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INTRODUCTION

The number of older students, especially women, returning to college campuses, has increased significantly in recent years. In accordance with the increased enrollment of older students on college campuses, programs designed to meet the needs of this special population have grown as well. According to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor (1974), in 1963 there were only 20 such programs in the United States; by 1966 there were 100 such programs and by 1971 the number had increased to 376 (Astin, 1976, p.49). Since the early 1960's the number of women students between the ages of 25 and 34 has tripled (Rice, 1976).

Population trends indicate that in the next ten years the number of traditional age college students in most parts of the U.S. will be decreasing (Scully, 1980). This projected trend has led college administrators to concern themselves increasingly with issues of retention of college students. In addition to a focus on retention of traditional age college students, it seems reasonable to expect that even more attention will be focused on non-traditional student populations, as one rich source of maintaining college enrollments (Scully, 1980).
While the number of men and women finding a return to college a desirable option continues to increase, and the interest of universities seems quite compatible with this trend, research on these students is still at a minimum. The literature that does exist often tends to be more descriptive than empirical in nature. The more research oriented studies tend to deal with the returning student group as a homogeneous population (O'Connell, 1977; Perrone, Wolleat, Lee & Davis, 1977; Tittle & Denker, 1977). It is only in discussion sections that the point is sometimes made that there may be relevant dimensions which create unique subgroups within this larger group.

One major distinction which exists within the returning student population is one of gender. In a study comparing the needs of returning students and traditional students by sex, Johnson, Wallace and Sedlacek (1979) found that male and female returning students seemed to be quite different in terms of their needs and expectations of the college campus. They concluded that "returning women as a group seem to be more involved in university life than returning men, who are more involved with paid jobs" (p.18). Even the return rate on the questionnaires reflected these differences; the return rate for men was small. Follow up phone calls indicated that the men were "no longer students, did not actually live at the address or they were too busy to respond" (p.18).
Often, studies have been based on the premise that returning women are a unique group with unique concerns, and have not included men in their studies. Johnson, Wallace and Sedlacek (1979) provide empirical evidence to support studying men and women separately.

Astin (1976) stated her conviction that returning women fall into two general categories; the first category included "those women whose ultimate goal is a career, or at least employment" (p.50) and the second group includes those women "who have no intention of seeking employment". Subgroups are delineated within the first major category, but not within the second.

Others have also speculated on the nature of subgroups within the larger group of returning students (Brandenburg, 1974; Geissler & Thrush, 1975; Johnson, Wallace & Sedlacek, 1979). Some researchers have used demographic variables in addition to motivational factors to differentiate between categories of returning women. Johnson, Wallace and Sedlacek (1979) performed an intercorrelation matrix and found three groups: the first consisted of the older family woman; the second consisted of working women, and the third informal subgroup were women with less educated spouses. The needs of these three subgroups were found to be quite different.

Some researchers, while not acknowledging the factors which may differentiate subgroups, focus their attention on one particular subgroup which happens to be well represented
in their sample. Brandenburg (1974) describes the "typical" returning student in her study (based also on an all female sample). These women "return to school during middle motherhood...typically between the ages of 35 and 40, but actually related more to situation than to age..." (p.11).

One focus of the existing research on returning women has been on assessing the needs of this population. Since the issue of subgroups has not been addressed in most studies, the needs are stated in general terms and the assumption is made that the needs are common among the majority of returning students. Along with the time-management concerns, financial concerns, and child-care concerns, vocational decision making seems to be a concern that is mentioned repeatedly (Brandenburg, 1974; Geisler & Thrush, 1975; Johnson, Wallace & Sedlacek, 1979; Perrone, Wolleat, Lee and Davis, 1977).

Once the returning student group is divided into subgroups, it seems quite plausible that vocational decision making may be more difficult within particular subgroups, than within the group as a whole. For example, the group defined by Astin (1976) as consisting of women who are currently involved in a career returning in hopes of increasing the chances of advancement, may be expected to have far fewer career decision problems than the group of women who were removed from the labor force for a number of years.
While the existing literature on returning women indicates that vocational decision making is often a prime concern of these students, an examination of the career development literature indicates that the career decision process of returning women students is neither well understood nor has it been well researched. The current investigation focuses on career undeterminedness as a dimension of the career decision process. This investigation is designed as an initial attempt to understand the factors, both demographic and psychosocial, which may relate to the level of career decidedness in returning women students.

A substantial amount of research has been generated in the career development literature in general around the dimension of career decidedness. Most of this research was done with traditional age college students, however, when this literature is read with the returning woman student in mind, a series of studies which have investigated the relationship between self-esteem and career decision are of particular interest. This vein of research is of particular interest, since self-esteem is mentioned again and again as a problem of returning women students (Astin, 1976; Brandenburg, 1974; Geisler & Thrush, 1975). Geisler and Thrush (1975) found that 53% of the returning women in their sample checked an option that described problems related to self-confidence. Generally, the career decision literature reveals that students with high
self-esteem have been more career decided than students low in self-esteem (Maier & Herman, 1974; Putnam & Hansen, 1972; Resnick, Fauble & Osipow, 1970). The present investigation examined the relationship between self-esteem in returning women and their level of career decidedness to see if the same relationship found in traditional age college students exists for returning women.

In searching for additional psychological variables which may relate to career decision level in returning women, the area of achievement appears promising. Brooks (1978) suggests that the return to school represents a shift for many women from vicarious achievement roles to direct achievement roles. According to the Lipman-Blumen frame-work of achievement behavior, direct and relational (referred to as vicarious in earlier formulations) behavior represents the two major achievement domains. Direct achievement style refers to the style used by a person "who confronts an achievement task directly, using their own efforts of mind and body to accomplish their goal...(these individuals) act in their own behalf..." (p.17). Relational achievers on the other hand "seek success through the medium of relationships...(they) establish, contribute to, depend on, or manipulate relationships to get what they want" (Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies & Handley-Isaksen, 1979, p.17). According to this framework, within
each general category of achievement behavior there are various subtypes.

For women returning to school, especially those who have been traditional homemakers for a number of years, achievement styles may be more relational than direct as Brooks (1978) has suspected. It further seems possible that for those women who have had relational achievement styles for a number of years, making a career decision may be a difficult process. In fact it is hypothesized that relational achievement styles will be associated with higher levels of career indecision than direct achievement styles. This may well be more pronounced for particular subtypes than for other subtypes within the same general achievement domain.

In addition to the psychosocial variables of self-esteem and achievement style it is hypothesized that certain demographic characteristics may play an important role in predicting the level of career decidedness, both directly and indirectly through their relationship to both self-esteem and achievement style.

The present study explored the relationship between self-esteem, achievement styles and selected demographic characteristics and the career decision level of a random sample of returning women students. In addition the relationships between self-esteem and demographic characteristics, and achievement styles and demographic characteristics have been examined.
Women's stated motivations for returning to school have also been examined with respect to career decision level. Since some researchers (Astin, 1976) have suggested that there are two basic groups of returning students; those interested in careers and those coming back with no career motivations, the current investigation explores the relationship between these stated motivations and the self-esteem level and achievement styles of the returning women students. It seemed possible, for example that women who claim to be coming back out of general interest without career interests, may actually have lower self-esteem levels. If they had more self-confidence it might be possible that they too, would acknowledge interest in a career.
CHAPTER I

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature which follows is divided into three sections. Each section of the review deals with a specific vein of research. The first section is a review of the literature on returning/re-entry women, with a major emphasis on the literature dealing with the needs and goals of returning women students. The second section is a selected review of the literature on career decision, with a special emphasis on the literature dealing with self-esteem and its impact on career decision level. The third section is a brief theoretical summary of the development and evolution of the achievement styles typology formulated by Lipman-Blumen and her associates.

Returning Women Students:

During the mid-1970's articles began to appear which addressed a variety of issues surrounding the returning student on the college campus. While a few of these articles dealt with both male and female students, the majority appear to have dealt with the returning woman as constituting a unique sub-group. For the most part this research tended to be an assessment of the needs and concerns
of this population. Most of the literature tends to be descriptive and anecdotal rather than research and data oriented. This conclusion is shared by a number of reviewers in this area (O'Neal & Bush, 1978; Slaney, Stafford & Russell, 1980; Tittle & Denker, 1977).

Among these descriptive articles are a number of articles which share the personal experience of the author during her own re-entry process (Margolis, 1974).

Brandenburg (1974) was one of the first in the 1970's to study returning women. Brandenburg studied women ages 23 to 53 (X = 38). Almost all of the women in her study were married and had children. The typical woman in her study had some previous formal education beyond high school and most had been out of high school at least 15 years. Many of the women had discontinued their education for purposes of marriage and children. All of these women had some sort of work experience outside the home during the interim period, almost exclusively in traditionally female domains (secretarial, clerical, and bookkeeping jobs). The women in this investigation were all matriculated day students, and had not entered through any special programs.

Brandenburg's (1974) study is representative of the literature in this area in two major ways. Brandenburg attempts to describe the "typical" returning student rather than attempting to systematically understand any diversity within the population of returning students. In addition,
while her research deals with the needs and concerns of these women, she deals in general impressions rather than in systematic, actuarial assessment. The general picture she paints of the returning woman is similar in both style and content to a number of "studies" which comprise the literature in this area.

Brandenburg (1974) suggests that the returning woman is undergoing some sort of identity crisis and that the return to school is an outgrowth of attempting to deal with questions of identity, understand feelings of depression, and feelings of failure. Brandenburg feels that many of these women have for a long time been subverting their own needs and interests to those of others. Frequently, they have gone from being dependent on their parents to being dependent on their husbands and, therefore, have not developed their own identities (p.12). Brandenburg further speculates that this dependency may produce resentment towards self and family, fear of taking risks and depression, and a resulting lack of confidence.

According to Brandenburg (1974) "many of these women return to school during middle-motherhood...It is often a time of renewed identity crisis and a second important period for career exploration...particularly for the married woman who has a family but holds no job, demands on time and energy are reduced during this period, when her children are in school and her husband is involved in
a career. Resulting feelings of being less needed or less useful, together with the pressure of advancing age generate serious questions" (p. 11).

As in Brandenburg's (1974) research, assistance in terms of career exploration is cited often as one of the primary needs of this population.

Geisler and Thrush (1975) presented their analysis of the needs and concerns of older women students. In reviewing articles which span the period of the 1960's, these authors conclude that the themes which seem to be recurrent in describing the concerns and needs of older students are: (1) pressures of time, (2) the wish for counseling geared to adults, and (3) the importance of vocational goals in their decision to return to school.

Geisler and Thrush assessed the concerns of the sample of older students and determined that of the concerns they provided in a checklist the following were the most prevalent: (1) time pressures--checked by 82 percent of the respondents, (2) problems related to self-confidence--checked by 53 percent of the respondents, (3) role definition--checked by 46 percent of the respondents, and (4) sense of direction--checked by 42 percent of the respondents. It should be noted that the sample of women in Geisler and Thrush's research is slightly different than women in most other studies in this area. Seventy percent of the sample were graduate students.
One might speculate that for undergraduate returning students the percentage concerned about sense of direction, at least, would be even higher since a greater amount of direction seems to be a prerequisite for graduate work due to its specialized nature.

Whereas Brandenburg (1974) sought to describe and understand the sub-population of returning women students as a whole, Astin (1976) has examined the variety of specific sub-groups in terms of women's motivation for returning to school. Astin sees two general categories of returning women: those whose ultimate goal is a career (or at least employment) and those who return out of more general interest, perhaps to finish a degree, but not for the purpose of seeking employment. Within the group whose ultimate goal is a career, Astin finds further discrete sub-groups:

(1) the women who must go to work to support or help support themselves and their families, so they seek marketable skills; (2) those who have already been employed, but seek a mid-life career change; (3) those who have jobs, but have found that without a degree they face little opportunity for advancement, and (4) the largest group in Astin's research consisted of those women who family demands have lessened and who now consider work to be a viable option for them.

Astin (1976) like Geisler and Thrush (1975) attempted to assess the common problems encountered by returning women. According to Astin, four major concerns emerged in her
analysis: (1) ignorance regarding the steps involved in re-entry; (2) lack of confidence in their capabilities; (3) fears of being isolated from other students, and (4) guilt at leaving or abandoning their homes and families in favor of more personally fulfilling ventures. While Astin found her largest sub-group to be those women whose family demands have lessened, and while the common problems of women seem to be concerns at least in part related to this particular sub-group, her research represents one of the first departures from equating returning women in general with the homogeneous sub-group of women who have been traditional homemakers.

Perrone, Wolleat, Lee, and Davis (1977) like Astin (1976) and Geisler and Thrush (1975) investigated the needs of adult students and found that female full-time students (adults) report more concern than students in general on eight items, including: (1) employment, (2) doing well on exams, (3) taking undesirable required courses, (4) having difficulty with mathematics, (5) getting money for education, (6) finding textbooks and teachers hard to understand, (7) giving oral reports, and (8) not believing their ideas are shared by others.

Of the concerns listed above, unemployment was the second ranked concern for female full-time students over the age of 26, with roughly 40 percent of the females fearing unemployment. These figures seem to provide further
evidence that career concerns are central to returning women.

In a more applied and less researched based article, Brooks (1978) discusses the re-entry process and implications of this process for counseling women. The general picture Brooks portrays seems quite similar to the descriptions set forth by Brandenburg (1974), Astin (1976), and others. According to Brooks the returning woman presents "a paradoxical appearance: an impressive set of talents and abilities and past achievements combined with an acute lack of confidence, mature cognitive ability and a strong sense of responsibility..." (p. 219).

Brooks' stage model for the re-entry process includes:

Preparation Phase:

**Stage 1**: Vague discontent, **Stage 2**: Inner preparation,
**Stage 3**: Intensive family involvement.

Decision Phase:

**Stage 4**: Assessment, **Stage 5**: Generating alternatives,
**Stage 6**: Narrowing alternatives and value clarification,
**Stage 7**: Implementation and goal setting.

This is a stage model and is suggested as a framework for counselors.

Again the special problems cited are familiar: low self-confidence, time management, role conflict, and guilt (Brooks, 1978). Brooks presents "typical scenarios of the life situations of these women including the older woman
suffering from the 'empty nest' syndrome, and the younger woman whose last child has been enrolled in nursery school and is searching for new roles."

Astin (1976) also alludes to the developmental changes which may relate to the decision to return to school by older non-traditional students. Astin states that women show a greater need for independence, become more outgoing and assertive, and remove themselves to some degree from the nurturing role. While the typical scenarios of Brooks (1978) and the developmental changes set forth by Astin (1976) seem to provide plausible justifications for women's decisions to return to school, one must consider that many women for whom these "scenarios" are applicable do not return to school. While a few researchers have compared returning women students with traditional age students (Perrone, Wolleate, Lee & Davis, 1977; Johnson, Wallace, & Sedlacek, 1979) only one study was found in which returning women students were compared with women in the community who had not actually enrolled in college (O'Connell, 1975).

O'Connell (1975) compared a sample of 31 returning women students ages 25-60 (the majority being between 31 and 40) and a comparable sample of non-returning women (21 subjects). Each of the subjects in this investigation completed the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1956, 1964) which was used to measure 18 personality traits. In addition, each of the subjects participated in a structured
interview which explored goals, life-style, role and self-concept, and relationships with family and society.

O'Connell (1975) hypothesized that women who return to college have (a) personalities which were more dominant (Dominance), more ambitious (Capacity for Status), more self-confident (Social Presence and Self-Acceptance), more focused toward independent achievement (Achievement via Independence) and more interested in self-actualization (Psychological mindedness); (b) better educated husbands and fewer children; (c) more personalized role concepts (versus traditional feminine role concept); and (d) broader, more liberal attitudes (versus traditional and conservative attitudes) than women who do not return to school.

In terms of personality characteristics (as outlined in "a" above), O'Connell found that her hypotheses were confirmed. The major difference appeared in the "dominance" trait, with returning women significantly higher on dominance than housewives ($\bar{X} = 30.2$, $\bar{X} = 23.6$, respectively, $F = 21.96$, $p < .001$). Significant differences also appeared in capacity for status ($\bar{X} = 22.1$, $\bar{X} = 19.6$, $F = 6.68$, $p < .05$) with the returning students going significantly higher than the non-returning women. Returning students were also significantly higher on social presence ($\bar{X} = 37.5$, $\bar{X} = 34.0$, $F = 34.0$, $F = 4.07$, $p < .05$), self-acceptance ($\bar{X} = 22.6$, $\bar{X} = 20.2$, $F = 6.86$, $p < .05$), achievement via independence ($\bar{X} = 23.1$, $\bar{X} = 20.7$, $F = 7.13$, $p < .05$), and psychological
mindedness ($\bar{x} = 13.7, \bar{x} = 10.9, F = 14.60, p < .001$). (Note that the means for the returning women precede the means for the non-returning women in the above statement.)

In terms of demographic characteristics, as described in "b" above, O'Connell did indeed find that the returning women had more educated husbands and significantly fewer children than the non-returning women (2.77 and 3.57 respectively) and that most of the college women did not have children under six years of age, but the majority of housewives did. O'Connell points to other researchers who have suggested that the differences in the numbers and ages of children is a consequence of the personalities and values of the women rather than the determinants of self-definition.

In terms of role concepts and attitudes, O'Connell found that according to the results of the structured interview the returning women were significantly more liberal (likely to approve of the goals of women's liberation) than the housewives. Ninety-four percent of the returning women saw a woman's role in society as marriage/home/volunteer/career, whereas 87 percent of the homemakers did not see career as part of that. Whereas 74 percent of the returning students answered "yes" or "sometimes" when asked if they set difficult goals for themselves, only 43 percent of the non-returning women answered in this way.

A second phase of this research was undertaken to determine whether the college milieu had caused these
differences between returnees and non-returnees, or whether these were simply differences in the women before the return to school which made it more likely for some women to return than others. In phase two women were measured twice, both at the beginning of their return and again two years later. A comparison of the first measurement between the returnees and non-returnees indicated that the returnees scored higher than the non-returnees on three personality traits: dominance, achievement via independence, and psychological mindedness.

Contrary to the hypothesis, the returnees did not score significantly higher than housewives in social presence, self-acceptance, or capacity for status. During the second year of college, however, significant differences appeared on self-acceptance and social presence between the returnees and non-returnees.

These results do not seem all that surprising in light of other research which repeatedly indicates that upon first re-entering women often confront problems of low self-confidence and questions regarding their ability to make it in college. After two years it seem plausible that many of these fears have been allayed and greater self-confidence than before may result.

While O'Connell's research sought to understand the differences between returnees and non-returnees, like the investigations comparing returning students with traditional age college students (Perrone, Wolleat, Lee & Davis, 1977),
the results tend to mask the within group differences. For example, it would be interesting to know how differences in dominance or self-acceptance within the group of returning women may relate to their success in school or any number of other criterion measures.

In spite of O'Connell's failure to examine within group relationships between these psychological factors and other criterion measures, this study stands out as one of the few studies of returning women which has employed rigorous psychological measures. In addition, it is one of the first to suspect that personality characteristics may have some important relationship to the re-entry process.

A recent article by Johnson, Wallace, and Sedlacek (1979) does address within group differences of returning students. This research is in the same vein as Geisler and Thrush (1975), Astin (1976), Perrone, Wolleat, Lee and Davis (1977), in that these researchers compared the needs of returning and traditional students. In their investigation unlike the previous investigations, male as well as female students were researched. While both men and women were studied, these authors concluded that male and female returning students seem to form unique sub-groups with different needs. Like Astin (1976) these authors stressed the apparent diversity within the sample of returning students.
The results of an intercorrelation matrix performed by Johnson, Wallace, and Sedlacek (1979) suggested the existence of three sub-groups of returning women with specific needs. The first group was "the older family woman who is quite unsure of herself and needs help with her changing identity and practical family problems..." (p. 17).

The second group according to Johnson et al's intercorrelation matrix is "the working woman (who) tends to be independent, career oriented, mobile, well educated, and uninterested in being helped, but needs to have more academic programs relevant to her career" (p. 17).

The third group suggested in this study consisted of the woman "with a less educated spouse (who) seems to be moving from a less college oriented background, (is) going to school to learn a career skill, has less psychological and practical support at home and thus needs help from the university in terms of support groups, financial aid, housing, and practical assistance in course advisement and job placement.

Most recently Badenhoop and Johansen (1980) once again compared the needs and goals of re-entry women with traditional age college women. These researchers found that a majority of re-entry womens' primary reason for returning was better employment, but that within this group older married women did not attribute as much importance to this as the re-entry women in their late 20's and early 30's in single or post-marital situations.
Badenhoop and Johansen found that unlike career related motivations "other motivational factors cited in previous studies, boredom and marital and family problems were considered unimportant and did not differentiate the continuous and re-entry groups" (pg.593).

Educational goals were higher among the re-entry women than among the traditional age students. In fact, the majority of re-entry women indicated plans to obtain a Master's degree. These higher goals matched the higher grade point averages in this group as compared with traditional age students. Sixty percent of the re-entry women indicated that they would make use of job application assistance, indicating once again that the majority of re-entry women are seriously considering careers and needing to make decisions in these areas.

Concurrently with the investigation reported in this dissertation Slaney, Stafford, and Russell (1980) have begun some research in this area (as yet unpublished) in which they compare the career decision of adult women, college women, and high school women. These researchers hypothesize that "adult women, perhaps as a result of the developmental process and perhaps marital issues are more likely to be resolved, may have fewer problems with career indecision than younger unmarried women". The Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, and
Koschier, 1976) as well as two other measures of career indecision were used. Contrary to their hypothesis, Slaney, et. al. found that on all three measures of career decision the adult women showed greater indecision than either the high school women or the college women. While there are a number of problems with the design of this study (such as confounding age and marital status) it is a first step toward systematically assessing the career development of returning women.

Summary and Conclusions:

The literature on the returning woman student is sparse. Literature that exists tends to be descriptive and applied rather than research and data oriented, with many articles seeking generalizations. The generalizations which have resulted, it would seem, would lead practitioners and researchers alike to focus their energy and attention on the traditional homemaker who has returned. She is portrayed as the woman with the greatest difficulties in this process. Only the more recent articles such as Johnson, Wallace, and Sedlacek (1979) have begun to point to other major subgroups of returning women who may also need more attention on college campuses.

Since virtually no other research has been done previously exploring the career decision process of returning women, it makes sense to explore the career decision
literature of traditional age college students and determine whether any of that may provide insights with respect to the process for returning women.

Career Decision Literature:

When the career decision literature is read with the returning woman student in mind, of particular interest is the series of studies investigating self-esteem and its relationship to career decision. This literature is of special interest, since self-esteem is mentioned again and again in the returning women student literature as a particular problem of returning women students (Astin, 1976; Brandenburg, 1974; and Geisler & Thrush, 1975). Geisler and Thrush (1975) found that 53% of the returning women in their sample checked an option that described problems related to self-confidence.

Among the early studies of the relationship of self-esteem to career decision are two studies which sampled only men. Marr (1965) found that early deciders tended to be self-directing. By self-directing he meant that they took responsibility for shaping their own career and they expended effort in advance in the occupation of interest to them. He found that subjects that were definitely not self-directing had lower self-regard scores as measured by Bill's Index of Adjustment and Values.
In another early study in this area, Korman (1966), again with a male sample, hypothesized that high self-esteem subjects are likely to choose occupations which they perceive to be likely to fulfill their specific needs. This according to balance theory would be consistent with their cognitions of themselves as need satisfying. Low self-esteem people, on the other hand see themselves as non-need satisfying individuals, and are more likely to accept other influences in making a career choice. His data supported his hypotheses.

Ashby, Wall and Osipow (1966) more directly focused on the undecided student studying both genders. These investigators explored background, personality and college performance of undecided students. Undecided students were so classified simply by having no idea of a major at the beginning of their freshmen year. Ashby, Wall and Osipow found that the undecided students uncertainty seemed related to high dependency scores on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. They interpret this to mean that for the undecided student, while capable enough, for some reason requires extra support and encouragement in working out a career plan. Undecidedness was not related to a lack of clarity with respect to interests, as measured by the SVIB.

Resnick, Fauble and Osipow (1970), in a study that directly assessed both self-esteem and career decidedness
in women, used the framework of career decision making process formulated originally by Super. They reasoned that since self-esteem is an aspect of the self-concept, and since self-concept influences the nature and progress of the individual through various developmental tasks, positive and negative self-esteem may affect the rate of progress through vocational development tasks.

Resnick, et. al. used the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965). According to this conceptualization, high self-esteem is a reflection of the degree to which people value themselves, tend to like themselves, or consider themselves to be worthwhile and act according to their feelings. Vocational certainty in the Resnick et. al. study was assessed by means of one item. The subjects rated their own vocational certainty on a 1-4 scale, ranging from very certain to very uncertain.

Resnick et. al. found that women who were high in self-esteem expressed greater certainty about their career plans than women who were low in self-esteem.

In a related study Maier and Herman (1974) measured both self-esteem and dogmatism in relation to career decidedness. Self-esteem was once again assessed by means of the total Positive score on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Decidedness was measured by means of three self-descriptive statements, with each statement representing one of the following: undecided, tentatively decided, or decided.
These researchers found significant differences in self-esteem level as a function of decidedness ($F = 4.8264$, $p = .0095$). Undecided students were found to be more dogmatic and lower in self-esteem.

In a somewhat related vein Walsh and Lewis (1972) found that responses of undecided females on the Omnibus Personality Inventory suggested a low state of well being.

Putnam and Hansen (1972) measured a number of psychosocial factors in relation to vocational maturity on Crites Vocational Development Inventory. These factors included self-esteem as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. In addition Fands Feminine Role Rating Inventory was used. This Inventory was designed to distinguish between "other-oriented" women (women who fulfill themselves through the intermediacy of others) and the "self-oriented" women (women who seek fulfillment in life by actualizing their own potential). Self-esteem was found to be useful in predicting vocational maturity. Women higher in self-esteem tended to be more vocationally mature.

While none of the above mentioned studies have investigated the relationship between self-esteem and career decision in returning women, the evidence seems to provide a rationale for expecting that self-esteem level may have an impact on the level of career decidedness in returning women. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale appears to be one of the more frequently employed measures of self-esteem in this body of research.
Putnam and Hansen (1972) point out, however, that while self-esteem was useful as a predictor of vocational maturity, in reality self-esteem accounted for approximately 10% of the variance. This leads one to conclude that various other factors could be helpful in understanding the career decision making of returning women students.

While the studies cited above have dealt with the concept of career indecision, the assessment of undecidenedness has varied considerably. Often an undecided student was so classified because he or she had not declared a major (Ashby, Wall & Osipow, 1966).

Recently a number of more sophisticated instruments have been developed to assess the level of career decision. These instruments include the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico & Koschir, 1976), the Vocational Decision-Making Difficulty Scale (Holland & Holland, 1977), as well as instruments which appear to have some relationship to the concept of career decision such as Career Maturity Inventory (Crites, 1978).

Some research has been conducted which has compared these various measures of career decision and career maturity (Slaney, Stafford & Russell, 1980; Westbrook, Simonson and Arcia, 1978, as cited in Osipow, 1979); and Westbrook, Cutts, Madison and Arcia, 1980). These studies have generally indicated that there is considerable overlap between the various measures of career decision. In fact there is significant
relationship between the Career Decision Scale and the Career Maturity Inventory though conceptually they are not measuring precisely the same construct.

Of particular interest for the present investigation is the research which has employed the Career Decision Scale. A substantial amount of research has been generated in the career development literature, around the dimension of career decidedness as measured by the Career Decision Scale. Most of this research, however, has dealt with traditional age college students and high school students. While claims are made that age effects exist, the age range studied has been quite restricted. Niece and Bradley (1979) studied career decision level as a function of age and sex, but studied only high school and traditional age college students. While these authors concluded that career decidedness increases with age, it seems equally plausible that the findings indicate significant grade effects rather than age effects. Osipow (1978) found such changes in level of decidedness to be more a function of grade than age. These findings suggest that class standing (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior) may be more of an indicator of career decidedness than their ages.

Hartman, Utz and Farnum (1979) appear to be the exception in terms of employing a somewhat older sample. These investigators adapted the Career Decision Scale for use with graduate students and found results similar to those found
in the original Osipow, Carney and Barak (1976) study. The only changes these researchers found it necessary to make involved a terminology change in three items. In these items the term "major" in the original scale was further elaborated as "major in or specialize in". They found that the use of the scale with this slightly older population was quite appropriate.

In a study previously described Slaney, Stafford and Russell (1980) used the Career Decision Scale with a sample of adult women who were considering re-entry and made no modifications in the instrument.

In addition to examining career decision level as a function of age and year in school, the Career Decision Scale has also been used in studies examining the relationship between a variety of demographic and psychosocial variables. Most recently Cellini (1980) examined the relationship between locus of control and career indecision and found that more externally oriented students tend to have greater levels of career indecision. Taylor (1980) found that there was a relationship between vocationally undecided college students and both locus of control and fear of success. Undecided students tended to be more external in their locus of control and more fearful of success and these relationships appeared to be especially significant in females.
The findings of Taylor (1980) suggest that the achievement area may provide some new insights into career decision level. The notion of fear of success was developed by Horner (1972) to account for the unexplained sex differences in the achievement motivation literature. An alternative explanation of the unexplained sex differences in the achievement motivation literature has been developed by Lipman-Blumen and her associates (Lipman-Blumen, 1972; Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1976; Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies & Handley-Isaksen, 1979). This literature will be examined in the next section as one possible influence on returning women's levels of career decision.

Summary and Conclusions:

An examination of the career decision literature indicates that in traditional college age students self-esteem level seems to have a significant impact on career decision level. The literature on returning women students indicates that self-esteem and self-confidence are particularly salient issues for returning women students. It seems quite possible, therefore, that self-esteem may play an important role in the career decision of returning women students.

A number of instruments have been developed to assess the level of career decision and there seems to be a good deal of overlap between these measures. The current
investigation will employ the Career Decision Scale developed by Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico and Koschier (1976).

An examination of recent research employing the CDS suggests that the achievement motivation literature especially the parts of that literature developed to account for the sex differences in achievement motivation may provide some additional insights into the career decision of returning women. In the next section the achievement styles literature will be discussed and the typology of achievement styles developed by Lipman-Blumen and her associates will be outlined.

Achievement Styles Literature:

In searching for other psychosocial dimensions which may prove useful in understanding the career decision process in returning women students the area of achievement styles developed by Lipman-Blumen and her colleagues seemed to provide a potentially fruitful area for exploration. Brooks (1978) in a descriptive article on the re-entry process has suggested that re-entry women may be shifting from vicarious styles of achievement to more direct styles of achievement. It seems possible that an examination of the theoretical literature on achievement styles may have some implications for the career decision process of returning women.
Lipman-Blumen's original work in the area of achievement styles was an article based on her dissertation research conducted at Radcliffe in 1968. In this research Lipman-Blumen (1972) mailed a detailed questionnaire to the wives of graduate students in the Boston area. 1012 wives of graduate students were selected for analysis. Each of these women had attended college. The ages of the women in the sample ranged from 18 to 54, with the median age being 23.4 years. The women who participated in the investigation completed an index of female-role ideology which measured two dimensions of the adult female role, "an internal dimension, based on issues of task sharing between husband and wife, and an external dimension, related to patterns of appropriate female behavior outside the home." Respondents were then categorized on the basis of their responses as either "traditional" or "contemporary". 27% of the women were considered traditional, while 73% were classified as contemporary. In addition to an assessment of female-role ideology, women were asked to indicate the highest level of academic training they expected to obtain. Results indicated that there was a strong interaction between a woman's concept of the female role and her educational aspiration. More than one-half of the traditional females did not plan to go beyond a bachelor's degree, while more than half of the contemporary females did plan to pursue graduate studies.
Of particular interest here is the hypothesis that mode of achievement might be a possible linking factor between sex-role ideology and educational aspiration (Lipman-Blumen, 1972). According to this earliest formulation, Lipman-Blumen defined mode of achievement as "how a woman seeks to satisfy her need for achievement outside the home" (p.36). Lipman-Blumen (1972) identified three categories of achievement: direct, balanced and vicarious. The direct mode referred to a style of achievement in which achievement needs are met completely or predominantly through their own efforts; the balanced mode is one in which equal weight is placed on husband's accomplishments and on their own, whereas the vicarious mode is one in which achievement needs are met either completely or predominantly through the accomplishments of the husband. Lipman-Blumen found that the majority of women in her sample (both contemporary and traditional) sought to satisfy their achievement needs vicariously, though the percentage of traditional women was considerably higher (76% vs. 54% respectively). Lipman-Blumen also found a clear connection between mode of achievement and educational aspiration, "among those who held a contemporary view of female roles and were also vicarious achievers, educational aspiration was reduced so that they could not be distinguished from women in the traditional group in terms of expectations for doctoral or post-doctoral studies" (p.36). In general it seemed clear in this original piece
of research that "the vicarious mode and the traditional view are linked and tend to predispose a woman to limit her educational goals. The balanced and direct modes of achievement are linked to the contemporary view of sex roles and tend to encourage high educational aspirations.

Lipman-Blumen in collaboration with Leavitt has expanded her theory of achievement styles and subsequently developed an instrument to assess an individual's achievement styles (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1976; Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies & Handley-Isaksen, 1979).

The first major presentation of the typology was contained in Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1976). According to the formulation, achievement styles fall along a continuum of vicarious to direct achievement. Within these broader achievement categories are three points along the vicarious portion of the continuum and three points along the direct portion of the continuum. Vicarious achievement according to the 1976 paper is defined a bit more elaborately than in the 1972 version as "finding personal fulfillment through a relationship with another, through the activities and qualities of another individual with whom the vicarious achiever, to some degree identifies." Within this broad achievement mode are the substypes of altruistic vicarious; contributory vicarious, and instrumental vicarious. Altruistic vicariousness refers to the tendency to gain satisfaction and pleasure from another person's activities,
accomplishments and/or qualities as if they were ones own. "Basking in reflected glory" is a phrase which can describe the altruistic vicarious achiever. Simply being in a relationship with a direct achiever can be a source of pleasure. The "stereotypical self-effacing wife of the 'great man' whose role is simply to be there to nurture him" is used as a classic example of this type of achiever.

The contributing vicarious achiever like the above achiever takes pleasure in the success and accomplishments of another as if they were her own, however, the pleasure is a function of the belief that she has contributed in some way to the direct achiever's success. She sees herself as enabling or facilitating the achievement of the direct achiever. The relationship is important both for its own sake and as a medium for the person to achieve.

The third type of vicarious achiever according to Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1976) is the instrumental vicarious achiever. These types perceive relationships as a means to security, status, love, money, achievement and even other relationships. Instrumental vicarious achievers may manipulate relationships in order to achieve some other goal. Primarily relationship is used as a way to meet other needs.

While identification with the direct achiever is a component of all of the vicarious types, the identification is the strongest with the altruistic vicarious achiever.
and considerably less the case with the instrumental vicarious achiever.

The broad category of direct achievement contains three subtypes as well: intrinsic direct, competitive direct, and instrumental direct.

The intrinsic direct achiever is one who experiences the intrinsic pleasures of accomplishment. These people are more attuned to the task at hand and to individual accomplishment than to other people or things. These people use their self as a means of achieving goals. This type of achiever pits herself against an abstract level of excellence rather than against other individuals. Accomplishment is seen as its own reward. Often these types are most comfortable working alone.

The competitive direct achiever, on the other hand, thrives on the chance to outdo a competitor. Success is more exciting if it is achieved within a competitive setting. Like the intrinsic direct achiever relationships are secondary to achievement. The process of winning against a competitor is the basic challenge.

The third type of direct achiever is the instrumental direct achiever, who uses their own achievements as a generalized means for achieving other goals, particularly relational goals, such as nurturance and affiliation as well as more traditional goals, including power, status and more success. The instrumental direct achiever uses direct
achievement as a medium through which to acquire relationships with people.

Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1976) further speculate on the reasons why more women than men tend to be vicarious achievers. They hypothesize that people who adopt a vicarious achievement mode have strong affiliation needs. They base their thinking on Hoffman (1974) who concluded that girls (compared to boys) engage less frequently in independent exploration of their environments and that this is related to early parental conditioning.

According to Hoffman (as cited in Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1976) "girls receive greater protection and support from parents (particularly their mothers) and less encouragement to establish a separate identity from mothers...(The) pattern supports the formation of dependency in girls" (p.140). It socializes girls to expect help from others, including help in mastering their environments. They are often socialized to seek help, whereas boys are encouraged to be individualistic and competent, through their own mastery. Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1976) point to vicarious achievement for women as a "natural outgrowth" of this set of conditions.

While to some extent these orientations are conceptualized as developing early in life, they are not considered to be unchangeable. While an individual may have one predominant style, in all likelihood they have access to other less
developed styles as well. In times of crisis these styles may change rapidly, whereas under other conditions an individual may experience difficulty making transitions (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1976).

According to the most recent formulation of the achievement styles typology, a few shifts have occurred in terminology and content. Rather than conceptualizing achievement styles into the two broad categories of direct and vicarious, Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies and Handley-Isaksen (1979) currently refer to these two broad achievement categories as direct and relational. Since the data suggested the addition of a few new subtypes relationality, rather than vicariousness per se was considered a broader and more useful conceptualization. Thus the three vicarious subtypes in the original formulation altruistic vicarious, contributory vicarious, and instrumental vicarious have been renamed without changes in definition from the earlier conceptualization (Lipman-Blument & Leavitt, 1976). These three types are now referred to as: vicarious relational; contributory relational and instrumental relational. In addition, two new subtypes of relational achievement have been uncovered, and are conceptualized as falling between contributory relational and instrumental relational. These new subtypes of relational achievement are collaborative relational and reliant relational, respectively.
Collaborative relational achievement refers to the type of achievement represented by team effort. The achiever prefers a social context for task accomplishment. Unlike the vicarious relational, and the contributory relational achievers, the collaborative relational achiever has a say in task definition and implementation. She is not merely accepting the goals of another. Smooth interaction among team members is valued and there are secondary gains from the comraderie and support of the group.

The reliant relational achiever is characterized by a tendency to seek out situations in which other individuals carry out the tasks defined by the reliant achiever. These individuals, like the collaborative relational achiever, have a voice in the goals selected. These achievers expect the people with whom they have developed dependent relationships to take responsibility for fulfilling the goals of the reliant achiever. Others identify with the reliant achiever rather than the process of identification which occurs with the vicarious and contributory relational achiever.

While the reliant relational achiever chooses her own goals, she leaves the choice of means to the direct achiever. The direct achieving member of the relationship is clung to, since his or her achieving skills are needed and relied upon.
Thus under the most recent typology, relational achievement is subdivided into five categories conceptualized as forming a continuum. The farthest extreme of relational achievement is 1. vicarious relational followed by 2. contributory relational, 3. collaborative relational, 4. reliant relational, and 5. instrumental relational.

The major shift in the direct domain in the most recent formulation has been the addition of another subtype of direct achievement behavior; the power direct achievement style. This style involves a tendency to "select, initiate, or seek out contexts which permit control and/or organization of individuals, things or situations as a means of task accomplishment" (Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies & Handley-Isaksen, 1979, p.19). For these types all tasks are seen as requiring organization and control. They like to take charge, prefer leadership roles, and use domination and personal control to attain success.

Thus the four direct achievement styles are intrinsic direct, competitive direct, power direct and instrumental direct, with intrinsic direct being the farthest extreme and instrumental direct being a "close cousin" of instrumental relational.

Combining the five relational achievement styles with the four direct achievement styles, there are nine distinct styles of achieving all within the direct and relational domains.
During the development of the achievement styles typology, Lipman-Blumen et. al. (1979) employed variations of the story cues fashioned after Horner's (1972) cues designed to assess fear of success. Lipman-Blumen et. al. speculate that a good portion of the fear of success imagery in the stories about Ann in medical school, may actually be considered evidence of vicarious or relational achievement instead of fear of success. Instead of employing only a single character confronting an achievement situation, a variety of cues were used including stories with two characters (one an achiever, the other an observer). New achievement styles were added to the typology on the basis of the themes which seemed to emerge with the use of these stimulus cues. In their most recent work, however, Lipman-Blumen, et. al. (1979) introduced the Achievement Styles Inventory which is an instrument designed to assess achievement styles through the use of a self-descriptive sentence format containing 45 items (See methodology chapter for a detailed description of the instrument).

Summary and Conclusions:

Lipman-Blumen's (1972) study indicated that a woman's level of educational aspiration was related to her primary achievement style. Women who were direct achievers tended to have higher educational aspirations than women who were vicarious achievers (later referred to as relational
achievers). It seems quite plausible that the area of achievement styles may provide additional insight into a whole range of behaviors.

Taylor (1980) found that career decision level in traditional age college students was moderated by fear of success and Lipman-Blumen has suggested that fear of success may actually at times be more accurately viewed as vicarious or relational achievement. One may reasonably suspect if this is accurate there may be a link between achievement styles and level of career decision as well. Taylor (1980) found the impact of fear of success particularly significant within the group of female students.

Applying the achievement styles typology to the career decision process in returning women students seems particularly relevant, since so many of the returning women have been traditional homemakers and are therefore likely to be relational achievers. In the current investigation the relationship between the two general achievement domains: direct and relational, and the overall level of career decision will be assessed. It is hypothesized that the relational achievers may have particular difficulty with the career decision task. In addition, the relationships between the nine achievement subscales and career decision level in returning women students will be examined.

In the next chapter the Methodology for the current investigation will be explained in greater detail.
CHAPTER II

Methodology

The general questions under investigation in the present study have been delineated at the end of Chapter I, though the more specific research questions under investigation are included at the end of this chapter. Generally this research reflects an attempt to understand and explore both demographic and psychosocial correlates of career indecision in returning women students. The particular psychosocial correlates investigated here are self-esteem and achievement styles. The demographic variables examined include among others work history, marital status, number of children, husbands' educational level, and subject's own previous educational level.

A description of the sample used in this study is given below, followed by a description of the instruments used to assess the various constructs of interest. The procedure used to collect the data is then described. Due to the exploratory nature of this investigation a number of research questions will be stated, rather than specific research hypotheses. Where it seemed reasonable to postulate hypotheses, these have been included.
Subjects:

The present investigation employed two subsamples of subjects. The first and major subsample consisted of 73 women who were a part of a random sample. A computer printout was generated through the Testing Research and Data Processing Unit of the Counseling Center at the University of Maryland. On this list were the names, addresses, and phone numbers of 173 women who had been enrolled at the University of Maryland College Park campus during the fall Semester of 1979. To be included on this list, the following criteria were employed: the subjects were all females, age 25 years or over by Dec. 31, 1979, and currently enrolled in an undergraduate curriculum on the UMCP campus.

The total number of women on the University of Maryland College Park campus who met these criteria (which served as an operational definition of returning students) was 1730 women. The original printout randomly selected 10% of the total "returning women student" population for study (N=173).

A total of 73 of the selected women actually came to the Counseling Center to complete the questionnaires. The women who did not complete the questionnaires consisted of four groups. The largest group consisted of those women who could not be reached by telephone. This included subjects for whom telephone numbers were incorrect, subjects who had
moved away from the area, and subjects who could not be reached after at least 6 attempted contacts (N=47). The second group consisted of those women who were asked to participate but for one reason or another were no longer appropriate subjects, e.g. no longer enrolled in school (N=9). The third subgroup consisted of those women who, though they were reached and were appropriate subjects, were for one reason or another not willing to participate in the study (N=30). The most common reasons cited for a lack of participation were time constraints and a lack of flexibility with respect to time on campus.

The fourth group of women who did not participate in the study consisted of those women who agreed to participate, made appointments, but did not actually keep the appointment (N=14). This number is relatively small, since women who missed one appointment were called after the first missed appointment and were encouraged to reschedule. Most of the women were willing to do this and most did appear for the second appointment. Fourteen of the 16 women who rescheduled actually completed the questionnaire.

The return rate based on the total number of women asked to participate and who were actually appropriate for the sample is 62.4%. Based only on the number of women who agreed to participate in the study, the percentage that did participate is 83.9%.
Though the criteria used in selecting the random sample specified women over the age of 25, two of the subjects who participated reported their age as 24. Their data were kept in the analysis, extending the age range from 24 to 79. Since a major focus of the present investigation relates to career decision level, it was determined that subjects who reported being retired were actually not appropriate for this study. Based on this decision five women above the age of 60 years were eliminated from all further analyses. This resulted in a sample of 68 women ages 24 to 58 years old ($\bar{X} = 35.29$, Mode $= 25$, Median $= 34.50$, and S.D. $= 9.07$).

A closer look at the age distribution of women in the study reveals that there were 24 women in their Twenties, 25 women in their Thirties, 12 women in their Forties, and 7 women in their Fifties.

Among the sample as a whole there were 2 Freshmen, 6 Sophomores, 18 Juniors, and 28 Seniors. There were an additional 13 women who had already completed a Bachelors degree in another field, but were returning to school for a second undergraduate degree.

The Grade Point Average among the women who participated in the present study ranged from 2.00 to 4.00 with a mean of 3.26, a mode of 3.00 and a median of 3.30 (S.D. $= .54$). This represents a significantly higher average than that of the general undergraduate population at UMCP.
The previous educational backgrounds of the women who participated in the study covered the full range. A closer look reveals that 8 of the women had completed high school, 12 had some other sort of post high school training (other than college), 23 had completed some college before their present return to college, 11 had completed Junior college, and 14 had undergraduate degrees in other fields.

The work histories of these women also varied. Many of these women had been or were currently working full time (N=23), others had been working and/or were currently working part time (N=28), while some had been out of the labor force (N=15).

Data were also gathered regarding the subject's personal and family situations. Of the women who participated in the study, the greatest percentage were married (N=46), followed by single women (N=15), divorced women (N=5), and separated women (N=2). None were widows. (A few of the women in the age 60 and above category were widowed, however, they were not included in these analyses).

While none of the single women reported having any children, the range reported for the married, divorced and separated women was 0 to 6. Of the married, divorced and separated women, 16 reported having no children, while 5 women had one child. Twenty women reported having two children, 7 had three children and 5 women had four or more children. The mean number of children for those who had
children was 2.38 (Mode = 2, Median = 2.18 and S.D. = 1.04). Of those women with children (N=37) only four women reported having preschoolers (under the age of 5).

The husbands of the married women in the sample appear to be highly educated as a group. Of the 46 married women, 22 spouses possess advanced degrees (M.A., Ph.D., M.D., etc...), while 8 husbands had completed some graduate work. Only 8 of the married women report having husbands who had not completed college, and only 1 married woman had a spouse who had not attended college at all.

A second subsample consisted of 11 women who had just completed a course for returning students conducted by the reading and study skills laboratory, a division of the Counseling Center. Fourteen women had completed the course. Of the 14 women, 13 agreed to complete the questionnaires, and 11 actually completed them, representing a return rate of 78.58%. This subsample is primarily of interest in terms of how its responses may have differed from the random sample.

To a great extent the women in the returning students class were self-selected. As a result of this self selection process, a few of the students did not meet the criteria previously set forth as the operational definition of returning students in the present investigation. The primary deviation from the operational definition of "returning student" was in age. Two of the students were 22 years old,
resulting in an age range of 22 to 58 ($\bar{X} = 32.73$, Mode = 22, Median = 29, and S.D. = 12.09). A closer look at the age distribution reveals that there were 6 women in their twenties, 3 women in their thirties, none in their forties, and 2 in their fifties.

Among this subsample there were 2 freshmen, 3 sophomores, 1 junior, 1 senior and 4 women who had completed other degrees, or were special students.

The Grade Point Average among the women in this subsample ranged from 2.00 to 4.00, with a mean of 3.19, a mode of 3.00 and a median of 3.03 (S.D. = .66).

The previous educational level of the women in this subsample indicates that all except one had at least started college before their current return. Five women described themselves as having obtained a previous degree. Not all of the women in this subsample indicated what that previous degree was. For some it may be an Associate degree while for others it may be a previous bachelors degree in another field.

The work histories of these women vary in a fashion quite similar to the random sample women. Five of the women had been or were currently working full time, three had been or were currently working part time, while 3 women had been out of the labor force for some time.

The marital and family situations of these women also varied. About half of the women in the returning students
class were married (N=5). There were two women in each of the other three categories (single, separated and divorced). While neither of the single women reported having children the range reported for married, separated and divorced women was 0 to 4. Of those women two reported having no children, three reported having two children, and one woman each had three children, and four children respectively. The mean number of children of those who had children was 2.60 (Mode=2, S.D.=.894). None of these women had pre-school age children.

The husbands of the married women are again a very educated group. Two of the husbands are college graduates, while the other three hold advanced degrees.

Most of the analyses reported were performed on the first group, the random sample. Many of the analyses could not validly be performed on the second subsample since there were so few women in that group.

Participation for both subsamples was strictly voluntary. Confidentiality was insured. Names did not appear on the questionnaires, rather a code number was used. Women who participated completed a separate sheet with their name and address, and were given the opportunity to indicate an interest in receiving a summary of the findings. In this way it was possible to determine who had completed the questionnaires, and who needed to be followed up and rescheduled.
Instruments:

The subjects in the present study were asked to complete four questionnaires. In order to assess the level of career decidedness, the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico and Koschier, 1976) was used. The level of self-esteem was assessed using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965). Achievement styles were measured using the Achievement Styles Inventory (Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt, 1979). In addition a demographic questionnaire developed by the present investigator was given. Each of the questionnaires is described below.

The Career Decision Scale:

The Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico and Koschier, 1976) slightly modified (described later) assessed the level of career decidedness in the sample of returning women students. The rationale for the instrument according to Osipow (1979) is "the notion that a finite number of relatively discrete circumstances are responsible for problems people have reaching appropriate closure and implementation of educational and vocational decisions" (p.1). The scale was developed in an attempt to assess the level of indecision as well as the type of barriers that a particular individual is encountering.
The third revision of the scale consists of 19 items. Each item except for the last one, consists of a statement followed by four response alternatives: Exactly like me (4), Very much like me (3), Only slightly like me (2), and Not at all like me (1). Items #1 and #2 inquire as to whether the subject has made a decision on career and major, respectively, while items 3-18 measure various facets of career decision. The Career Decision Score used in the analysis is the total of items 3-18. Item #19 provides the subject the opportunity to create a description that would seem more fitting for him or her.

Reliability studies with the Career Decision Scale indicate that the scale as a whole has high test-retest reliability (.902 in one study and .819 in the other study, based on 56 and 59 subjects, respectively. (Osipow, 1979)). The majority of item retest correlations fall within the .60 and .70 range, however, the full range as reported in the manual was .343 to .820.

The construct validity of the scale has been addressed in research by Taylor (1979) (as cited in Osipow, 1979). In this research it was shown that students seeking special housing in a residential career planning program scored significantly higher (were less decided) (N=96, \( \bar{X} = 33.58 \), S.D. = 6.81) than students housed randomly (N=42, \( \bar{X} = 28.67 \), S.D. = 8.10) p = .001. Osipow (1979) concludes that "these results testify to the construct validity of the items,
since the residential career planning group sought special housing arrangements in order to resolve their career indecision.

In addition, the construct validity of the scale has been assessed by pre and post comparisons for groups with varying treatment interventions. Those groups exposed to treatments designed to address vocational indecision have generally had lower post-test scores than groups that have not received the treatment (Osipow, 1979).

Factor analytic studies of the scale suggest that it consists of four factors (Osipow, Carney and Barak, 1976). The four factors include 1. A factor reflecting a "lack of structure and confidence with respect to dealing with vocational decision making," 2. An external barrier to a preferred choice, 3. An approach-approach problem, and 4. Two items reflecting personal conflict. The issue of factor structure will not be addressed in the present investigation. Rather the general level of indecision will be assessed using the total of items #3-18.

In assessing the appropriateness of the item content for returning women students, only one item appeared to be potentially problematic. For purposes of the present investigation Item #5 was separated into two items. In the original scale the items reads "I know I will have to go to work eventually but none of the careers I know about appeal to me". A certain percentage of returning women may not
"know that (they) will have to go to work eventually."
Answering the item, if a woman does not feel she needs to go to work, her answer could mean something quite different than if she knows she must go to work, but none of the careers she knows about appeal to her. Thus, Item 5 appears as "None of the careers I know about appeal to me". At the end of the traditional questionnaire one more item appears: "I know I will have to go to work eventually". The score on this item will not be added in to the career decision score, however, it will allow an assessment to be made as to the appropriateness of using the original scale as is, with returning women students.

**Tennessee Self Concept Scale:**

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965) was used to assess overall level of self-esteem in the sample of returning women students. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was originally developed to meet the need for "a scale which is simple for the subject, widely applicable, well standardized, and multi-dimensional in its description of the self-concept." There are a number of subscale scores for the TSCS, reflecting different aspects of self-concept; identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. In addition there are a number of administrative indices. In addition to the separate subscale scores for self-concept,
there is also a total P score, which is one of the most important scores. It reflects the overall level of self-esteem, and is the total of the previously listed subscale scores.

It is the total P score which is of primary interest in the present investigation. According to Fitts (1965) "persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of worth and value, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed, and unhappy; and have little faith or confidence in themselves" (p.2).

The TSCS consists of 100 items. Each item is a self-descriptive statement, followed by 5 response alternatives. Subjects have the opportunity to assess the degree to which the statement is consistent with their self image. The five response alternatives range from Completely false (1), to Completely true (5), with the midpoint representing Partly true and partly false (3). Most of the subjects complete the scale in 10 to 20 minutes, and the scale requires only a sixth grade reading level (Fitts, 1965).

According to a review of the TSCS, by Bentler (Boros, 1972), the retest reliability of the scales is in the high .80's, though it varies for different subscores. Bentler concludes that this sort of reliability is "sufficiently large to warrant confidence in individual difference
measurements." He states further that "many psychometric qualities of the scale meet the usual test construction standards that should exist" (p.366).

According to the manual, the reliability of the total Positive score, the score of particular concern in the present investigation, is .92 (Fitts, 1965).

Discriminant validity of the TSCS has been assessed by comparisons of scores among various groups. Fitts (1965) worked on the assumption that groups that differ on certain psychological dimensions should also differ in self-concept. He made comparisons between three large groups: 369 psychiatric patients, 626 nonpatients and a third group considered psychologically to be high in personality integration (N=75). The patient group almost always had means that "substantiated the original prediction," that is the mean of the patient group was lower on self concept than the mean of the nonpatient group. In turn the mean of the group considered to be high in personality integration, was higher than the other two groups. For the particular scores of interest here, the total Positive score, the means for the patient group, the nonpatient group, and the personality integration (PI) group were 323.0, 345.57, 376.01, respectively. The standard deviations, in the same order, were 44.5, 30.70, and 25.46. These standard deviations indicate that among patient groups there is considerably more variation than among nonpatient groups.
Fitts (1965) supports the content validity of the scale by assuring that an item remained on a particular scale only if "there was unanimous agreement by the judges that it was classified correctly. Thus...(it may be assumed) that the categories used in the Scale are logically meaningful and publically communicable" (p.17).

Fitts (1965) has also explored the relation between the TSCS and other personality measures. The strongest relationship between the total Positive score on the TSCS and any other instrument, appears to be the relationship it has with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (r = -.70). Bentler in his review interprets these findings to mean that it is "safe to conclude that the scale overlaps sufficiently with well known measures to consider it a possible alternative for these measures in various applied situations" (Boros, 1972).

There are two forms of the TSCS available. The counseling form and a clinical and research form. The clinical and research form includes scoring for a number of additional scales. For the present investigation, since the total P score is the primary score of interest, the Counseling form of the TSCS appears to be adequate.

Achievement Styles Inventory:

The Achievement Styles Inventory (Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt, 1979) was used to assess the achievement styles of
of the returning women students in this sample. The rationale for the instrument is based on the conceptual framework of achievement behavior developed by Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt. Since this is a new conceptual framework, it was necessary to develop a new instrument to assess these achievement styles.

The instrument developed by Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt emerged out of a three step process. First an item pool was developed which looked like reasonable indicators of achievement styles, and these items were assigned to theoretical scales on a rational basis. The items were then administered to several populations and analyzed in intercorrelation matrices. Forms of the instrument were then administered to specific criterion groups, i.e. persons in service organizations were hypothesized to score highly on vicarious and contributory relational scales.

The current form of the Achievement Styles Inventory (ASI) is a 45 item instrument. Each item consists of a declarative statement followed by a seven point scale, ranging from Never (1) to Always (7). The subject is instructed to circle the number that best describes his or her behavior.

The scale is scored by an unweighted sum-score method. Each scale score is computed by averaging the values of the 5 items keyed to each scale. According to the scales' authors, the instrument shows adequate reliability, using
"both Cronbach alphas as estimates of scale reliability and four week test-retest coefficients as estimates of stability." (Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies, and Handley-Isaksen, 1979) Actual values for these reliability estimates are not provided, however, a manual is in the process of being prepared for this instrument, and it is expected that the manual will have such data.

Results of the research with the instrument to date, indicate that the data do conform to the conceptualization of the various achievement styles as falling along a continuum. Correlation coefficients of adjacent scales in the model are reported to be moderate, however, once again the actual data are not provided in the manuscript.

Since the instrument was originally developed (there have been at least eight revisions to date) it has been administered to over 1200 subjects, from all walks of life. Lipman-Blumen, et. al. report that among older and more traditional populations there have been sharp sex differences, with men scoring higher on the direct scales and women scoring higher on the relational ones.

The Demographic Questionnaire:

The demographic questionnaire was designed to gather data about the subject in a number of life domains. It is divided into five sections covering the following areas:

returning to school, 4. University involvement, and 5. Family history. A copy of this questionnaire appears in Appendix G. While the questions are generally of a multiple choice nature, there are a few questions where the subject is given the opportunity to write in a response.

Method:

Using the computer generated random sample of 173 women, letters were sent to each of these women explaining that as returning women students on the UMCP campus they could be of great help. The letter (see Appendix A) indicated that they could expect to receive a phone call from the investigator some time during the following two weeks. The letter was cosigned by the two women who head the returning students program at the Counseling Center and was sent out on Counseling Center letterhead to increase credibility. In addition to the cover letter, another sheet was included which provided additional information (See Appendix B).

During the following few weeks each woman was contacted by the investigator who identified herself by name and referred to the letter that the woman had probably received in the mail. If the subject responded with some recognition, the investigator inquired as to the possibility of arranging a convenient time for the woman to come to the Shoemaker Building (the campus building where the
Counseling Center is housed) to complete the questionnaires. Times were then negotiated and directions to the building and room were provided. If the subject did not acknowledge receiving the letter, then the investigator provided the information in the letter. Appointments were arranged over a 6 week period from April through May of 1980.

Subjects willing to participate in the investigation were instructed to report to the testing room of the Counseling Center. The psychometrist provided the subject with the necessary materials. An instruction sheet was provided in the packet so that no further instructions were necessary. Most subjects completed the questionnaires at their own pace, taking an average of approximately 40 minutes. Often subjects were alone while completing the questionnaires, though at other times more than one subject was scheduled at the same or overlapping times.

In addition to the instruction sheet, each packet included a sheet to be turned in separately with their names and addresses, and a place to indicate an interest in receiving a summary of the findings. In addition to this, the four questionnaires and answer sheets were included. The order of the questionnaires was random and varied from packet to packet, to prevent order effects.

The sheet with the subject's name and address was placed in a separate box after the questionnaires were completed.
Research Questions:

Because the investigation was exploratory in nature, it was deemed that the formation of specific research questions would be more appropriate than posing research hypotheses. In those cases where specific research hypotheses seem to be reasonable, the hypotheses are included following the specific research question to which they relate.

While most of the research questions are stated in general terms, in some cases a particular subgroup is of special interest. Where that applies the particular subgroup of interest is indicated following the more general question.

I. Questions relating to the use of the Career Decision Scale with this population:

The Career Decision Scale has heretofore been used primarily with traditional age college students. The findings of the previous research have indicated both significant age trends and significant grade trends, however, in most cases age and grade have been confounded. In addition the range of ages studied has been restricted. The present population of returning women students provides a new opportunity to look at age and grade effects, in a situation where age and grade are in all likelihood not
correlated with one another. In addition the range of ages is far less restricted than in most investigation with this scale.

**Question 1**: Considering the sample of returning women students as a whole, is there any significant difference in career decision level as a function of age?

**Question 2**: Considering the sample of returning women students as a whole, is there a significant difference in career decision level as a function of year in school?

**II. Questions designed to understand the relationship between career decision level and some selected psychosocial variables, and demographic variables:**

**Question 3**: Considering the sample of returning women students as a whole, is there a significant difference in career decision level as a function of stated motivation for returning to school?

**Partial hypothesis with respect to Question 3**: It seems plausible that the sample of returning women students can be categorized into two groups based on their stated motivation for returning to school. The first group should consist of those women who are already involved in a career. On the demographic questionnaire these are women who state that they are returning for one of the following reasons: a. to gain skills relevant to a career I am already involved in, b. to gain a college degree to increase opportunity for
advancement in a field she is already involved in. The second group of women would consist of: a. those women who want to change careers, b. those women who have been out of the job market and want to re-enter, and c. those women who are returning out of general interest. Since the first group seems to have already made some decisions about their career (by virtue of their stated motivations), it seems reasonable to expect that their scores on the Career Decision Scale would reflect a higher decision level, than the second group.

**Question 4**: Considering the group of returning women students as a whole, is the level of self-esteem a significant predictor variable of the level of career decision?

**Hypothesis with respect to Question 4**: Previous research with other student populations has shown that self-esteem has been a significant predictor of career decision level. Accordingly in the present investigation women with low self-esteem are expected to have lower levels of career decision than women higher in self-esteem.

**Question 5**: Using Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt's framework of nine achievement styles, and considering the sample of returning women students as a whole, is there a relationship between achievement styles and career decision level?

**Question 5a**: Using the more general categories of direct and relational achievement style, and considering the sample of returning women students as a whole, is
there a relationship between these achievement styles and level of career decision?

Hypothesis with respect to Question 5a: Schlossberg, Troll and Liebowitz (1978) suggest that women who have generally been vicarious achievers may have difficulty with many of the demands of the student role. In recent formulations Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt have renamed the vicarious style, now the relational style, in addition to other modifications. Women who are more relational in their typical achievement styles may have more difficulty in making career decisions than those women who typically are more direct in terms of their achievement style.

Question 6: Considering the group of returning women students as a whole, are demographic characteristics (such as work history, previous educational level, marital status, number of children, and spouse's educational level) related to level of career decision?

Question 7: In relation to the above general question, a more specific question of interest is the relationship between the demographic variables of marital status and work history and their effects on career decision level.

Hypothesis with respect to Question 7: An hypothesis is that the level of career decision will be lower for the married, traditional homemaker who has been out of the job market for a number of years, than for other women in the sample of returning students.
Question 8. What is the combined impact of the demographic data (as listed in Question 6 above) and data on the psychosocial variables (self-esteem, achievement styles, and motivation for returning to school) in predicting level of career decision in returning women students?

III. Questions designed to understand the interrelationship between the demographic variables, and the psychosocial variables.

Question 9: What effect do the demographic variables of marital status and work history have on the self-esteem of returning women students? Of particular interest is the self-esteem level of the traditional homemaker in comparison to the other women.

Question 10: Do returning women students who are grouped according to their marital status and work history differ with respect to their achievement styles? Once again the achievement style of the traditional homemaker is of particular interest.

Question 10a: Do returning women students who are grouped according to their marital status and work history differ with respect to their general achievement style (relational versus direct)? Once again the achievement style of the traditional homemaker is of particular interest.
**Question 11:** When only considering those returning women who can be classified as traditional homemakers, does their self-esteem vary as a function of their stated motivation for return?

**Question 12:** For the same sample of women mentioned above, do their stated motivations for returning to school relate to their dominant achievement style?

**Question 12a:** Once again for the same subsample, do their stated motivations for returning to school relate to the more general categories of achievement styles (relational and direct)?

The results presented in Chapter III are organized around these questions.
CHAPTER III

Results

In this chapter the results are presented in an order corresponding to that of the statement of the research questions in the methodology chapter.

Research questions 1 and 2 focused on the use of the Career Decision Scale with the sample of returning women students. Research question 1 examined whether or not there was any significant difference in career decision level as a function of age.

In order to answer question 1, women were classified into one of six age categories. Women age thirty or under composed the first group (N = 25). Those women over the age of thirty, but not over the age of 35 composed the second group (N = 11). Women of ages 36 to 40 composed the third group (N = 16). Women of ages 41 to 45 composed the fourth group (N = 5), while the fifth group consisted of women ages 46 to 50 (N = 5). The final group consisted of women ages 51 to 60 (N = 6). In this and all subsequent analyses women above the age of 60 were eliminated from the analyses, since these women indicated that they were retired and no longer concerned with "career" issues.
Results of the one-way analysis of variance investigating the effect of age on the level of career decision are presented in Table 1. An examination of Table 1 reveals that the relationship between age and level of career decision was not significant in the present investigation \( (F = 1.091, p = .37) \).

Research question 2 asked whether there was a significant difference in career decision level as a function of year in school. In order to answer this research question women were classified into one of five categories: freshmen \( (N = 2) \), sophomore \( (N = 6) \), junior \( (N = 18) \), senior \( (N = 28) \) and other \( (N = 13) \). The other category was used by women who already had a degree, but were enrolled in a second undergraduate curriculum, or those who considered themselves "special" students. Data were missing for one individual. For the analysis of variance exploring grade effects, only those women categorized as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors were considered appropriate.

Results of the one-way analysis of variance investigating the effect of year in school on the career decision level of returning women students are presented in Table 2. The results of the Analysis of Variance indicate that the effect of year in school on career decision level was not significant \( (F = .135, p = .94) \), however, the meaningfulness of these results must be questioned. Since many returning women reported having completed some college
Table 1

One Way Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(age)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
One Way Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year in School)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
before their return, it is not surprising to find few freshmen and sophomores (N=2 and N=6, respectively). However, the small number of students in the first two categories, especially the freshmen category, makes it difficult to interpret data for grade effects on career decision level. Anyway, in other studies grade level in college produced no significant difference (Osipow, 1980).

Thus, the results indicate that the sample of returning women students displayed neither age nor grade effects regarding their level of career decision.

Research questions 3 through 8 explored the relationship between career decision level and selected psychosocial variables, and demographic variables.

Research question 3 focused on whether the returning women's career decision level would vary as a function of their stated motivation for returning to school.

The returning women were categorized in one of five ways according to their responses on item #12 of the Demographic Questionnaire. This question asked women to select from a list of six options, the option which "most closely reflects your reason for returning to school." The options provided included the following:

1. To gain skills relevant to a career I am already involved in;

2. To gain a college degree, so that I will have an opportunity for advancement in a field that I am already involved in, that I would not have without a degree;
3. To change from a career that I am currently involved in, to a new career;

4. To prepare myself to reenter the job market, after having been away from the job market for some time;

5. General interest, or personal growth, but not with any intention of seeking employment, or

6. Other.

Participants in the study were asked to check one option, however, if they found it necessary they were allowed to rank order more than one relevant response. In these cases, women were categorized on the basis of their #1 reason.

Women who selected the "other" option were often re-categorized into one of the previous categories on the basis of their accompanying explanation. Data for those Ss who could not be recategorized were eliminated from this analysis. Of the 68 women, the absolute frequencies of these responses were distributed as follows: 1. to gain skill relevant to career already involved in (N=11); 2. to gain college degree for advancement (N=4); 3. to change careers (N=31); 4. to reenter the job market (N=13); 5. general interest (N=7), and 6. other (those who could not be recategorized) (N=2).

Results of the one-way analysis of variance investigating the effect of stated motivation for returning to
school on career decision level are presented in Table 3. The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the effect of stated motivation for returning to school on career decision level was not significant ($F = .94, p = .44$).

The partial hypothesis that those women who checked options 1 or 2 above would be more decided (have lower career decision scores) than women in the other three categories cannot be supported on the basis of these data. The mean career decision scores of these women were not significantly different from each other (Group 1, $\bar{X} = 23.73$; Group 2, $\bar{X} = 20.75$; Group 3, $\bar{X} = 26.58$; Group 4, $\bar{X} = 23.69$; Group 5, $\bar{X} = 29.57$) ($p > .05$).

Research question 4 asked whether there is a significant relationship between the level of self-esteem and level of career decision.

Women were placed in one of three groups on the basis of their total positive score on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Based upon the distribution of total positive scores within the sample, the range of total positive scores was divided into thirds. Approximately one third of the women were categorized as low self-esteem women (total positive $\leq 342$, $N = 21$). One third of the women were categorized as moderate self-esteem women (total positive $> 342$ and $\leq 365$, $N = 18$), and the final third of the women were considered the high self-esteem group (total positive $\geq 366$, $N = 24$).
Table 3
One Way Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Stated Motivation for Returning to School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Stated Motivation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the one-way analysis of variance investigating the effect of level of self-esteem on career decision level are presented in Table 4. The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the effect of level of self-esteem on career decision level is significant (F = 5.20, p = .008).

Post hoc analysis using Scheffe procedure indicates that the group means for groups 2 and 3 (X = 23.11, and X = 23.67, respectively), while not significantly different from one another, are significantly different from group 1 (X = 30.86) (p < .05). This supports the hypothesis set forth in Chapter 3 that those women with low self-esteem will be less career decided than women high in self-esteem (Note that high career decision scores reflect high levels of indecision). The present results indicate that low self-esteem women are also significantly less decided than women with moderate levels of self-esteem.

Research question 5 asked whether or not there is significant relationship between the nine achievement scores of the Achievement Styles Inventory and the level of career decision.

Items on each of the nine achievement subscales were tallied for each subject, to produce nine subscale scores; representing the styles: subscale 1- Intrinsic Direct; subscale 2- Competitive Direct; subscale 3- Power Direct;
Table 4
One Way Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Level of Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Self-Esteem)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>387.87</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to determine whether a relationship exists between achievement styles and career decision level, a stepwise multiple regression analysis with the nine achievement subscale scores as predictors and career decision level as the criterion was performed. Prior to doing this analysis scatterplots were drawn to insure that one of the nine subscales were curvilinearly related to career decision scores.

The stepwise regression analysis begins by entering the variable that correlates most highly with the criterion, e.g. subscale 6 in Table 5. It then enters, in descending order, the variable that independently adds most to the correlation with the criterion. Table 5 presents this hierarchical listing. Note that the table contains a dotted line across it which indicates conservatively the point at which adding variables becomes unreliable. The conservative criteria used for determining the reliability of the added variables are: (a) the shrunken $R$ itself was statistically significant ($p < .05$); (b) the addition of the predictor yielded a shrunken $R^2$ that was at least .02 greater than that yielded by the prior predictor (thus the added variable accounted for at least 2% more of the variance
in the criterion than did the predictor to which it was added); and (c) the increment due to the added variable was a statistically significant addition.

An examination of Table 5 indicates that only achievement subscales 6 and 8 (Reliant Relational and Contributory Relational, respectively) meet these conservative criteria, while the seven additional subscales failed to add a significant amount of predictability to the criterion of career decision level. It should be noted, however, that the resulting regression equations taken as a whole were significant through the variable entered on step number 6. In descending order the subscales entered were subscales 6, 8, 1, 4, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 2, with the last three (7, 9, and 2) yielding nonsignificant regression equations.

Research question 5a asked whether there is a relationship between the two broader achievement domains (relational and direct) and the level of career decision.

Items on subscales 1, 2, 3, and 4 were combined to form the broader direct domain, while the remaining subscales (5, 6, 7, 8, and 9) comprised the relational domain.

In order to determine whether there is a relationship between these two achievement domains and the level of career decision, a stepwise multiple regression analysis with the two broader achievement domain scores as predictors and career decision level as the criteria was performed.
Table 5
Stepwise Regression Analysis with Subscales of the Achievement Styles Inventory as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Shrunken R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.6</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.8</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.1</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.3</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.5</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.7</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.9</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ach.S.2</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stepwise regression analysis employed the same procedure outlined with respect to question 5 above, and the same criteria were employed in determining the reliability of the variables. Table 6 presents the hierarchical listing in descending order.

An examination of Table 6 indicates that only the Relational Domain meets the conservative criteria set forth under question 5. The direct domain did not meet the criteria. The results indicate that high scores in the relational domain are associated with higher career decision scores (high scores indicating greater indecision). While this finding does indicate that a high degree of relational achievement is associated with greater career indecision, it has not been determined that there is any relationship between degree of direct achievement and career decision level.

Research question 6 asks whether there is a relationship between demographic characteristics (such as previous educational level, number of children, and spouse's educational level) and the level of career decision, while research question 7 focuses specifically on the relationship of marital status, work history and level of career decision. It should be noted that the variables of interest in research question 6, may be considered continuous variables, while the variables of interest in research question 7 (marital status and work history) are discreet variables. This difference
Table 6
Stepwise Regression Analysis with the Two Achievement Domains of the Achievement Styles Inventory as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Domain</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Shrunken $R^2$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
has certain implications for the analysis of the data for each of these questions.

In research question 6, the specific variables explored were: (a) the subject's own highest educational level prior to her return to school (demographic question #6), (b) husband's highest educational level (if the woman is married) (demographic question #23), (c) number of children (demographic question #22), and finally (d) a self-assessment of the degree to which the woman has been career and/or home oriented over the past few years (demographic question #24).

A stepwise regression analysis was performed using the above variables as predictors and career decision level as the criterion variable. Once again, the stepwise regression analysis enters in that variable first that correlates most highly with the criterion followed by the other variables in descending order. This procedure yields a hierarchical listing as seen in Table 7.

This analysis was performed twice. The first analysis included the factor of husband's educational level, while the second analysis eliminated this factor. Only 46 of the subjects were included in the first analysis, since only married women responded to the item dealing with husband's educational level. In multiple regression analysis only those subjects may be used who have values for each of the variables in the analysis. Results of the first analysis
are provided in Table 7, while the results of the second analysis are provided in Table 8.

An examination of both Tables 7 and 8 indicate that none of these demographic variables have met the conservative criteria set forth in the discussion of research question 5. Thus, the dotted line, which ordinarily separates the reliable variables from the unreliable additions, appears at the top of both tables. These results indicate that none of the demographic variables explored in this set of analyses appear to be significant predictors of the level of career decision.

Research question 7 focused specifically on two of the discrete demographic variables; marital status and work history. For this analysis women were classified into one of three categories with respect to work history: (a) women who worked full time prior to returning to school and/or currently worked full time (N = 25), (b) women who worked part-time prior to returning to school and/or currently worked part-time (N = 28), (c) women who had been out of the job market prior to returning to school and were currently unemployed (N = 15). Women were classified into these three categories on the basis of the combined information provided by demographic questions 1 and 3. Marital status was determined by demographic question 17, with the following results: (a) single women (N = 15),
Table 7
Stepwise Regression Analysis with Demographic Variables as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Shrunken R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Educational Level</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational History</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Descriptive Statement*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Note that N = 45 for this analysis, since only the married women were included.

*The self-descriptive statement regarding involvement with home and/or career over the past few years, was not kept in the analysis since the F level was insufficient for computation.
Table 8

Stepwise Regression Analysis with Demographic Variables (Excluding Husband's Educational Level) as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Shrunken R^2</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Descriptive Statement</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational History</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that N = 61 for this analysis, since the single, divorced and separated women were included in this analysis.
(b) married women (N = 46), (c) divorced women (N = 5), and (d) separated women (N = 2).

The relationship between the demographic variables of work history and marital status and the level of career decision was explored by means of a two way analysis of variance. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 9. An examination of Table 9 indicates that while the effect of work history does not appear to be significant (F = .06, p = .94), the effect of marital status appears to be significant (F = 3.55, p = .02). The interaction of these variables (marital status and work history) does not appear to be significant (F = .44, p = .65).

Though marital status appeared to be significant in the above analysis, it was determined that a second analysis should be performed excluding the divorced and separated women in the sample, since the numbers of women in each of these categories were so small (N = 5, and N = 2), respectively) that the results become questionable. Results of this second analysis of variance are presented in Table 10. The effect of marital status comparing the group of single women and married women on their level of career decision appears to be quite significant (F = 9.30, p = .003). The means indicate that single women appear to be significantly more undecided than married women (\( \bar{X} = 31.27, \bar{X} = 23.51 \), respectively).
Table 9
Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Work History and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work History (W)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital History (M)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>270.16</td>
<td>(3.55^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*p < .05\)
Table 10

One Way Analysis of Variance of Career Decision Scores by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Marital Status)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676.67</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that only single and married women were included in this analysis, since the numbers of divorced and separated women were quite small, making analysis difficult.
Thus, in terms of demographic variables explored in the current investigation (through questions 6 and 7), only marital status emerges a significant variable in relation to career decision level. Contrary to the hypothesis set forth under research question 7, which predicted that married, traditional homemakers who had been out of the job market for a number of years would be less career decided, evidence in this investigation suggests that the single women are less decided than married women. In addition work history did not predict level of decidedness in the present study.

Research question 8 focuses on the combined impact of the demographic data and the psychosocial variables of self-esteem, achievement styles and reasons for returning to school. Since each of the variables has been explored individually in one of the previous analyses, some determination could be made as to which factors are significantly related to career decision level. Using this information, only those variables that have previously been shown to significantly relate to career decision level have been used in the current analysis. The significant variables determined in the previous analyses are: marital status, self-esteem, the Relational Domain subscore of the Achievement Styles Inventory, and achievement subscales 6 and 8 of the same instrument.
Two stepwise regression analyses were performed. In the first analysis the Relational Domain subscore was entered, along with self-esteem and marital status. It would have been inappropriate to enter achievement subscales 6 and 8 into the same regression equation as the relational score, since the subscales are components of the relational domain, and are therefore not independent of it. Two separate regression equations were therefore employed.

As mentioned previously marital status is not a continuous variable and therefore not ordinarily appropriate for a regression analysis; however, through the use of dummy coding, this variable has been altered to permit its use in a multiple regression analysis. Through dummy coding the one variable of marital status becomes 4 variables: (a) single or not single, (b) married or not married, (c) divorced or not divorced, and (d) separated or not separated. In this way each of these four variables is a continuous variable and therefore appropriate for regression analysis. The results of the dummy coding can provide additional information in terms of the specific component of a variable that is crucial.

Results of the stepwise regression analyses are presented in Tables 11 and 12. Again, these analyses enter the variable first, which correlates most highly with the criterion variable, e.g. career decision level, and then enters in descending order the other variables which
correlate with the criterion variable. Judgments may now be made as to which of these various factors relate most significantly to career decision level.

An examination of Tables 11 and 12 indicates that of the variables found to be significant predictors of career decision level in previous analyses, self-esteem stands out as the most significant predictor. Generally the relationship appears to be one in which the lower the level of self-esteem, the higher the level of career indecision. The second most salient factor appears to be whether or not a woman is single. Previous analyses indicate that single women (who have never been married) are more likely to have higher indecision scores than non-single women (married, divorced or separated). The third most salient factor, according to Table 11, is the Relational domain score on the Achievement Styles Inventory. In fact a comparison of Tables 11 and 12 indicate that the Relational score yields more predictive information than the combination of the two subscale scores (6 & 8) in Table 12.

The research questions outlined in Part III of the previous chapter were designed to understand the interrelationships between demographic variables and the psychosocial variables, if there are any.

Research question 9 focused, in particular, on whether there is a relationship between the demographic variables of marital status and work history and the level of self-esteem.
Table 11
Stepwise Regression Analysis with Marital Status, Self-Esteem and Relational Achievement Scores as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Shrunken R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Not Single</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Achievement Score</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Not Separated</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Not Married</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Note that Marital Status was entered as four separate factors (Married/Not Married; Single/Not Single)

N = 62 Subjects
Table 12
Stepwise Regression Analysis with Martial Status, Self-Esteem and Achievement Subscales 6 and 8 as Predictors and Career Decision Scores as the Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Shrunken $R^2$</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Not</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Not</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Not</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between marital status, work history and the total positive score of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was explored by means of a two way analysis of variance. Results of the two way analysis of variance are presented in Table 13. An examination of Table 13 indicates that the relationship between both marital status and self-esteem and work history and self-esteem are not significant ($F = 1.89$, $p = .14$, and $F = .32$, $p = .73$, respectively).

Research question 10 focused in particular on the relationship between achievement styles and the demographic characteristics of work history and marital status. As originally stated the research questions attempted to explore the 9 subscales of the Achievement Styles Inventory.

In order to answer this research question, it was necessary to determine which of the nine subscales represented each woman's predominant achievement style.

In order to determine each woman's predominant achievement style, the raw scores on each of the nine subscales of the Achievement Styles Inventory was converted to a z-score. A comparison was made between each of the nine z-scores for each subject. The subscale with the highest z-score was considered as the primary achievement style for that subject. In the case of ties, the subject was given more than one primary achievement style.

Table 14 reveals the distribution of primary achievement styles for the nine subscales of the Achievement Styles Inventory.
Table 13
Analysis of Variance of Self-Esteem Scores by Work History and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work History (W)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>309.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (M)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1855.59</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W x M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>704.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>979.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Distribution of Primary Achievement Styles Among the Women in the Random Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Subscale</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ach. Style 1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84(^1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Note that some subjects were assigned more than one primary achievement style in the event of tie scores. Actual N = 68.
The next stage of the analysis involved an examination of a group of Chi-square analyses. In order to determine if there were any particular relationships between achievement styles and demographics a series of chi square analyses were performed exploring the relationship between marital status and primary achievement styles, controlling for work history and a second series of chi squares analyses exploring the relationships between primary achievement styles and work history controlling for marital status.

For each primary achievement style there were an average of approximately nine women; controlling for marital status or work history the number of women in each separate analysis was considerably lower than the average of nine. For virtually every analysis empty cells emerged, leaving the analysis uninterpretable. It was especially difficult in analyses where single, divorced or separated women were examined in terms of work history, since virtually none of these women were out of the work force.

It was decided that since work history had not proven to be a significant predictor of career decision level, and since marital status had appeared to be an important predictor of career decision level, a new series of analyses were undertaken. The new series of chi square analyses explored the relationship between marital status and primary achievement styles without consideration of the work history of the subject. In addition, only two levels of
marital status were examined, married and single, since there were so few subjects in the divorced and separated categories. These two measures (leaving out work history and examining only married and single women) were attempts to increase the number of subjects per cell and therefore attempts to produce results which could be interpreted; however, even these measures resulted in few valid chi square analyses. Two groups of primary achievement styles resulted in valid analyses: (a) those women with primary achievement style 6 (N = 13), and (b) those women with primary achievement style 8 (N = 9). Results indicate that there was not a significant relationship between achievement style 6 and the marital status of the women ($X^2 = .38, p = .54$). Achievement style 8 was also not significantly related to marital status ($X^2 = .06, p = .81$).

For the second part of this research question (10a) the focus was on the relationship between the two general achievement domains (relational and direct) and the demographic variables of work history and marital status. For each woman, a comparison was made between her z-score in the relational domain and her z-score in the direct domain. Those women who had higher z-scores in the relational domain were classified as relational achievers (N = 36). Those women who were higher scorers in the direct domain
than in the relational domain were classified as direct achievers (N = 32).

A series of chi square analyses were again performed as in Question 10 above, and again the problem of cells with two few subjects emerged. A second analysis, looking at only marital status (single versus married) and achievement domain was then performed. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 15.

An examination of Table 15 reflects no significant tendency: \( X^2 = 2.45, \ p = .12 \).

Of particular interest in this research question was the achievement style of the traditional homemaker. In order to explore this particular phase, a chi square analysis looking at work history and achievement domain for the married women in the sample was performed. Since the greater percentage of subjects were married (N = 46), the problem of empty cells did not arise. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 16. The subjects who are in the out of the job market category are considered to be the traditional homemakers. The chi square analysis indicates that there is no significant relationship between achievement domain and work history for married women (\( X^2 = .56, \ p = .75 \)).

Research question 11 focused on the traditional homemakers (those women who are currently married and have been out of the job market a number of years). Question 11 asks
Table 15
Crosstabulation of Primary Achievement Domains by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Primary Achievement Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4^2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 2.45, p = .12

^1Note that only single and married women were included, since the number of divorced and separated women was too small for meaningful analysis.

^2This represents the number of women per cell.
Table 16
Crosstabulation of Work History by Achievement Domain for Married Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work History(^1)</th>
<th>Primary Achievement Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the Job Market</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Current status and/or status just prior to return to school.

Chi-square = .56, p = .75
whether there is a relationship between these women's stated motivation for returning to school and their level of self-esteem.

By definition, these women have selected one of only two options on demographic question 12, asking for their reason for returning to school; either they want to prepare themselves to re-enter the job market, or they are returning out of general interest with no intention of seeking employment.

In order to assess whether there is a relationship between the traditional homemakers stated motivation for returning to school and their level of self-esteem, a t-test was performed comparing the mean self-esteem level of those women who are returning for career purposes (option 4 on item 12) and those whose stated motivation is not career related (option 5 on item 12). An examination of Table 17 indicates that though the mean self-esteem level of the career interested women is higher than the mean for the non-career women, it is not a significant difference ($\bar{X} = 358.59$, S.D. = 28.83, $\bar{X} = 352.00$, S.D. = 22.04, respectively) ($F = 1.71$, $p = .53$).

Research questions 12 and 12a focused on the same group of women as above, exploring whether there is a relationship between the stated motivation for returning to school (options 4 and 5 on item 12 of the demographic questionnaire) and the primary achievement styles.
Table 17

t-Test of the Difference between the Mean Self-Esteem Scores of Traditional Homemakers as a Function of their Stated Reason for Returning to School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Returning</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning for Career Purposes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning for Non-Career Purposes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = .53, \text{ d.f.} = 18, p = .60\]
While the first part of the question focuses on the nine subscales of the Achievement Styles Inventory, the recurring problem of too few subjects in each of the nine subscale categories arose. Given that only traditional homemakers were being considered in this analysis, the number in each primary achievement category was extremely small, making it impossible to validly complete the analysis required to answer this question.

It was possible, on the other hand, to explore the relationship between the reasons for returning and the achievement domains (relational and direct). Results of the two sample z-test for proportions are presented in Table 18. The statistics indicate that the relationship between the reasons for returning and the achievement domains is not significant \( (z^2 = 1.31, p > .05) \).

While the research questions stated at the end of Chapter 3 have been analyzed and the results presented above, a few additional analyses were performed in order to compare the subsample of women in the Returning Students Class \( (N = 11) \) with the random sample used in all of the above analyses. Since the class consisted of so few women, most of the previous analyses could not be validly performed for this group. Instead a few general comparisons have been made. An examination of Tables 19 and 20 reveal that on t-test comparisons of career decision level and self-esteem level there are no significant
Table 18

$z^2$-Test of the Relationship between Reason for Returning to School and Primary Achievement Domain in Traditional Homemakers Who Have Returned to College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Returning</th>
<th>Primary Achievement Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning for Career Purposes</td>
<td>9$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning for Non-Career Purposes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$Note that the numbers reflect the number of subjects.

$z^2 = 1.31, \ p > .05$
Table 19

\textit{t-Test of the Difference between the Mean Career Decision Score by Group Membership}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Career Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Sample</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Students Class</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t = .88, \text{ d.f.} = 10, p > .05. \)
Table 20

t-Test of the Difference between the Mean Self-Esteem Score by Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Sample</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>356.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>361.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t = .46, d.f. = 10, p > .05.
differences between the women enrolled in the returning students class, and those who comprises the random sample (t = .88, d.f. = 10, p > .05 and t = .46, d.f. = 10, p > .05, respectively).

An examination of Table 21 reveals that a $z^2$ test of the relationship between the primary achievement domains and subsample membership, indicates that there is not a significant relationship between the two ($z^2 = .99, p = .31$) (Note that the demographics of both subsamples have been discussed in the Methodology chapter, under the section headed Sample).

Chapter 4 has summarized the research findings for the twelve research questions formulated at the end of Chapter 3. Chapter 5 will provide a discussion of the implications of these findings, as well as a discussion of the relationship between these findings and previous related research. In addition implications for future research will be discussed.
Table 21

$z^2$ Test of the Relationship between Primary Achievement Domain and Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Primary Achievement Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Sample</td>
<td>32^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Student Class</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1Note that the numbers reflect the number of subjects.

$z^2 = .99, p = .31$
CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The results presented in Chapter III indicate that there was no significant difference in career decision level as a function of age within the sample of returning women students. Clearly the range of ages represented in the sample of returning women was far greater than in previous studies of age effects with the Career Decision Scale. Previous research findings had been somewhat inconsistent with respect to age effects. Niece and Bradley (1979) had indicated that there were age effects (though the range of ages in their sample was younger and far more restricted), while Osipow (1978) had suggested that grade effects rather than age effects were evident in the samples he examined (also traditional age college students). Results of the present investigation would seem to indicate that level of career decision is not related to age in a straight-forward way with returning students.

The present investigation also failed to find significant grade effects on career decision level, however, these results are somewhat questionable since there was not a fair sized representation of returning women in
their freshman and sophomore years. The lack of women in the freshman and sophomore classes is representative of the fact that most of the returning women students have completed some college before their return, and therefore are more likely to have more advanced class standing upon re-entry. The lack of grade effect on career decision level may be related to the fact that class standing for these women is not representative of how long they have been returning students. It seems possible, for example, that upon first re-entering women may on the whole show greater levels of indecision than women who are further along the road as returning students, regardless of actual class standing. The present data cannot answer this question definitively.

Research questions 3 through 8 were aimed at understanding both the demographic and psychosocial variables which may be related to career decision scores. Looking at the results of all of these analyses, self-esteem emerges as the strongest predictor of career salience. Women low in self-esteem appear to have particularly high levels of career indecision, which is compatible with all of the research which has examined this relationship in traditional age college students (Ashby, Wall & Osipow, 1966; Maier & Herman, 1974; Resnick, Fauble, & Osipow, 1970). While women categorized as low in self-esteem had significantly higher levels of career indecision than other
women, there was not a significant difference between the career decision levels of those women categorized as high in self-esteem and those women categorized as moderate in self-esteem. This finding would seem to imply that there is some minimal amount of self-esteem which is necessary for ease in career decision making not a linear relationship between self-esteem and career decision level.

The second most salient predictor, and the only demographic predictor in the present investigation which had any significance was marital status. According to the results of the present investigation single women had higher levels of career indecision than either married, separated, or divorced women. This result seems particularly surprising, since much of the descriptive literature focuses its attention on the traditional homemakers as the population particularly in need of assistance. In the present investigation work history (whether or not a woman had been a labor force participant) was not significantly related to career decision. The finding that single women seem to be having particular difficulty with career decision implies that programs designed to attend to the needs of returning women may be doing a disservice to a significant portion of their target population if their efforts are focused solely on the traditional homemakers who are returning to school.
The other major prediction of career decision problems appears to be a high score in the Relational domain of the Achievement Styles Inventory. As mentioned previously women whose primary style of achievement is relational tend to satisfy their achievement needs through relationships with others rather than through a direct confrontation with a task. Personal fulfillment is found through identification with another individual who acts and achieves. While the present analysis has not categorized women as direct vs. relational achievers, it is possible to say that these women who tend to have high scores in the relational domain tend to have greater career decision difficulties. (It should be noted that these women may or may not also be high scorers in the direct domain as well.) That is, there was no relationship found between career decision scores and direct domain scores in general nor between career decision scores and any of the direct domain subtypes.

Examining particular subtypes of achievement behavior which are predictive of career indecision, the clearest finding is that high scores on the reliant relational domain are associated with higher levels of career indecision. As mentioned previously reliant relational achievers are people who select their own goals, however, they are.
characterized by a tendency to expect significant others in their lives to carry out the goals for them (Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies & Handley-Isaksen, 1979). These reliant relational achievers tend to seek out situations where the style described above is possible.

The only other achievement style subscale which produced significant results was the contributory relational style. High scores on the contributory relational subscale seem to be associated with greater levels of career indecision.

In terms of total predictability the single broader relational domain score was more significantly related to career indecision than was either of the two subscales, reliant relational or contributory relation. In fact the relational domain score yielded greater predictability than the two subscale scores combined.

It would seem for the present investigation that the nine substyles of achievement, contained within the two domains of relational and direct achievement, have not added significantly to the predictability of career decision level over the knowledge of the two broader domain scores. However, this is not to imply that the achievement typology may not have great use in other areas. In fact one might suspect that these substyles of achievement might have implications for both the content of career choice and the level of job satisfaction. It may be that some
sort of congruence between one's primary achievement style and demands of a particular job would lead to greater job satisfaction than would occur where such congruence did not exist. (This seems similar in some ways to the notions of congruence relating to greater job satisfaction contained in Holland's typology of the world of work.)

In addition to an examination of the predictors which yielded significant relationships with career decision level, it seems equally important to examine the relationships that do not appear to be significant. While Astin (1976) examined returning women in terms of their stated motivations for returning to school, these stated motivations did not significantly relate to career decision level in the present investigation. A nonsignificant trend did appear in the direction of higher levels of indecision for those women whose stated motivation was specifically not career related. No differences emerged between women who were already involved in a career and those who were seeking a career change or re-entry into the job market.

Aside from marital status the demographic variables explored in the present investigation did not yield significant relationships with career decision level. The demographic variables examined included subjects' own previous educational level, husband's highest educational level, number of children, self-assessment of previous career/home orientation and previous work history.
The lack of significant findings with respect to demographic characteristics suggests that it may be more important to assess intrapsychic variables than demographic variables in trying to target subgroups of returning students in need of special career assistance. These findings seem to be in contrast to the many descriptive studies that focus particularly on the traditional homemakers as the subgroup in particular need of assistance (Brandenburg, 1974; Brooks, 1978).

In addition to an examination of the relationships between career decision level and both demographic variables and the psychosocial variables of self-esteem and achievement styles, further examinations were conducted with the hope of understanding the relationship between the demographic variables of marital status and work history and the psychosocial variables of self-esteem and achievement styles.

The relationship between marital status, work history and self-esteem was not significant. Neither marital status nor work history related to the level of self-esteem in a significantly predictable way, however, there did appear to be a trend toward lower self-esteem among the single women. The analyses undertaken to explore the relationship between the nine achievement substyles and both marital status and work history ran into a number of difficulties. The major difficulty centers around the fact
that there were too few women with each of the primary sub-
styles to complete the analyses. Even if the number of
subjects had been increased, however, certain combinations
of marital status and work history do not emerge regardless
of primary achievement style. Single women, for example,
are almost always in a category involving some degree of
participation in the labor force. Single women are more
influenced by the economic necessity of supporting them-
selves that by intrapsychic variables. To some extent
married women seem to have the luxury of possibly being
influenced by intrapsychic variables. That is a married
woman may not necessarily have to work to support herself
and therefore the possibility exists that her choice
whether or not to work may be influenced by such intra-
psychic factors as achievement style.

For the two general achievement domains (relational
and direct) the same situation arose; single women regard-
less of achievement style were never categorized as out
of the labor force. Therefore the problem of empty cells
arose once again.

A second analysis examining the relationship between
marital status and achievement domain indicates a tendency
for the single women to be more relational than direct in
their achievement style, while for married women there
appears to be an equal likelihood of relational and direct
achievement as the primary achievement style. However, this was not statistically significant.

An interesting picture begins to emerge when this trend of relational achievement for single women is combined with the finding that single women tend to be less career decided than other women and tend to have lower self-esteem than married women. While much of the literature focuses on the traditional homemaker, the results of the present investigation suggest that single women over the age of 25 who are returning to college may have greater difficulty than the married homemakers. It is possible that by the time married women return to school they may have passed through a relational stage of achieving. Coming back to school for many of these women may reflect a desire for more direct opportunities for achievement.

Single women over the age of 25 do not generally have the same sort of opportunities for relational achievement, which are available to a married woman especially those with children. Coming back to college for these single women is not necessarily a rejection of relational achievement and a quest for direct achievement possibilities. Instead their increased difficulty with career decision may reflect their ambivalence towards direct achievement. Self-esteem tends to be lower for these women as well. The picture described above is speculative in nature and based on
trends in the research. Further research would be necessary
to determine whether this portrait may be valid.

The analyses which attempted to focus directly on the
traditional homemakers and the relationships between their
stated motivations for return and self-esteem and achieve­
ment style yielded no significant finding. A nonsignificant
trend does suggest the possibility that the homemakers who
are direct achievers may be more likely to state their
reason for return as career related, than the relational
achievers.

The findings of the present investigation also suggest
that the women who enrolled in a special class for returning
students were not significantly different than the women in
the random sample. Along the dimensions of overall level of
career decision, self-esteem, and primary achievement styles.

Relationship to the Literature:

In terms of the career decision literature, the present
investigation provides a few new insights. While almost all
of the previous literature has dealt with traditional age
college students, the present investigation indicates that
career decision issues are very real for non-traditional
students as well. The findings of the present investigation
also suggest that some of the same factors which have in­
fluence on traditional age college students in terms of their
career decidedness, seem to be relevant factors affecting
the career decision process of returning women. In the present investigation the findings with respect to the influence of self-esteem level on career decidedness particularly points to the applicability of the research conducted on traditional age students (Maier & Herman, 1974; Resnick, Fauble & Osipow, 1970).

The present investigation has also served to provide information regarding the applicability of the Career Decision Scale with older students. Only one minor modification in one question was necessary. This change involved the elimination of the first part of question #5 which states: "I know I will have to go to work eventually." In the present investigation this was included as a separate item and yielded the whole range of responses from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree." For some returning women the reality is that they have a choice. Since the inclusion of this statement as a part of item #5 would confound the response, it seems best to simply eliminate the statement, leaving item #5 as "None of the careers that I know about appeal to me."

Thus like the research of Hartman, Utz and Farnum (1974), the present investigation has found that with minor modification the Career Decision Scale can serve varying populations.

In terms of the achievement styles literature, once again the research has applied the achievement styles typology to a new population, and results indicate that the
typology has applicability and implications for returning women. The present investigation seems to suggest that in relation to some research questions, the two general achievement domains of relational and direct achievement may provide enough of a discrimination and the addition of the substyles may not add a substantial amount of information. Since the typology is relatively new there has not been much applied research to which to relate the present investigation.

In terms of the returning women's literature in general it seems that the present investigation steps forth in the direction of more carefully planned research and away from the descriptive literature which seems to have prevailed in the field up until the present time. This seems consistent with the directions other researchers are taking as well (Slaney, Stafford & Russell, 1980).

More specifically the results of the present investigation seems to provide evidence that career issues are very real for returning women. While many studies had suggested that women need assistance with career decision making (Astin, 1976; Brandenburg, 1974; Brooks, 1976; Geisler & Thrush, 1975; Perrone, Wolleat, Lee & Davis, 1977), until recently researchers have not systematically examined the process. The research of Slaney, Stafford and Russell (1980) which appears to be in a similar vein as the present investigation is a part of an emerging trend.
In terms of applications of the present findings, it might be suggested that more attention and energy be focused on single women who are returning to school. While much of the research until now has focused on the particular needs and process of the traditional homemaker returning to school (Brooks, 1978), it is the single women who emerge in the present investigation as being particularly in need of assistance.

Implications for Further Research:

The present investigation would seem to suggest a few trends for further research. In terms of understanding the career development of returning women students, the present investigation suggests the usefulness of exploring intrapsychic variables in addition to self-esteem and achievement styles. In addition to career decision level other criteria measures may be important to understand. Content of career choice, career salience and eventual job satisfaction are just a few of the other dimensions of career development which would seem fruitful to explore.

Of particular interest would be the relationship between achievement styles and the content of career choice. As mentioned previously, it would seem that certain occupations tend to require certain achievement styles for maximal performance. The possibility that level of career decidedness may relate to the congruence between ones own achievement
style and the type of achievement style inherent in particular occupations has not been explored. The possibility for research in this area could take the direction of much of the research on Holland's typology of the world of work and the implication of congruence on career satisfaction.

**Limitations**

The present investigation has several methodological limitations based upon sample size and sample selection. The sample was too small to complete certain analyses involving the substyles of achievement. In addition, since the sample was based on a random sample and was not stratified, certain groups were underrepresented, especially women in their freshman and sophomore years and separated and divorced women.

The analyses which attempted to explore primary achievement styles as a function of marital status and work history ran into the problem of empty cells which prevented the analyses from being completed. A considerably larger sample could have helped to eliminate some of the problem with empty cells. It is important to note in this regard, however, that certain cells seem to inevitably be empty. For example, all analyses involving single women result in empty cells with respect to the category "Out of the work force." Single women regardless of primary achievement style must obviously work out of economic necessity.
The sample, while based upon a computer printout which provided a random sample, in the end was somewhat biased. A number of women who would have liked to participate in the investigation, literally could not find the time to come in for an hour and complete the questionnaires. It seems quite possible that a disproportionate number of these women who seemed to be overwhelmed by the number of responsibilities that they were juggling, may have been divorced or separated. For many of the analyses in the present study investigating the effects of marital status, the findings could only be generalized to married or single women, due to the small numbers of separated and divorced women.

In addition the number of freshmen and sophomores in the final sample was quite small. While it seems possible that these small numbers are actually representative of the fact that most returning women students have had some college prior to returning, the small numbers in these categories made it difficult to explore the effect of year in school on career decision level.

Finally, an obvious limitation of the present investigation is that career decision is only one aspect of career development. For a true understanding of returning women's career development a number of dimensions need exploration. These are considered in the section entitled implications for further research which precedes this section.
In summary, it would seem that the primary limitations of the present investigation center around three aspects of the sample: its size being a bit small for some of the analyses, the lack of many separated and divorced women, and the lack of returning women who were in their freshmen and sophomore years.
CHAPTER V

Summary

The present investigation served as an initial attempt to explore and understand the career decision making of returning women students. The impact of both demographic and psychosocial variables were explored. The demographic variables which were examined included: marital status, work history, previous educational level, number of children and a self assessment, the degree to which a woman has been a traditional homemaker versus career woman.

The psychosocial variables examined in the present investigation included self-esteem and achievement styles. In addition to examining the relationship of these variables to career decision level, the interrelationships of these psychosocial variables and the demographic variables were also examined.

The sample consisted of 73 women age 25 or above enrolled in an undergraduate curriculum at the University of Maryland's College Park Campus during the Spring of 1980. These women were part of a random sample returning students. A second sample consisted of 11 women enrolled in a special class for returning students.
Participation involved the completion of four questionnaires: (1) The Career Decision Scale; (2) The Tennessee Self Concept Scale; (3) The Achievement Styles Inventory, and (4) a demographic questionnaire designed for the present investigation.

Twelve research questions which explored the relationships between career decision, demographics, self-esteem, and achievement styles were formulated. Hypotheses were not set forth for all of the research questions, however, due to the exploratory nature of the study. Hypotheses were set forth in 2 areas. It was hypothesized that self-esteem would relate to career decision such that women high in self-esteem would be more career-decided than women low in self-esteem. It was also hypothesized that women who tended to be relational achievers would be less career decided than more direct achievers.

Results indicated that self-esteem bore the strongest relationship to career decision. As predicted women low in self-esteem had significantly higher levels of career indecision. Marital status bore a significant relationship to career decision as well; single women were significantly less career decided than other women. As predicted high scores in the Relational achievement domain were associated with higher levels of career indecision. The relational subscales of reliant relational achievement and contributory relational achievement were also associated with higher
indecision. The relationships between self-esteem and demographics was not significant, nor was the relationship between demographics and achievement styles.

The subsample of women in the special class for returning students appear to be quite similar to the random sample along with the dimensions assessed.
APPENDIX A

COUNSELING CENTER
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of Maryland
Shoemaker Hall
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454-2931

April 9, 1980

Dear Returning Student,

As a returning student, here at the University of Maryland, you can be of great help to me. As part of my dissertation research in Counseling Psychology, I am conducting a study of returning women students on this campus. This research is aimed at understanding the needs and goals of returning students.

This letter is a request for your participation in this research project. Participation in this investigation will involve answering a set of questionnaires which should take no longer than one to one and one half hours to complete. The confidentiality of your responses on these questionnaires will be insured.

I will be on contacting you by phone some time over the next two weeks, to try to arrange a time convenient to you to come in and complete the questionnaires. On the following page are more complete details regarding this research.

I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request, and I hope that you will be able to come and complete the questionnaires. I look forward to talking to you in the near future.

Sincerely,

Joyce K. Illfelder
Counseling Intern

We hope that you will be able to help out in this request.

Sincerely,

Barbara Goldberg
Counselor- Returning Students Program
Counselor- Reading and Study Skills Lab

Barbara Goldberg

Beverly Greenfeig
Counselor- Returning Students Program
Counselor- Reading and Study Skills Lab.

Accredited by the International Association of Counseling Services
APPENDIX B

Further Details on the Returning Women Student Research Project:

While the number of nontraditional age college students on campuses across the country has increased significantly in recent years, the research on these students has been minimal. I believe that as the needs and goals of returning women, like yourself, become better understood, campuses can better address the particular needs of your group.

If you are willing to participate in this research, as I hope you will be, it will be necessary for you to come to Shoemaker Hall on the University of Maryland College Park Campus. I will be contacting you (as I mentioned on the previous page) some time during the next two weeks. If you have any further questions regarding this research and would like to talk to me sooner, feel free to contact me at 454-2931 (and ask for Joyce Illfielder). If I am not available when you call, I will return your call if you leave your name and number with the receptionist.

Since this research is a part of my doctoral dissertation, I am very limited on funds. Therefore I am not able to pay you for your participation in this research. I do believe, however, that your participation in this research may help you and future returning students on this campus. To insure that the findings of this study have the greatest possible impact, copies of the findings will be sent to the following offices and commissions on this campus: Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Returning Students of the Chancellor's Commission on Women.

In addition, if you are interested, a summary of the findings will be sent to you. A packet of information regarding services for returning students both on this campus and in the larger community will also be made available to you if you choose to participate.

Thank you once again for your consideration of this request.
APPENDIX C

DIRECTIONS: Under this cover sheet you will find that there are four questionnaires that have been clipped together. Please answer all of the questionnaires in the order that you have received them. There are directions on each of the questionnaires that explain how to go about completing them. When you come to the green sheet labelled Tennessee Self Concept Scale you will need to use the blue booklet that was given to you along with this envelope. Be sure in answering the questions in this booklet that you have lined up the answer sheet properly and are marking the proper items on the answer sheet.

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete these questionnaires. If you are interested in receiving a copy of the findings of this research, please check the space below:

_____ Yes, I would like to receive a copy of the findings of this research.

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRES: Take this sheet and place it in the "NAMES" box. In this way I will know that you came, but your name will not be associated with your answers. Place all of the questionnaires back into the envelope, and place both the envelope and the blue booklet in the "IN" box.

NAME: ______________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________
    Street
    Town  State  Zip
APPENDIX D

CAREER DECISION

Samuel H. Osipow, Clarke G. Carney, Jane Winer, Barbara Yanico, and Maryanne Koschier, 1976 (3rd Revision). All rights reserved. Reproduced and Adapted with permission of the Authors.

Directions: This questionnaire contains some statements that are commonly made by students about their educational and occupational plans. Some of the statements may apply to you; others may not. Please read through them and indicate how closely each item describes you in your thinking about a career or a college major by circling the appropriate number next to the item.

An example is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Self-Description Item</th>
<th>Sample Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am excited about graduating and going to work.</td>
<td>Exactly like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you were excited about going to work and felt no hesitation about it, you would circle "4" as it is circled above to indicate the description was exactly the way you felt. If the item is very close but not exactly the way you feel—for example, you're generally excited about going to work after you graduate but you are experiencing some minor concerns about it— you would circle the number "3". You would circle "2" if the item described you in some ways but in general it was more unlike than like your feelings; for example, if you were generally more concerned than excited about work after graduation. Finally, you would circle "1" if the item did not describe your feelings at all; that is, you were experiencing a great deal of concern and no excitement about graduation and work.

If you change your answer, please be sure that all previous marks are completely erased. Please give only one response to each item and respond to all items.

1. I have decided on a career and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice.

2. I have decided on a major and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice.

3. If I had the skills or the opportunity I know I would be a ______ but this choice is really not possible for me. I haven't given much consideration to any other alternatives, however.
4. Several careers have equal appeal to me. I'm having a difficult time deciding among them.

5. None of the careers I know about appeal to me.

6. I'd like to be a ________ but I'd be going against the wishes of someone who is important to me if I did so. Because of this, it's difficult for me to make a career decision right now. I hope I can find a way to please them and myself.

7. Until now, I haven't given much thought to choosing a career. I feel lost when I think about it because I haven't had many experiences in making decisions on my own and I don't have enough information to make a career decision right now.

8. I feel discouraged because everything about choosing a career seems so "iffy" and uncertain; I feel discouraged, so much so that I'd like to put off making a decision for the time being.

9. I thought I knew what I wanted for a career, but recently I found out that it wouldn't be possible for me to pursue it. Now I've got to start looking for other possible careers.

10. I want to be absolutely certain that my career choice is the "right" one, but none of the careers I know about seem ideal for me.

11. Having to make a career decision bothers me. I'd like to make a decision quickly and get it over with. I wish I could take a test that would tell me what kind of career I should pursue.

12. I know what I'd like to major in but I don't know what careers it can lead to that would satisfy me.

13. I can't make a career choice right now because I don't know what my abilities are.

14. I don't know what my interests are. A few things "turn me on" but I'm not certain that they are related in any way to my career possibilities.

15. So many things interest me and I know I have the ability to do well regardless of what career I choose. It's hard for me to find just one thing that I would want as a career.
16. I have decided on a career but I'm not certain how to go about implementing my choice. What do I need to become a _______ anyway?

17. I need more information about what different occupations are like before I can make a career decision.

18. I think I know what I want to major in but feel I need some additional support for it as a choice for myself.

19. I know I will have to go to work eventually.

20. None of the above items describe me. The following would describe me better:

(Write your response below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exactly like me.</td>
<td>Very much like me.</td>
<td>Only slightly like me.</td>
<td>Not at all like me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exactly like me.</td>
<td>Very much like me.</td>
<td>Only slightly like me.</td>
<td>Not at all like me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exactly like me.</td>
<td>Very much like me.</td>
<td>Only slightly like me.</td>
<td>Not at all like me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exactly like me.</td>
<td>Very much like me.</td>
<td>Only slightly like me.</td>
<td>Not at all like me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

ACHIEVING STYLES INVENTORY

Circle the number that best describes your behavior. Please respond to every statement.

1. For me, the most gratifying thing is to have solved a tough problem.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I get to know important people in order to succeed.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I achieve my goals through contributing to the success of others.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. For me, winning is the most important thing.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. When I want to achieve something, I look to someone else to show me how.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I work hard to achieve so people will think well of me.  
   NEVER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I want to be a leader.  
   ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. More than anything else, I like to take on a challenging task.  
   ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Faced with a task, I prefer a team approach to an individual one.  
   ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I seek out leadership positions.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Winning in competition is the most thrilling thing I can imagine.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I feel the successes or failures of those close to me as if they were my own.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I strive to achieve so that will be well liked.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. The more competitive the situation, the better I like it.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Real team effort is the best way for me to get a job done.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. For me, achieving is helping others to meet their own goals.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. For me, the most exciting thing is working on a tough problem.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I seek relationships in which the other person takes the responsibility for achieving my goals.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I feel I've failed when those I care about do poorly.  
    ALWAYS 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I use friendship as the easiest road to get what I need to succeed.  
21. I seek positions of authority.  
22. I am not happy if I don't come out on top in a competitive situation.  
23. My way of achieving is by coaching others to their own success.  
24. For me, group effort is the most effective means to accomplishment.  
25. I depend on others to help me since I feel I can't achieve my goals myself.  
26. I establish friendly relationships for the future benefits they may bring.  
27. I try to be successful at what I do so that I will be popular.  
28. I want to take charge when working with others.  
29. When someone I care for is achieving, I feel that I too am achieving.  
30. I measure my achievements in terms of what else they will bring me.  
31. I avoid making decisions without reassurance from others.  
32. For me, the greatest accomplishment is when people I love achieve their goal.  
33. I go out of my way to work on challenging task  
34. I succeed by making it possible for others to succeed.  
35. I use my relationships with others to get things done.  
36. Working with others brings out my best efforts.  
37. I select competitive situations because I do better when I compete.  
38. Controlling others is exciting to me.  
39. I utilize my accomplishments to gain relationships with others.  
40. I establish a relationship with one person in order to get to know others.  
41. My way of achieving is by helping others to learn how to get what they want.
42. I feel a sense of accomplishment when those important to me do well.

43. For me, the greatest satisfaction comes from breaking through to the solution of a new problem.

44. I look for other people to take charge in helping me reach my goals.

45. My best achievements come from working with others.
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### APPENDIX F

ASI FORM 10 SCORING KEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale #</th>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Relevant items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>1, 8, 17, 33, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4, 11, 14, 22, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>7, 10, 21, 28, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instrumental Direct</td>
<td>6, 13, 27, 30, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instrumental Relational</td>
<td>2, 20, 26, 35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reliant Relational</td>
<td>5, 18, 25, 31, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>9, 15, 24, 36, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>3, 16, 23, 34, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>12, 19, 29, 32, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score:

- **Direct Domain** = Sum of 1, 2, 3, 4, divided by 4
- **Relational Domain** = Sum of 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, divided by 5
- **Total**: sum of all 9 divided by 9
APPENDIX G

Identification Number __________

WORK HISTORY

1. Are you currently employed? (Please check one.)
   _____ Yes, Full time
   _____ Yes, Part time
   _____ No

2. If you are currently employed, please list your current occupational title, and in
   a sentence or two describe the position.
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

3. If you are not currently employed, were you employed just prior to returning
   to college? (Please check one.)
   _____ Yes, Full time
   _____ Yes, Part time
   _____ No

4. If your answer to Question 3 above was a Yes, please list your most recent occupational
   title, and in a sentence or two describe the position. Please state your reason for
   leaving this position.
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

5. If you are not currently employed, but did have a job before you returned to college,
   which of the following best describes your situation? (Please check one.)
   _____ I quit the job so that I could return to school.
   _____ I was fired from the job I had been working at.
   _____ I was laid off from the job I had been working at.
   _____ I had been out of the job market for some time before I decided to return
   to school. (If you check this option, in the space please indicate how long
   You have been out of the job market.)
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____ Other (please describe.)
EDUCATIONAL HISTORY:

6. Before you returned to college, what was the highest educational level that you had completed? (Please check one.)
   - Graduated from high school.
   - Graduated from high school, and had some sort of additional training other than college (e.g. Secretarial school, Nursing school etc...)

If you checked the above option, please specify the type of training you had, and how long the training lasted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>Length of Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school started college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you checked the above option, please state the major reason that you did not complete college at that time.

   - Graduated from college (4 year or Junior College).

If you checked the above option, what was your degree, and in what field?

7. Year in school (Please check one)
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Other (please explain.)

8. Current cumulative Grade Point Average (If you are uncertain please approximate it.)

9. Current Major:

10. If you do not have a current major, are there any majors that you are seriously considering? (If there are please list them.)
    - Yes
    - No, I still have no idea what I will major in.
Identification Number ______________

1. Please describe your plans following the completion of your current educational pursuits.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

REASONS FOR RETURNING TO SCHOOL:

12. The following is a list of the reasons women may return to college. Please check the response which most closely reflects your reason for returning to school. If more than one response seems to fit you, please rank order the responses, placing a #1 next to the most important reason, and a #2 next to the second most important reason... (Please keep in mind that you need rank only those responses that are indeed important for you.)

_____ To gain skills relevant to a career I am already involved in.

_____ To gain a college degree, so that I will have an opportunity for advancement in a field that I am already involved in, that I would not have without a degree.

_____ To change from a career that I am currently involved in, to a new career.

_____ To prepare myself to re-enter the job market, after having been away from the job market for some time.

_____ General interest, or personal growth, but not with any intention of seeking employment.

_____ Other (Explain in the space below.)

UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT:

13. Are you currently, or have you been, a member of the University Returning Student Association? (Please check one.)

_____ Yes

_____ No

14. Have you taken, or are you currently taking the course for returning students offered through the Reading and Study Skills Lab at the University Counseling Center? (Please check one.)

_____ Yes

_____ No
Identification Number

15. Have you been involved in any other groups or activities directed at returning students on this campus? (Please check one.)

____ Yes
____ No

16. If you answered no to Questions 13, 14 or 15, did you know that such services and programs existed on this campus?

____ Yes
____ No

FAMILY HISTORY:

17. What is your current marital status? (Please check one.)

____ Single (Never been married.)
____ Married
____ Separated
____ Divorced
____ Widowed

18. If you are currently separated, divorced or widowed, how long has it been in years and months, since you first had this status?

____ Years and ____ Months.

19. Do you have any children?

____ Yes
____ No

20. If you do have children, are any of them preschoolers (under the age of 5)?

____ Yes
____ No

21. If you do have children, are they currently living at home with you?

____ Yes
____ No

22. In the space below, please fill in the number of children that you have as well as their ages.

____ Number of children. Ages: __________________________
23. If you are currently married, what is the highest educational level that your spouse has completed? (Please check one.)

- Attended high school.
- Graduated from high school.
- Graduated from high school, completed some college.
- Graduated from college.
- Graduated from college, completed some graduate work.
- Graduated from college, and has an advanced degree, e.g. Masters, Ph.D. or professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., etc...)

24. Thinking back over the past few years, which of the following statements best describe you? (Please check one.)

- I have been a traditional homemaker for the past few years. My time and energy have been devoted almost exclusively to the demands of a home and family.
- While I have been a fairly traditional homemaker over the past few years, I have also had an occasional part time job, but not anything that I considered to be a career. All in all I would say that I was considerably more involved in being a homemaker than in a career.
- While I have been a fairly traditional homemaker for the past few years, I have also been involved in work outside of the home, part time or full time which I considered to be somewhat important to me. All in all my home and family have been more important than my work outside of the home.
- While I have been a fairly traditional homemaker over the past few years, I have also been quite involved in work outside of the home, part time or full time which I considered to be very important to me. All in all I would say that I have been equally involved with being a homemaker & having a career.
- While I have been quite involved with my career over the past few years, I have also devoted a good deal of time and energy into the task of being a traditional homemaker. All in all I would say, however, that my career has been more important to me than the tasks involved in being a traditional homemaker.
- While I have been quite involved with my career over the past few years, I have also devoted some time and energy into the tasks of a traditional homemaker. All in all I would say that I have been considerably more involved in with my career than with being a traditional homemaker.
- I have been a career woman for the past few years. My time and energy have been devoted almost exclusively to the demands of my career.

25. What is your present age? _________ (Please fill in the blank.)

26. What is the date of your birth? __________________________

Month   Day   Year
## APPENDIX H

Ranges and Mean Scores for the Returning Women Students on the Major Instruments Employed in the Present Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Achievement Styles Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 1</td>
<td>12-35</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 2</td>
<td>6-35</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3</td>
<td>5-31</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 4</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 5</td>
<td>6-25</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6</td>
<td>5-26</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 7</td>
<td>6-35</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 8</td>
<td>6-31</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 9</td>
<td>7-31</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Domain</td>
<td>7-24</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Domain</td>
<td>11-29</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Career Decision Scale</strong></td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>16-48</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Tennessee Self Concept Scale</strong></td>
<td>278-428</td>
<td>356.43</td>
<td>31.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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