 on the Aff scale (Gough and Heilbrun, 1957). Data reported in the ACL Manual indicated a correlation of .40 between standard scores on the Ach scale and the Aff scale in a sample of 400 females.

The California Psychological Inventory contains 480 items which require a true or false response, yielding 18 standard scores. The total set of 18 scales was designed to "provide a comprehensive survey of an individual from a social interaction point of view" (Gough, 1957). The A₁ and A₉ scales were constructed using the "empirical technique." A₉ was designed to identify those "factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior." A₁, on the other hand, focuses on achievement in any setting where "autonomy and independence are positive behaviors,"
(Gough, 1957). Test-retest reliability over a one year period in a sample of high school females as reported in the CPI Manual was .73 for the A_c scale, .57 for the A_i scale. For females, scores on the A_c and A_i correlated .38. Data available on a sample of 100 males yielded correlations between the Ach scale of the ACL and A_i and A_c as follows: Ach and A_c, r = .30 (p < .01); Ach and A_i, r = -.01. There were no comparable data for females.

The career salience measure (Greenhaus, 1971) contained 27 items of a 5-point Likert format. Seventeen of the items were positively worded and ten were negatively worded. Greenhaus (1973) identified three factors underlying the construct of career salience. He labelled them: 1) relative importance of a career; 2) general attitudes toward work; 3) degree of vocationally relevant planning and thought. A factor analysis performed using the subjects in the present study in addition to 100 other undergraduate females yielded three factors which corresponded generally to those reported by Greenhaus. A principal components analysis was used to generate the factor matrix. Three factors were extracted on the basis of previous findings (Greenhaus, 1973), which accounted for 27.9% of the total variance. Greenhaus reported that his factors accounted for 27% of the total variance. A varimax rotation was used, yielding the factor loadings which appear in Table 1. Items were assigned to a particular factor if the loading was equal to or greater than .25. Factor scores were computed using unit weighting for salient items, zero on others.
### Table 1

Rotated Factor Matrix of Career Salience Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued

Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of common variance

| .44 | .16 | .14 |
Data Analysis

A two group discriminant analysis with seven dependent variables was used. Subjects were divided according to age (between subjects factor), women over 28 and women under 22. Within each age group, subject scores were obtained on the following dependent variables (within subjects factors):

1. Factor I (relative importance of a career)
2. Factor II (general attitudes toward work)
3. Factor III (planning and thinking about a career)
4. Need for achievement (nAch)
5. Need for affiliation (nAff)
6. Achievement via independence (A_i)
7. Achievement via conformity (A_c)

A step-wise multiple regression yielded correlations among variables which served as tests of the following hypotheses.

Hypotheses

I. College women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than college women under 22.

II. There are no differences on a measure of nAff between college women over 28 and college women under 22.

III. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of career salience than college women under 22.

IV. A. High career salient college women regardless of age score higher on a measure of nAch than low career salient women.

B. High career salient college women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient.
C. High career salient college women under 22 score higher on a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient.

V. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of $A_i$ than do college women under 22.

Hypotheses VI and VII were tested using a paired t-test.

VI. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of $A_i$ than $A_c$.

VII. College women under 22 exhibit higher levels of $A_c$ than $A_i$.

Demographic data were examined on a post hoc basis.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

In this chapter, the results relative to the seven major dependent variables are presented. Means and standard deviations of subjects' scores on the dependent measures are presented in Table 2 as a reference point in examining the subsequent analyses. Group 1 is composed of those subjects under 22 years of age; Group 2 includes those 28 years of age and older. Raw scores on the ACL and CPI were converted to standard scores prior to data analysis.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations on Dependent Measures According to Subject Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group 1 (N = 40)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N = 39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Factor I of career salience)</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Factor II of career salience)</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Factor III of career salience)</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (nAff)</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (nAch)</td>
<td>50.03</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (A₁)</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (A₇)</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Discriminant Analysis**

A discriminant analysis was performed to determine which variable or combination thereof maximally differentiated between the two subject groups. This analysis was also used to predict a given subject's membership in a particular age group.

The analysis yielded a statistically significant discriminant function, indicating that the two groups were differentiated by some combination of the dependent variables ($F = 4.36, df = 7, 71, p < .001$). The variables and their standardized discriminant weights appear in Table 3.

Table 3

**Standardized Discriminant Weights for Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Discriminant Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Factor I)</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Factor II)</td>
<td>-22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Factor III)</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (nAff)</td>
<td>-5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (nAch)</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ($A_1$)</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ($A_2$)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group means on the discriminant function were 15.01 for Group 1; 20.16 for Group 2. In summary, the following variables maximally distinguished between women over 28 and women under 22: 1) Factor II of
career salience, general attitude toward work; 2) need for achievement; and 3) achievement via independence. The discriminant function itself was significant at the .001 level ($X^2 = 26.28$, df = 7).

The discriminant analysis also predicted each subject's group membership on the basis of her scores on the seven dependent variables. The accuracy of prediction is detailed in Table 4. The figures in Table 4 indicate that the discriminant analysis was successful in predicting the actual group membership of almost 75% of the subjects.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 22</th>
<th>Over 28</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 22</td>
<td>29 (72.5%)</td>
<td>10 (25.6%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 28</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>29 (74.4%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step-Wise Multiple Regression

A step-wise multiple regression was performed with the addition of group membership as a dependent variable in order to investigate the relationships among the variables. The resultant correlation matrix was examined in order to test the hypotheses. Each hypothesis is restated here, and results relevant to confirmation or disconfirmation are reported.
Hypothesis I  College women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than college women under 22.

Support is provided for this hypothesis by the significant correlation between group membership and scores on the nAch scale of the ACL ($r = .28$, $p < .05$). Returning women students expressed higher levels of nAch than regular women undergraduates.

Hypothesis II  There are no differences on a measure of nAff between college women over 28 and college women under 22.

The nonsignificant relationship between group membership and nAff scores provides support for this hypothesis. Comparable levels of nAff were expressed by women in both age groups.

Hypothesis III  College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of career salience than college women under 22.

While no hypotheses were proposed for the separate factors of career salience, the three factors were examined individually in relation to group membership. The only statistically significant finding was a negative correlation ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$) between group membership and Factor II, general attitude toward work. This indicates that women under 22 expressed more favorable attitudes toward work than did women over 28. Examination of Table 2 reveals that differences in mean scores of the two groups on Factors I and III are in the predicted direction, but are not statistically significant.

Hypothesis IV  

A. High career salient women regardless of age score higher on a measure of nAch than low career salient women.

Partial support is provided for this hypothesis by the positive
relationships between Factor I and nAch (r = .33, p < .01), and between Factor II and nAch (r = .24, p < .05). The relationship between Factor III and nAch is nonsignificant. Thus, women indicating that a career is relatively important to them and who also have a generally more positive attitude toward work also tend to exhibit higher levels of nAch than women who value a career to a lesser degree.

B. High career salient college women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient. Support for this hypothesis is provided by the statistically significant relationship, for women over 28, between Factor I and nAch (r = .42, p < .01), and between Factor II and nAch (r = .42, p < .01). The relationship between Factor III and nAch scores is nonsignificant.

C. High career salient college women under 22 score higher on a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient. This hypothesis is not supported by the results, although the relationships for women under 22 parallel those found for women over 28. Factors I and II are more highly related to nAch scores than Factor III, and the first two correlations approach statistical significance at the .05 level.

Hypothesis V College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of A1 than do college women under 22. Support is provided for this hypothesis by the positive correlation between group membership and A1 scores (r = .39, p < .01). Table 2 also reflects the differences in the means of the two groups on this variable.
Hypothesis VI College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of $A_1$ than $A_c$. Results of a paired t-test indicate that women in Group 2 did score significantly higher on $A_1$ than on $A_c$ ($t = 8.93$, $df = 38$, $p = .001$).

Hypothesis VII College women under 22 exhibit higher levels of $A_c$ than $A_1$. This hypothesis was not supported by the results. Women in Group 1 also scored significantly higher on $A_1$ than they did on $A_c$ ($t = 8.52$, $df = 39$, $p < .001$).

Demographic data are presented as frequencies in Table 5. As can be determined from inspection, intuitive hypotheses vis à vis differences between groups in marital status, full/part-time enrollment and numbers of children are borne out by the data. Women students over 28 were also asked "What are your primary reason(s) for returning to college?" Table 6 contains a tabulation of their responses.
Table 5

Demographic Characteristics of Women Students
According to Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>17 - 22</td>
<td>28 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There is a discrepancy in total number of responses among some items due to non-response by some subjects.)

Table 6

Expressed Reasons of Women Over 28 for Returning to College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal fulfillment, growth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career change, to increase marketable skills</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of above reasons</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, the results detailed in Chapter IV will be discussed, beginning with an examination of each individual hypothesis. The limitations of this study will be outlined, and finally, areas for future research will be proposed.

Hypothesis I

As predicted, women over 28 returning to college expressed higher levels of nAch than women who begin college shortly after high school graduation. At this time in our society, the woman who chooses to return to school after a prolonged absence faces various psychological and social hurdles. These may range from the pragmatics of time management to self-doubts as to her academic abilities. In both the present sample and in the population at large, the majority of women are/have been married and have children by the time they are in their mid-thirties. Family responsibilities have traditionally been assumed to occupy the greater portion of the time and energy of such women. It is expected that the women in this group who actually implement their plans for resuming their education, such as those in the present study, are affected by some combination of higher levels of motivation and circumstances that permit their re-entry.
For the younger student, on the other hand, social expectations support her uninterrupted education. In many cases, options other than schooling are few, and thus individual motivation may not be as critical a determinant of one's presence in the college classroom. While the data from the present study by no means support Baruch's hypothesis of a general resurgence of women's achievement motivation after the childrearing years, they do contribute to further understanding of those women who do resume their education.

Hypothesis II

The finding of comparable levels of nAff across age groups supports the proposals of researchers such as Oliver (1974), who state that women's career orientation is more accurately a reflection of the interaction of various needs, rather than a simple correspondence to high nAch/low nAff. It is also interesting to note that fulfilling a wife-mother role is not associated in the present sample with a decrease in nAff, as discussed by Bardwick and Douvan (1972). It can be proposed that the socialization of women in our culture is homogeneous in the extent to which a certain "baseline" need for affiliation is developed, and such a need remains important throughout the female life cycle. The highly defined nature of the present sample, however, restricts the generalizations to other groups of women necessary before any credibility can be given to such a proposal.

Hypothesis III

The lack of support for the hypothesis that women over 28 exhibit higher levels of career salience than women under 22 is unexpected in light of the association in the literature between career orientation
and nAch (e.g., Rand, 1968; Tyler, 1964), and the present data indicating higher nAch in women over 28 returning to school. A possible explanation relates to the differences between definitions of "career salience" and "career orientation," as discussed in Chapter II. While career orientation has been used as a bipolar concept, the construct of career salience allows for the expression of importance of several life areas. As part of the demographic data sheet, women over 28 in this study were asked their primary reasons for returning to school. A tabulation of their responses (see Table 6) indicates that they returned to college for a variety of reasons other than career-related concerns. While their careers are clearly a motivating factor for many, other issues are important enough to reduce the group level of "career salience."

Another factor contributing to the obtained results is the actual instrument used to measure career salience. The relatively small percent of the variance (27%) accounted for by the three isolated factors indicates the need for further refinement of the measure before making any definitive statements as to the role of career salience. This limitation is applicable to all data in this study dealing with relationships between career salience and other dependent variables.

The finding of a significant negative correlation between group membership and Factor II (general attitudes toward work) indicates that younger women expressed more positive attitudes toward work in general than did the older sample. The fact that the differences between groups on Factors I and III, while not reaching statistical significance, were in the opposite direction, increases interest in this finding. The
reality may be that younger women's attitudes toward work in our society are becoming more positive due to increased options, rising salaries, etc., while the older women's attitudes are more strongly influenced by the state of affairs ten to fifteen years ago. Another explanation of the data could be that the younger sample responded with little actual first-hand experience with the realities of work, feeling more positively about the possibilities available than do the older women. The latter group has had more experience with the day-to-day frustrations and boredom connected with working, and it is possible that their reality was expressed in a lower mean score on Factor II. Further investigation is needed in order to clarify which is the most feasible explanation.

Hypotheses IV A, B, C

Data relevant to the hypotheses relating career salience and nAch suffer from the same limitations in measurement mentioned previously with regard to Greenhaus' instrument. Thus, the lack of significant correlations in this part of the study may be as much a function of insensitivity of the measure as an expression of the strength of the relationships among the variables themselves.

In general, Factors I (relative importance of a career) and II (general attitudes toward work) are more highly correlated with nAch than Factor III (planning and thinking), regardless of the age group of the subjects. The significant relationship between career salience (Factors I and II) and nAch supports the trend in the literature reporting positive relationships between career orientation and nAch in college women (e.g., Hoyt and Kennedy, 1958; Tyler, 1964).
A somewhat different perspective is provided, however, when high career salient women are divided according to age group. For women over 28, the relationship between nAch and career salience is clear \((p < .01)\), while for women under 22 only a statistically nonsignificant trend appears. Thus, women over 28 are contributing more to the overall significant relationship between career salience and nAch than are women under 22. The caution expressed previously against generalizing from one age group of women to an older or younger group is borne out by the present data. A possible explanation of these findings may be found in the "cultural imperative" of career and marriage proposed by Rand and Miller (1972). If it is indeed the case that pursuing a career is becoming a more "normative" state of events for younger women, then those women who express such a career orientation may not necessarily also exhibit high levels of nAch. A link between career salience and nAch in men has certainly not been the focus of extensive research. It may be assumed that this is partially due to the reality that the large majority of men pursue careers. If more younger women are beginning to respond to a "cultural imperative" involving work, then the relationship between career salience and nAch may be expected to become weaker.

**Hypothesis V**

The data indicate that college women over 28 did exhibit higher levels of \(A_1\) than college women under 22. This finding can be taken as support for the need to view nAch in women in terms other than "high" and "low", and fits with the proposals of developmental theorists (e.g., Chickering, 1972; Eriksen, 1963) who describe movement
from conformity to independence as a major thrust in human development. These results must be viewed, however, within the constraints of the present sample, i.e., women over 28 returning to college. Data must be obtained from women over 28 who have not returned to school before any hypotheses can be offered as to the developmental nature of nAch. An alternative explanation could focus on the activities connected with attending college that might promote the development of A\textdagger in some women.

**Hypotheses VI and VII**

The notion of a developmental trend in nAch received support from the data indicating women over 28 had higher levels of A\textdagger than A\textasciicircum, but was not supported by the finding that women under 22 also had higher levels of A\textdagger than A\textasciicircum. A possible explanation of these results can be found in the discussion of Hypothesis IV: some type of interaction between women who choose to attend college and the college environment itself. Any conclusions must await data from a non-college sample of women under 22 as well as women over 28.

**Discriminant Analysis**

The discriminant analysis supports the findings discussed under each hypothesis. The two groups of women were maximally differentiated by their scores on Factor II (general attitudes toward work), nAch and A\textdagger. The complexity of the relationships among these variables indicates that "common sense" proposals as to why older women are returning to school in increasing numbers, the expression of nAch in career orientation, and differences between high and low career salient women should be viewed with caution. There also remains the possibility that a variable not investigated in the present study is an even more
effective discriminator. It is not surprising that the sample of older women differs from that of younger women. It is rather the specific differences and their contribution to an understanding of women's lives that merits attention.

**Limitations**

The major limitations of the present study involve the subject population and the instrumentation. Generalizability of the findings is, of course, limited by the nature and size of the sample: college women in introductory psychology, and volunteer college women over 28. A more comprehensive study will involve not only a larger sample size, but also a more random population of women students over 28. The inclusion of a group of non-college women of the same ages would, as mentioned previously, strengthen the conclusions that might be drawn about the career development of women.

While the use of Greenhaus' measure of career salience represented an improvement over the use of a career - home dichotomy, the measure itself would benefit from refinement. The lack of clear differences between groups on this variable may be due in part to the instrument itself. The large percentage of variance unaccounted for by Greenhaus' three factors indicates the need for a reexamination of the items themselves as well as the brevity of the instrument. While the utility of the construct of career salience is not being questioned, it is recommended that further attention be paid to the measure before the results of this and other studies become separated from their methodologies.

The relatively high intercorrelations among certain dependent variables indicate the need for measures other than paper-and-pencil
in further studies in this area. As reported in Chapter III, $A_1$ and $A_c$ scales had a correlation of .38 (Gough, 1957). While certain characteristics are no doubt common to both constructs, understanding of the nature of women's achievement motivation could be increased through the use of alternative measurement techniques.

**Implications**

Implications of this study involve directions for further research and applications of the results obtained herein. As discussed in the **Limitations** section, further research needs to involve non-college women, older women who chose to return to work rather than college, and women who remain primarily wives and mothers. Developmental hypotheses depend on obtaining data from such groups of women.

The refinement of the career salience measure could do much to clarify both the role of career salience in women's decision-making and its relationship to other variables of interest. Investigation of career salience in all male populations is also indicated. It should not be assumed that men are unaffected by the social changes that are resulting in increased female involvement in the labor force.

The expression of a range of reasons behind women's return to college (see Table 6) implies that an equal diversity of programs and counseling interventions are required to meet the needs of such women. The assumptions of "self-fulfillment" and "increasing one's job skills" may be equally inaccurate when generalized to the entire population of reentering women. Administrators, program planners and counselors alike must be sensitive to the correspondence (or lack thereof) between their assumptions and actual data.
In providing academic counseling to older women students, the results of this study indicate the necessity for advisers to pay attention to the primary motivation of the student. A woman who is resuming college with the clear goal of training for the job market will most likely want courses with a somewhat different emphasis than a woman whose major goal is intellectual stimulation. Counselors who are aware of the potential differences among returning women students may anticipate the range of frustrations they may experience: from the "irrelevance" of certain requirements for a vocational goal to the apathy expressed by younger classmates.

The differences in general attitudes toward work expressed by the two groups of women students can be important to the career counselor. The need for factual information on the contemporary working world exists within both age groups. Younger students need to become aware of the frustrations and routine connected with any career, while older women may need to discard some of their beliefs about fields closed to women and unfair salary differentials. In either case, the counselor should be sensitive to the myths that may be influencing an individual student's attitude toward work.

The similar levels of need for affiliation expressed by both age groups in this study also have implications for counselors working with women. A wife/mother returning to college is not necessarily expressing decreased involvement in her affiliative relationships, and the success of her educational venture may depend on resolving conflicts she feels over "deserting" her family. On the other hand, a career committed younger student may be denying or ignoring her needs
for affiliation in assuming such needs are not part of career decision-making. A counselor who hopes to be effective in facilitating women's career development should be attuned to needs throughout the life span, not only at the times when critical choices are made.

A programmatic response to older women students' relatively high level of nAch may also be indicated. Opportunities for extracurricular work, more challenging course assignments and individualized study programs geared to the returning student might be more involving for such women and also might serve as an attraction for women considering college but discouraged by its regimentation.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

This study investigated need for achievement, need for affiliation, and career salience in women college students. Subjects were divided into two groups: those under 22 years of age, and those 28 years of age and older. The younger students were members of introductory psychology classes and university residence halls. The older women were recruited from various academic classes, student groups and through an advertisement in the campus newspaper.

On the basis of related research and theories of human development the following hypotheses were offered:

I. College women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than college women under 22.

II. There are no differences on a measure of nAff between college women over 28 and college women under 22.

III. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of career salience than college women under 22.

IV. A. High career salient college women regardless of age score higher on a measure of nAch than low career salient women.

B. High career salient college women over 28 score higher on a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient.

C. High career salient college women under 22 score higher on
a measure of nAch than those who are low career salient.

V. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of $A_4$ than do college women under 22.

VI. College women over 28 exhibit higher levels of $A_4$ than $A_c$.

VII. College women under 22 exhibit higher levels of $A_c$ than $A_4$.

A discriminant analysis indicated that need for achievement, Factor II of career salience (general attitude toward work) and achievement via independence most effectively differentiated between the groups of women.

A multiple step-wise regression and paired t-tests yielded data that supported Hypotheses I, II, IV B, V and VI. A trend toward significance was noted with respect to Hypotheses III, IV A, and IV C. Hypothesis VII was not supported by the results, and indeed, the opposite state of affairs was noted: higher levels of $A_4$ than $A_c$ in the younger group as well as the older group.

Limitations of the study were discussed, and directions for further research were offered. Implications for counselors and program planners were presented and discussed.
APPENDIX A

Demographic Data Sheet

I agree to allow my responses to the following questionnaires to be used for research purposes. I understand that my individual answers will be used without identifying me personally. I am aware that there will be an opportunity for feedback at the completion of the study.

Signature__________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Caucasian</td>
<td>1. Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Black</td>
<td>2. Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>3. Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Widowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Children ____
Their ages __________________________

Current university status
  1. Freshman
  2. Sophomore
  3. Junior
  4. Senior

Are you enrolled
  1. Full-time
  2. Part-time

College of enrollment________________

Father's education
  1. Less than high school
  2. High school or GED
  3. Some college
  4. College degree
  5. Advanced degree (MA, PhD, MD, etc.)

Mother's education
  1. Less than high school
  2. High school or GED
  3. Some college
  4. College degree
  5. Advanced degree (MA, PhD, MD, etc.)

What is (are) your primary reason(s) for returning to college?

Indicate your primary activities since high school, and approximate length of time you have been involved in them:
  1. Home and/or childrearing activities. How long? ________________
  2. Employment. How long? ___________________________________________
     In what capacities?_______________________________________________
  3. Volunteer work. How long? ________________________________
  4. Other. Please explain. __________________________________________
Appendix A Continued

List any other training you have had (secretarial, LPN, etc.)

What do you see yourself doing in 5 years?
APPENDIX B

Achievement via Independence and
Achievement via Conformity Scales*

DIRECTIONS: Read each of the following statements, decide how you feel about it, and then mark your answer next to each item. If you agree with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, make an X over TRUE (T). If you disagree with a statement, or feel that it is not true about you, make an X over FALSE (F).

T F 1. I looked up to my father as an ideal man.

T F 2. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."

T F 3. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.

T F 4. I usually go to the movies more than once a week.

T F 5. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

T F 6. I am often said to be hotheaded.

T F 7. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.

T F 8. I have very few fears compared to my friends.

T F 9. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.

T F 10. I think I would like the work of a school teacher.

T F 11. When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him/her back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.

T F 12. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.

T F 13. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties.

T F 14. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.

T F 15. It is always a good thing to be frank.

T F 16. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his/her mind as to what s/he really believes.
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T  F  17. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all s/he can get in this world.
T  F  18. Planning one's activities in advance is very likely to take most of the fun out of life.
T  F  19. I was a slow learner in school.
T  F  20. I like poetry.
T  F  21. There is something wrong with a person who can't take orders without getting angry or resentful.
T  F  22. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
T  F  23. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
T  F  24. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.
T  F  25. Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.
T  F  26. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
T  F  27. I certainly feel useless at times.
T  F  28. I have the wanderlust and am never happy unless I am roaming or traveling about.
T  F  29. I am sometimes cross and grouchy without any good reason.
T  F  30. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
T  F  31. Teachers often expect too much work from the students.
T  F  32. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.
T  F  33. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.
T  F  34. I think I would like to fight in a boxing match sometime.
T  F  35. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.
T  F  36. I like to plan a home study schedule and then follow it.
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T  F  37. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.

T  F  38. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.

T  F  39. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

T  F  40. I like to read about history.

T  F  41. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.

T  F  42. I like to talk before groups of people.

T  F  43. The person who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.

T  F  44. I am often bothered by useless thoughts which keep running through my mind.

T  F  45. I like to plan out my activities in advance.

T  F  46. I must admit I find it very hard to work under strict rules and regulations.

T  F  47. I like large, noisy parties.

T  F  48. I sometimes feel that I am a burden to others.

T  F  49. Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.

T  F  50. I always try to do at least a little better than what is expected of me.

T  F  51. Lawbreakers are almost always caught and punished.

T  F  52. I would be very unhappy if I was not successful at something I had seriously started to do.

T  F  53. I dread the thought of an earthquake.

T  F  54. I often lose my temper.

T  F  55. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.

T  F  56. I am bothered by people outside, on buses, in stores, etc., watching me.
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T  F  57. I often get disgusted with myself.
T  F  58. Society owes a lot more to the person in business and the manufacturer than it does to the artist and the professor.
T  F  59. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club.
T  F  60. I used to like it very much when one of my papers was read to the class in school.
T  F  61. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.
T  F  62. I don't seem to care what happens to me.

*Permission for use of separate scales granted by test author and publisher, January, 1977.
APPENDIX C

Career Salience Measure*

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by placing a check on the line under the appropriate category. Please try not to leave any statement out.

(1) SD = Strongly disagree
(2) D = Disagree
(3) U = Uncertain
(4) A = Agree
(5) SA = Strongly Agree

1. I intend to pursue the job of my choice even if it cuts deeply into the time I have for my family.

2. It is more important to have some leisure time after work, and to enjoy some of the adventures of the mind (art, music, literature) than to have a job in your chosen field, be devoted to it, and be a success at it.

3. If you work very hard on your job, you can't enjoy the better things in life.

4. Work is one of the few areas in life where you can gain real satisfaction.

5. I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it limits my personal freedom to enjoy life.

6. To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a way of making good money.

7. I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career.

8. It is difficult to find satisfaction in life unless you enjoy your job.

9. Work is one of those necessary evils.

10. Deciding on a career is just about the most important decision a young person makes.
11. I don't think too much about what type of job I'll be in ten years from now. 

12. I'm ready to make many sacrifices to get ahead in my job.

13. I look at a career as a means of expressing myself.

14. I would consider myself extremely "career minded."

15. I could never be truly happy in life unless I achieved success in my job or career.

16. I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it allows only very little opportunity to enjoy my friends.

17. I want to be able to pretty much forget my job when I leave work in the evenings.

18. I started thinking about jobs and careers when I was young.

19. I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it leaves me little time for my religious activities.

20. It is more important to have a job in your chosen field of interest, be devoted to it, and be a success at it than to have a family that is closely knit and that shares many experiences.

21. The whole idea of working and holding a job is kind of distasteful to me.

22. Planning for and succeeding in a career is my primary concern.

23. I often find myself thinking about whether I will enjoy my chosen field.
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24. It is more important to be liked by your fellow human beings, devote your energies to the betterment of people, and be at least some help to someone than to have a job in your chosen field of interest, be devoted to it and be a success at it.

25. Planning for a specific career usually is not worth the effort; it doesn't matter too much what you do.

26. I would move to another part of the country if I thought it would help advance my career.

27. I never really thought about these type of questions very much.

*Permission for use granted by test author, Jeffrey H. Greenhaus, November, 1976.
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