A STUDY OF PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATED TO FEAR OF SUCCESS IN COLLEGE MEN

By

RONNEY EARL SMALLWOOD

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1974

Thesis
1974
S635s
cop. 2

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

MAR 28 1975

A STUDY OF PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATED TO FEAR OF SUCCESS IN COLLEGE MEN

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

903455

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincerest gratitude goes to my very dear friend, Stan Althof, for encouraging me to do this study, which he did originally with women. His help, encouragement, and sense of humor kept me going and I cannot express my thanks to him enough.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family. The fact that they all put up with my behavior during graduate school and especially while I was doing this study is amazing, indeed. I am especially grateful to my wife, Beverly, who worked as hard as I did on this study and who never stopped encouraging me nor lost her sense of humor. Thanks must be given to my children, Keith, Jenny and Spencer who saw very little of me during this time, and the times they did see me I was hard to put up with. And, I ask forgiveness of Spencer, who is three years old and would sit outside my door and cry because he wanted to see me. The four of them deserve the degree as much, if not more, than me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of fear of success has received limited attention in our society and in the literature of psychology. The attention given has been focused on women (Horner, 1968, 1969; Althof, 1973) where it is probably most readily apparent and easily accepted in our society. However, there is support for the contention that fear of success manifests itself in the male population of our society also. Shuster (1955) spoke of the "success neurosis" and Ovessy (1962) called it "success phobia."

Simply, fear of success consists of a person having adverse feelings or dread about succeeding. Fear of failure is the dread of consequences resulting from failing a task. Therefore, one may try to avoid engaging in the task. Fear of success is the same. That is, it manifests itself as the fear that success will lead to some negative consequences.

At first, the idea may seem more reasonable as applied to women but not to men. Our society does seem to frown on "bright" women, women who beat men in sports, etc. However, the same type of negative sanctions toward success are just as possible in males. There are two personal anecdotes which will illustrate this point. First, in the Navy, senior

enlisted men sometimes have the opportunity to be recommended for and obtain the rank of Limited Duty Officer or Warrant Officer. The author has personally seen and been told of many cases of individuals turning down this opportunity for higher pay, higher status and further achievement opportunity. These are men who are achievers and who have reached their senior enlisted status faster than the majority. But they also turn down the opportunity for better pay, further promotion and higher status; exactly the types of incentive that probably brought them to their current rank. Why? The common theme heard is the lack of peer group approval for the move. That is, if they became officers, their old peer group would no longer regard them as they formerly did. This is only one of the prime reasons. But it illustrates the point: success will bring negative consequences.

The second ancedote is concerned with the author's uncle, a line forman for a rural electric company. He was offered a white-collar job of executive rank in middle-management of the company because of his capabilities. He turned it down. His reasons to the author were that he would lose friends, would have to stay indoors, and would have to associate with a crowd of people for whom he did not care. Again, negative consequences related to success were the factors.

Murray (1955) describes the syndrome which he calls the American Icarus. This case study details a young man with a strong, highly achieving father. The young man avoids success and has lost his ambition, among other

symptoms. It is reasonable to suppose that this is the fear of failure or fear of success. The negative consequences due to success may vary, but it is the dread of what will happen if one succeeds, not the dread of failure. In the case of American Icarus, it may as easily be fear of rejection by the father if he succeeds as fear of failing that causes him to avoid success.

Fulgenzi (1971, personal communication) described a patient who was in psychotherapy with him who also exemplifies this idea. The basis for this patient's self-defeating behavior was the two conflicting messages which he had received from his parents. One message was to succeed, while the other was to not outdo his father who had only an eighth grade education. The second message was much more subtle and partially nonverbal, but the patient recalled many incidents which supported this interpretation. This facet of fear of success is much like Bateson's et al (1956) double bind theory of schizophrenia. Two conflicting messages are given in this type of phenomenon, also.

It is the thesis of this study that fear of success in males is a distinct phenomenon in our society and is measurable. The effect of fear of success is scholastic underachievement, unnecessary mental anguish, loss of potential, and loss of productivity. The male who manifests this fear in our society is at a distinct disadvantage because of the tremendous emphasis placed on achievement. If the personality factors, dynamics, and developmental traits which

constitute this condition can be discerned, clinicians and educators will be able to develop better treatment, educational, and preventative procedures.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theories Regarding Fear of Success

The early literature on the self-defeating individual concerns itself almost exclusively with theoretical considerations. Very little actual experimental research was undertaken until Horner's (1968) study of fear of success in women. Freud (1941) was the first to label this phenomenon and write about it. He termed it "success neurosis" and described it as an inhibitor of the full use of one's resources.

Other psychoanalytic writers have theorized about the idea of fear of success under different labels. Menaker (1956) used the term "moral masochism" instead of success neurosis and theorized that its origin came from early childhood experiences with the mother. Schuster (1955) reported that the moral masochist was more likely to blame external than internal factors for his lack of success. Berliner (1940) theorized that the child was powerless to change the conditions he was born into and was traumatized by sibling hostility or hating parents.

Ovessy (1962) reported on individuals who were unable to tolerate vocational success. He believes that this

ailment is more frequent in men because they are more subject to competitive pressures. His theory about this type of individual involves guilt feelings and aggressive impulses toward peers and siblings.

The problem with these theories is that they are only speculation. That some phenomenon did exist which concerned success is perhaps the most reasonable conclusion that can be drawn. The literature just discussed is mainly a subjective philosophy and not testable. However, these studies merit consideration because they do point out that some phenomenon associated with success came to the attention of psychologists as early as Freud's writings and continued until the present. It is not clear by these writings just what the phenomenon is, and it was Horner's (1968) work which began to clearly define fear of success.

Horner (1968) defined fear of success as the avoidance of success because of the anticipation of negative consequences associated with the success. Much use of McClelland's theory of achievement motives was made in this study. McClelland's theory is interesting here because of the inferences that may be made about why males might fear success. McClelland (1958) states that something happens to the child as early as age four or five to affect his achievement motive or need for achievement. McClelland (1961) cites Winterbottom's (1958) study of mothers' attitudes about independence, mastery, and "caretaking." Independence and mastery entail such things as making one's own decisions,

finding your way around the neighborhood, etc. "Caretaking" is being able to feed yourself, being able to dress yourself, etc. Winterbottom found that lower class parents were more restrictive and seek early caretaking ability for children. Higher class people seek earlier independence and mastery for their children. The findings indicate that early mastery training promotes high need for achievement provided it does not reflect generalized restrictiveness, authoritarianism, or rejection by the parents.

In this same vein, Rosen and D'Andrade (1959) found that children with high need for achievement had parents who set a high standard of excellence for them and children with a low need for achievement had just the opposite type of parents. They concluded that parents can have children with low achievement motive by either not setting standards or setting them too low.

In contrast to Horner's definition of fear of success, fear of failure is the anticipation of negative consequences if one fails to succeed. Atkinson and Feather (1966) speak of the fellow "who is dominated by a 'dread of failure'." Their definition is that fear of failure exists when the motive to avoid failure exceeds the motive to achieve. Birney, Burdick, and Teevan (1969) seem to agree with the above definition when they speak of "a person motivated by fear of failure, rather than a particular type of personality."

The point is that there is a reasonably clear delineation between fear of success and fear of failure. That is, fear of success refers to a person who associates negative consequences with succeeding. Fear of failure denotes someone who associates negative consequences with failing. It should be noted that the overt behaviors of these two types of individuals may be quite similar. It is quite possible that the motivation for avoiding a task may be similar also. In other words, both might fear rejection by some significant other due to either the failure or success. The argument could go on endlessly and later studies may find that the concepts exist in circularity. That is, perhaps the negative consequences associated with success consist of fear of failure in some indirect or direct aspect. For instance, in the anecdotes mentioned in the introduction to this study, the loss of peer group approval for taking the higher positions may be construed as a fear of failure in socialization terms. However, it is not in the scope of this paper to solve this dilemma. For our purposes, fear of success will be defined as the avoidance of success because of the negative consequences an individual believes is associated with it.

Experimental Studies of Fear of Success

Although most of the experimental studies of fear of success and indeed the most publicized ones have concerned themselves with women, Tresmer (1974) postulates that fear

of success may manifest itself more in males than in females. It is his contention that trends in our society such as the women's liberation movement have pushed the idea of fear of success in women into more ready acceptability than fear of success in men when it may not be true. Nevertheless, it was Horner's (1968) study on fear of success in women which led the way for current research on fear of success in both sexes.

Horner (1968) investigated fear of success in an attempt to clarify the sex differences that had been confounding achievement motivation studies. Specifically, some of these problems were the failure of women to exhibit the expected increase in need for achievement when exposed to experimental conditions stressing intelligence and leadership. Also, while achievement motivation can predict the performance on intellectual tasks for males, it fails to predict the performance for females. Horner cites Atkinson as saying that sex differences in achievement motivation are "perhaps the most persistent and unresolved problem."

Horner's study involved asking students to write four-minute stories to the verbal lead of: "At the end of first-term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class." This cue was to elicit fear of success imagery (thematic responses in the stories) from women exposed to another woman's success in a male-dominated profession. Horner postulated three themes which she believed would theoretically indicate fear of success:

(1) social rejection, (2) fears of negative feelings because of success, and (3) bizaare or hostile responses or denial of the cue altogether. She scored the stories on the basis of presence or absence of fear of success imagery. She found that 65.5 percent of women and only nine percent of men showed fear of success imagery to the verbal lead. With male subjects, she had used the same lead but used "John" instead of "Anne" as the individual who was at the top of the class. This set the stage for further studies in the area of fear of success in women and furthered the idea that women, not men feared success in our society. This was contrary to the earlier writing (e.g., Freud 1941; Menaker, 1956; Ovessy, 1962) who believed that the phenomenon was almost exclusively a male problem.

Tresmer (1974) takes exception to the idea that it is a problem more prevalent in females than males. He believes that the trends in society today make fear of success in females a readily acceptable idea when the more prevalent condition may be fear of success in males. Tresmer reviewed 36 studies on fear of success imagery in men and found that high fear of success imagery ranged from 14 to 86 percent with a median of 43 percent. In 61 studies on women, he found that the proportion of women showing high fear of success imagery ranged from 11 to 88 percent with a median of 47 percent.

Tresmer postulated some reasons to account for the large variability among the fear of success studies. First,

he states that there is no scoring manual for Horner's projective technique. Secondly, he believes that there is a great deal of subjectivity in scoring the stories for fear of success imagery. Thirdly, Tresmer suggests some investigators have incorrectly employed the technique because they have taken any negative comment in the subjects' stories as indications of fear of success imagery. Tresmer reiterates that only negative consequences associated with the actual success after it has occured can be defined as scoreable.

While Tresmer cites a large number of studies, they cannot be reviewed here because of their lack of availability. Many of the studies cited by Tresmer and by Horner are unpublished studies which the author was not able to obtain.

Support for the contention of fear of sucesss in males is lent by several available studies. Hoffman (1972) meticulously recreated Horner's (1968) study using four different forms of Horner's medical-school cue, such as: "Anne finds that she is the top child-psychology graduate student." This was to elicit responses to success which was non-masculine. She found that percentage levels of fear of success imagery was nearly identical on the four stories, but that males consistently showed more fear of sucess than females, 77 percent to 65 percent. Tresmer (1974) states that other studies (which he does not name) show similar findings.

Tresmer (1974) cites a study by M. L. Katz (no date given) as further evidence against the idea of women showing more fear of success than men. Katz (according to Tresmer) wanted to find out if it made a difference whether or not "Anne" was the only woman in her class or not. He varied the leads given to reflect that Anne was the only woman and that half of anne's classmates were women. Fear of success imagery decreased in the second case, suggesting to Tresmer that the female respondents were more concerned about Anne's being deviant than about her being successful.

The conclusions to be drawn from the aforementioned studies mainly concern themselves with two problems: (1) the measurement of fear of success, and (2) whether or not it exists more in women than men. In the first area, it seems reasonable to state that some new method for measurement or a vastly modified version of Horner's technique is needed to adequately measure fear of success in both men and women. The discrepancies in the ranges of fear of success imagery and Tresmer's (1974) criticisms are evidence of the limitations of Horner's technique. In the second area, it is this author's conclusion from the evidence cited that fear of success exists in both men and women, but it would be unreasonable to estimate differential percentages nor is it within the scope of this paper to try to do so.

It is the contention of this study that fear of success does manifest itself in males in our society. The evidence cited (e.g., Hoffman, 1972; Horner, 1968; Menaker, 1956;

Ovessy, 1962; Tresmer, 1974) lend credence to an exploratory study of the phenomenon of fear of success in men. All of the previous studies cited used either Horner's original or a modified version of her verbal cue. Tresmer's (1974) criticisms of Horner's (1968) projective technique center around the subjectivity of scoring due to lack of a manual and variations of different scorer's interpretations of what constitutes negative consequences due to success. In addition to Tresmer's criticisms, Hoffman's (1974) study pointed out the inadequacy of using one verbal lead. It is reasonable to postulate that using only one lead and scoring it solely for presence or absence of fear of success imagery puts the scorer in a restricted position. It becomes very much like a "forced choice" situation. Further, the criteria for what constitutes fear of success imagery needs to be clarified. The use of several leads with clear scoring criteria which offer more than just a choice between presence and absence of imagery would offer a more objective, reliable instrument for identifying fear of success. Althof (1973) agrees and developed such a technique.

Althof (1973) expanded and further modified the instrument based on the idea that one verbal lead was unsatisfactory. Five leads from a larger pool were selected to comprise the new projective technique. Also, a modification of the classification of men and women into high and low fear of success imagery groups was adopted. Specifically, Horner scored her subjects' responses to the verbal lead as

either absent or present for fear of success imagery, thus treating this variable as discrete. Althof believes that fear of success is not only present or absent but varies in intensity. Therefore, while employing the criteria Horner set forth, fear of success was scored on a continuum from 0 to 7.

The five verbal leads selected to comprise the new projective measure all correlate well with the total fear of success imagery score and only moderately well with each other. This was interpreted to mean that the five leads sample from areas only mildly related to each other but that they correlate well with the total score.

Many hypotheses have been formulated concerning the fear of success individual. Various writers have hypothesized that individuals who fear success reveal feelings of inadequacy and display a poor self-image (Menaker, 1956; Ovessy, 1962; Schuster, 1955). Schuster (1955) believes that individuals who fear success tend to blame external rather than internal factors for their lack of success. Winterbottom's (1958) study indicates that high need for achievement is developed by early mastery training provided that it does not reflect restrictiveness, authoritarianism, or parental rejection. Rosen and D'Andrade (1959) found that children with high need for achievement had parents who set high standards for them. Horner's (1968) three themes which indicate fear of success also have theoretical implication. The themes were: (1) social rejection, (2) fears

about success, and (3) bizaare responses or denial of the cue. It can be theorized that fear of social rejection would be reflected in an individuals' level of self-esteem and anxiety. Fears about success should also manifest themselves as anxiety, as might bizaare responses or denial of the cue.

These studies support the contention that fear of success exists in males in our society. However, there is considerable variation in theories as to what factors develop fear of success and therefore, what personality factors exist in individuals with high and low fear of success. What is needed, then, are measures which focus on the factors which have been theorized as relating to fear of success. The main areas which need to be investigated concerning fear of success are: (1) anxiety, (2) inadequacy and self-image, (3) social rejection, and (4) developmental factors concerning parents, e.g., social status, childhood training in mastery and independence, authoritarianism, and rejection. Additionally, due to Freud's (1946) suggestion of a "success neurosis," it would be reasonable to investigate factors of emotional problems, e.g., neuroticism.

The Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist, Yonge, McConnel, and Webster, 1968), Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965), and a Biographical-demographical questionnaire (Cowan, 1974, personal communication) consists of items which adequately measure these areas.

The OPI has scales which measure anxiety level, non-authoritarian thinking and need for independence (autonomy), being or not being with people (social extroversion), and a scale which measures denial of adjustment problems, feelings of anxiety and inadequacy (masculinity-feminity). The anxiety scale ties in with the area of anxiety while autonomy measures the theory of mastery and independence training. Social extroversion gives a measure of importance of people for this individual and should have some correlation with fears of social rejection. The MF scale reflects a person's feelings about inadequacy and adjustment problems. Appendix B has a complete listing of the scales.

The TSCS measures openness and self-criticism (self-criticism scale), overall level of self-esteem (Total Positive), and self-satisfaction (Row 2 - positive), and sense of personal worth (Col C - Personal self). These measures give a good estimate of the areas of inadequacy in self-image. In addition, clinical scales such as the Neurotic, Psychotic, and Personality Disorcer scales give an index of emotional disturbance.

The biographical-demographical questionnaire (BDQ, Cowan, 1974) gives interesting indices in light of the McClelland (1961), Rosen and D'Andrade (1959), and Winterbottom (1958) studies which indicate that levels of achievement have correlation with social class factors. The BDQ gives father and mother's occupation and educational level, size of area where the person grew up, religious

affiliation, and number of brothers and sisters as well as other indices. The occupational and educational levels are good indices of social class. The other measures in combination with indices such as closeness to mother, closeness to father, and father or mother's favorite child (yes, no, or no difference) will give factors examinable in light of theories of disturbances in childhood relationships with parents, rejection by parents (closeness to them) as well as helping generate new hypotheses about the fear of success individual.

The contention that fear of success exists in males in our society and the evidence in support of this contention require further exploration of the phenomenon. Furthermore, theories regarding this phenomenon's developmental aspects and personality manifestations are speculative and unclear. Therefore, the present study was designed to investigate and to try to determine the personality variables associated with fear of success in men.

CHAPTER III

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In reviewing the literature on fear of success, it becomes apparent that many of the articles and books concern themselves primarily with theoretical speculation, and generalizations made from a small number of psychoanalytically oriented case studies. Only since the appearance of Horner's (1968) dissertation has experimental research begun to flourish. Yet, much of the work is inaccessible because it is in the form of unpublished manuscripts. Further complicating this area is the appearance of numberous oversimplified and unsophisticated articles of fear of success studies that appear in popular magazines and newspapers.

The purpose of this study was to confirm and expand current research in the fear of success area. It is an attempt to integrate theoretical clinical considerations with previous experimental research.

The technique to identify high and low fear of success individuals has been expanded and modified by Althof (1973). The present study employed Althof's projective technique to differentiate a high and low fear of success imagery group. In addition, subjects were given the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist, Yonge, McConnel and Webster,

1968), the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965), and a 22 item biographical-demographical questionnaire (Cowan, personal communication, 1974).

The Althof Projective Technique

The Althof projective technique consists of five verbal leads to which the subjects wrote stories. The leads are:

1. The local town paper runs a story on David's promotion to an executive position.
2. After three weeks of dieting, Joe loses fifteen pounds.
3. Carl finds that he has been elected to a senate seat over three opponents.
4. Ken wins the sportsperson of the year award.
5. George finally gets that important date with Betty.

The subjects were asked to answer standard Thematic Apperception Test questions in their stories. These questions are: (1) What is happening? Who are the persons, (2) What has led up to this situation? That is, what has happened in the past? (3) What is being thought? What is wanted? By whom? and (4) What will happen? What will be done?

The stories were scored for fear of success imagery if there was negative imagery expressed which reflected concern about success. Specifically, one point was given for each of the following:

1. Negative consequences because of success.
2. Anticipation of negative consequences because of success.
3. Negative affect because of success.

4. Instrumental activity away from present or future success.

5. Any direct expression of conflict about success.

6. Denial of the situation described by the cue.

7. Bizaare, inappropriate, unrealistic, or non-adaptive responses to the situation described by the cue.

This allows the scores for each verbal lead to range from zero to seven. Thus, on the five leads the total score could range from 0 to 35. Two independent scorers were trained and employed to score the leads. Twenty subjects' responses were picked at random to test the reliability of the scorers. The interjudge reliability of scoring was found to be r = .93.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS, Fitts, 1965), clinical-research form, is a well standardized, widely applicable, multidimensional measure that has been extensively utilized in recent research concerning self theory. It is composed of 100 self-descriptive statements to which the subject must respond on a five point scale ranging from completely true through completely false. The TSCS is applicable for subjects over twelve years who have a sixth grade or better education.

Results of the TSCS are reported in terms of standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A total of 29 scales can be derived. A full listing of these 29 scales can be found in Appendix A. These scales measure

a total self concept, internal and external referents to the self as well as scores which reflect the rigidity and inconsistencies of these perceptions. Also, some empirical scales that measure psychological defensiveness and disturbance are included.

The standardization group was composed of 626 individuals of varying age, sex, race, intellectual ability and social class. The validity of the items was determined by a panel of seven psychologists who had to unanimously classify the item by content into one of fifteen possible categories. The test retest reliability of the 29 scales over a two week period ranges from .60-.92 (Fitts, 1965).

The TSCS was developed as a research instrument that might contribute to the difficult criterion problem in mental health (Fitts, 1965). Fitts suggests that the TSCS be employed to distinguish among groups that differ on a certain psychological dimensions utilizing a discriminant function analysis. Fitts' suggestion is congruent with the planned statistical design of this study.

Omnibus Personality Inventory

The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI), Form F (Heist, Yonge, McConnel and Webster, 1968) consists of 385 statements to which the subject must respond either true or false. Each item belongs to one or more of the 14 scales (See Appendix B) that assess intellectual interests and values, individual modes of thinking, authoritarian and religious

attitudes, masculinity-feminity, and components of social-emotional maturity and mental health. Scores for the 14 scales are expressed as standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The theoretical basis of the OPI encompassed the developmental nature of man and the social context in which current behavior occurs and growth and development take place (Heist and Yonge, 1968).

This instrument is ideal for the population under study since it was normed on and developed for use with college students. Also, this measure was devised to provide a basis for differentiating among students and groups.

The normative sample was composed of over 7,000 freshmen attending 37 public and private colleges and universities in 14 states. Extensive validity studies have been undertaken primarily employing correlations with other measures such as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, California Personality Inventory and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. The test retest reliability is estimated at greater than .85. Internal consistency calculations for the total standardization sample employing the Kuder-Richardson 21 formula range between .67-.89 (Heist and Yonge, 1968).

Biographical-Demographical Questionnaire

The biographical-demographical questionnaire (personal communication with Cowan, 1974) is composed of 19 items (See Appendix C) that investigate areas such as family background and relationships, scholastic achievement and

interests and the more usual personal data such as age, marital status, etc.

One stepwise linear discriminant function analysis was computed to examine the differences between the high and low fear of success imagery groups. The six best predictor variables from the TSCS, OPI, and biographical-demographical questionnaire were selected which best differentiated the two groups.

It was the thesis of this study that factors discriminating high and low fear of success were of a theoretical nature and had not been adequately tested. Therefore, this study was designed to explore these theoretical considerations and to try and discover the personality variables related to high and low fear of success in males.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

From an initial testing pool of 100 male undergraduate students enrolled at Oklahoma State University, the 24 highest and 24 lowest males in fear of success imagery as measured by the total score on the projective technique were selected to comprise the high and low fear of success groups in the subsequent analysis.

Materials

This study utilized four instruments: Althof's (1973) modified version of Horner's (1968) projective technique for assessing fear of success imagery which was the criterion, and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Omnibus Personality Inventory and a biographical-demographical questionnaire which contributed the predictor variables.

Procedure

As the students entered the testing session the proctor directed the male subjects to their seats and the coded test booklets were distributed. The group size varied from eight to thirty males. The composition of the test booklet varied from one testing session to another because the order in

which the tests were given consisted of all possible permutations of the projective technique, Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the biographical-demographical questionnaire to control for order or sequence effects. However, due to time limitations the Omnibus Personality Inventory was completed by each subject at home as part of the class requirement and for which he received extra credit.

The instructions for the TSCS and the OPI were self-explanatory and contained within the test booklet. There was no time limit for either of these tests. The proctor read the instructions aloud to the class for the projective technique when it was given and supplied appropriate time cues to the subjects while they took this measure. Subjects had three minutes to complete each of the five stories for the projective technique. The proctor signaled when the subjects had one minute remaining for each story and when time was up. A copy of the instructions for the projective technique can be found in Appendix D.

Statistical Analysis

The five short stories written in response to the verbal cues were scored for fear of success imagery by two independent trained scorers. A random sample of 20 subject's responses was employed to estimate interscorer reliability. The 24 highest men and 24 lowest men in fear of success imagery from the initial pool of 100 men comprised the high and low criterion groups.

One stepwise linear discriminant function analysis was computed to examine the differences between the high and low fear of success imagery groups. The predictor variable in these analyses included the 29 scales from the TSCS, the 14 scales from the OPI and the 34 variables from the biographical-demographical questionnaire. A complete list of the 77 variables employed in this study may be found in Appendix E.

The analysis provided a discriminant function for each group based on a weighting system which maximized the variance between groups while minimizing the variance within groups (Cooley and Lohnes, 1962). This statistical analysis assumes that the misclassification costs are equal and that the prior probabilities of each population are equal.

The stepwise discriminant function analysis also demonstrated the order in which the variables are selected in discriminating between the two groups. For example, the variable that contributed the most to the prediction system already containing the best single predictor was chosen as the second predictor. Also, an F test with g-1 and n-g-p (n=subjects, g=group, p=predictor variables) degrees of freedom was employed at each stage to determine whether the predictor contributed to accounting for the remaining variance in the system.

The second phase of the study consisted of delineating those variables that met certain specifications. Specifi-

cally, the criteria by which the best final predictors were chosen were:

1. Shrinkage occurs in this type of analysis, that is, the first predictor variable selected at Step 1 of the analysis extracts a certain percentage of the total variance, the second predictor at Step 2 extracts a certain amount of the variance left, etc. Therefore, the number of final predictor variables were limited to the first six variables selected providing a subject to predictor ratio of 8:1.

2. Final predictor variables were selected such that the number of misclassifications were at a minimum. That is, the correct classification of high fear of success males into the high group and the low fear of success males into the low group was the highest percentage possible.

3. Every variable in the final predicting system was selected to be significant at the .10 level or greater.

4. An equal number of predictors (six) was picked for both groups such that they best predicted correctly into each of the two groups (high and low fear of success).

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The results of this study will be examined using three approaches. First, a general look at the characteristics of the high and low fear of success groups will be made. Second, the *F* values at Step 0 of the variables which significantly differentiated the high and low fear of success groups will be examined. Third, the six variables which best predicted high and low fear of success will be reported. Three questions will be examined in this presentation: (1) What variables differentiate men in the high and low fear of success groups? (2) Do these variables predict group membership? (3) What is the accuracy of the predictor system?

Reduction of Data

The data from the biographical-demographical questionnaire was nominal data and reflected both dichotimous variables (e.g., "catholic," yes or no) and continuous variables (e.g., age). Dichotimous variables were always scored as one for yes and zero for no in order to reduce the data for the analysis.

General Characteristics of the Groups

The characteristics of the low and high fear of success groups was compiled through the use of the centeral tendency statistics. Table I contains the means and standard deviations for both groups.

The average male in this study is 19 to 20 years old, single, and a freshman or sophomore at Oklahoma State University. His grade point average is approximately 2.9. He is the first or second born of three children with one brother and one sister and will report being closer to his mother than his father.

The low fear of success male in this study is most likely to have grown up in a city of 10,00 or more population. This man's mother and father differ in their occupational levels as might be expected, but the difference is slight. Father and mother are both in the "blue-collar" working group.

In contrast to the low fear of success group, the high fear of success male comes from all sizes of towns from very rural to large city. In addition, his father is at a much higher occupational level than his mother and is probably a "white-collar" worker.

TABLE IA

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE HIGH AND LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS IMAGERY GROUPS, OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY

	Low Fear of Success		High Fear of Success	
Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Thinking Introversion	48.08	9.21	49.83	9.05
Theoretical Orientation	46.67	9.01	48.83	10.09
Estheticism	47.83	8.44	49.46	9.02
Complexity	49.83	8.78	53.50	8.54
Autonomy	52.29	7.14	52.33	8.49
Religious Orientation	50.95	9.40	49.87	9.81
Social Extroversion	46.17	7.37	48.21	12.77
Impulse Expression	56.41	9.88	58.83	8.72
Personal Integration	53.21	10.61	50.33	10.14
Anxiety Level	50.83	9.17	50.50	9.99
Altruism	47.79	9.27	49.08	13.15
Practical Outlook	51.29	8.91	50.08	9.30
Masculinity-Feminity	52.71	6.74	52.37	5.37
Response Bias	50.33	10.08	49.54	11.81

TABLE IB

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE HIGH AND LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS IMAGERY GROUPS, BIOGRAPHICAL-DEMOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Variable	Low Fear of Success		High Fear of Success	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	19.87	1.96	19.75	0.99
Single	0.96	0.20	0.92	0.28
Married	0.04	0.20	0.08	0.28
Duation of Marriage	0.21	1.02	0.13	0.45
Prefer Male Child	0.25	0.44	0.25	0.44
Prefer Female Child	0.08	0.28	0.04	0.20
Not Like Children	0.04	0.20	0.08	0.28
No Preference	0.63	0.49	0.63	0.49
Protestant	0.50	0.51	0.58	0.50
Catholic	0.29	0.46	0.25	0.44
No Religious Preference	0.21	0.41	0.17	0.38
Year in School at OSU	2.00	1.25	1.87	0.85
Grade Point Average	2.91	0.52	2.89	0.58
Times Major Changed	0.67	0.70	0.71	1.08
Ordinal Position	1.79	1.38	2.00	1.18
Number of Brothers	1.04	1.08	1.00	0.93
Number of Sisters	1.17	1.27	1.50	1.10
Mothers Favorite - Yes	0.46	0.72	0.29	0.46
Mothers Favorite - No	0.46	0.51	0.63	0.49
Mothers Favorite - No Difference	0.21	0.41	0.08	0.28
Fathers Favorite - Yes	0.29	0.46	0.29	0.46
Fathers Favorite - No	0.46	0.51	0.58	0.50
Fathers Favorite - No Difference	0.25	0.44	0.13	0.34

TABLE IB (CONTINUED)

Closeness to Father	30.71	24.83	36.58	30.73
Closeness to Mother	22.63	21.51	24.08	18.60
Fathers Occupational Level	5.04	4.47	2.71	2.11
Fathers Highest Education	14.37	3.70	14.58	2.7
Mothers Occupational Level	8.54	3.79	7.00	4.28
Mothers Highest Education	13.50	1.89	13.33	1.95
Large City	0.42	0.50	0.29	0.46
City	0.33	0.48	0.21	0.41
Town	0.17	0.38	0.17	0.38
Rural Area	0.04	0.20	0.25	0.44
Very Rural Area	0.04	0.20	0.08	0.28

TABLE IC

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE HIGH AND LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS IMAGERY GROUPS, TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

	Low Fear of Success		High Fear of Success	
Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-Criticism Score	37.37	5.42	36.42	5.05
Total Conflict	27.96	8.82	30.29	8.65
Total Positive	336.46	38.32	326.04	45.46
Row 1 - Identity	121.00	15.71	117.87	21.24
Row 2 - Self-Satisfaction	105.83	15.03	102.13	13.22
Row 3 - Behavior	109.63	14.55	106.04	14.73
Column A - Physical Self	66.96	8.49	64.83	11.51
Column B - Moral Ethical Self	68.29	10.47	65.25	8.79
Column C - Personal Self	66.79	8.92	65.00	10.37
Column D - Family Self	67.25	10.61	66.00	10.46
Column E - Social Self	67.17	7.06	64.96	10.26
Total Variability	47.00	14.42	46.13	12.01
Column Total Variability	28.37	9.81	28.04	7.84
Row Total Variability	18.63	6.37	18.08	6.20
Distribution Score	112.58	20.32	110.29	30.65
Distribution 5	15.00	9.38	16.17	13.95
Distribution 4	27.87	9.65	28.13	11.26
Distribution 3	19.71	9.35	21.67	9.30
Distribution 2	20.13	8.46	18.25	8.62
Distribution 1	17.29	7.16	15.79	10.26
General Maladjustment	93.00	12.63	88.87	14.16
Psychosis Scale	51.33	6.70	50.58	7.32

TABLE IC (CONTINUED)

Personality Disorder Scale	70.96	12.44	68.17	9.25
Neurosis Scale	84.13	10.23	78.79	16.34
Personality Integration	11.46	4.64	9.75	4.76
True/False Ratio	1.10	0.20	1.24	0.35
Net Conflict	-1.21	8.94	4.21	15.09
Defensive Positive Scale	56.33	8.85	53.92	12.14
Number of Deviant Signs	12.79	14.72	19.75	22.43

Significant Variables Differentiating the High and Low Fear of Success Groups at Step 0

Two variables from a total of 77 significantly differentiate high and low fear of success males at Step 0 of the discriminate function analysis. Table 2 contains the variables with their means and F values and Table 3 contains the significant correlations with all other variables. These correlations are Pearsons r's computed for each group and then averaged for an overall correlation. The correlation of these two variables is -0.02. Both of the significant variables are from the biographical-demographical questionnaire.

The high fear of success male is significantly different on both of the discriminating variables. High fear of success men are much more likely to come from rural areas ($F = 4.39$, $df = 1,46$; $p < .05$) and their fathers are from significantly higher occupational levels ($F = 5.35$, $df = 1,46$; $p < .05$).

Predictors at Step 6 of the Discriminant Function Analysis

The overall F test at Step 6 ($F = 4.86$, $df = 1,41$; $p < .05$) indicates that the six predictor variables presented in Table 4 significantly differentiate the high and low fear of success groups. These variables come from the biographical-demographical questionnaire and the TSCS. Table 5 contains a correlation matrix of these six predictor

variables. The significant correlations of other variables with the six predictor variables is presented in Table 6.

The six best predictor variables were father's occupation, rural area, mother's occupation, father's education, and mother's favoriate--no difference from the biographical-demographical questionnaire and the true/false ration (T/F) from the TSCS. A significantly higher number of low fear of success males said that their mother had no favorite child. The high fear of success males' fathers were engaged in occupations at a higher level than the lows and had more education. In addition, high fear of success males' mothers were engaged in a higher occupational level than lows. Highs are also more likely to have come from a rural area than are low fear of success males. Finally, the high fear of success male had a significantly higher T/F ration on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale than did low fear of success males.

Table 7 contains a frequency distribution of the accuracy of predicting the membership of each subject using the six predictor variables. The proportion of high fear of success males correctly classified as high fear of success was 0.83. The proportion of low fear of success males correctly classified as low fear of success was 0.79.

TABLE II

F TABLE FOR THE TWO VARIABLES DISTRINGUISHING THE HIGH FEAR OF SUCCESS GROUPS AT STEP 0

Variable	Mean LFS	Mean HFS	F	df
Father's occupation	5.04	2.71	5.35*	1,46
Rural Area	0.04	0.25	4.39*	1,46

* = $p \leq .05$

TABLE III

CORRELATIONS OF THE TWO VARIABLES DISTINGUISHING THE HIGH AND LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS GROUPS AT STEP 0 WITH THE NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

	Father's Occupation	Rural
Single	-.34*	
Married	-.34*	
Duration	-.41**	
Father's education	-.59***	
Self Criticism Score		-.33*
Column A - Physical Self		-.29*
Psychosis Scale		.41**

*$p \leq .05$
**$p \leq .01$
***$p \leq .001$

TABLE IV

VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION FOR HIGH FEAR OF SUCCESS VERSUS LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS MEN

Variable	Final Predictors F Step 0	F entered	F Step 6
Father's Occupation	5.348* (1,46)	5.348* (1,46)	12.31** (1,41)
True/False Ratio	3.065[a] (1,46)	3.948[a] (1,45)	3.22[a] (1,41)
Rural Area	4.389* (1,46)	3.513[a] (1,44)	6.04* (1,41)
Mother's occupation	1.744 (1,46)	3.317[a] (1,43)	7.34** (1,41)
Father's occupation	0.048 (1,46)	3.699[a] (1,42)	6.61* (1,41)
Mother's favorite - no difference	1.489 (1,46)	4.67* (1,41)	4.67* (1,41)

[a] $p < .10$
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE V

CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE SIX PREDICTOR VARIABLES

	F.O.L.	T/F	Rural	M.O.L.	F.Ed.	M.F.-N.D.
Father's Occup. Level	1.00					
True/False Ratio	0.15	1.00				
Rural	-0.02	-0.03	1.00			
Mother's Occup. Level	-0.08	0.18	0.06	1.00		
Father's Educ.	-0.59***	-0.11	-0.04	-0.22	1.00	
Mothers Favorite - No Difference	0.01	-0.12	0.23	-0.10	-0.24	1.00

***p< .001

TABLE VI

CORRELATIONS OF THE PREDICTOR VARIABLES WITH OTHER VARIABLES

	F.O.L.	T/F	Rural	M.O.L.	F.ED.	MF-ND
TI		-0.30*				
TO		-0.29*				
Duration of Marriage	0.41**				-0.32*	0.29*
Single	-0.34*					
Married	0.34*					
AL		-0.42**				
AM		-0.44**				
PO		0.34*				
RB		-0.37*				
Mother's Favorite - yes						-0.29*
Mother's Favorite - no						-0.43**
Father's Favorite - yes					0.30*	
Father's Favorite - no						-0.42**
Father's Favorite - N.D.						-0.86***
Ordinal Position		0.31*			-0.34*	
Father's Education	-0.59***				1.00	
Mother's Education				-0.30*	0.52***	
Total V					0.36*	
Column Total V					0.35*	
Town				-0.29*		

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

DP			0.33*
SC		-0.34*	
Column A		-0.29*	
Psych		0.40**	
Dist. 2	-0.46**		
Net Conflict	0.86***		

*p< .05
**p< .01
***p< .001

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROBABILITY OF CLASSIFICATION OF HIGH AND LOW FEAR OF SUCCESS GROUPS

Probability	LFS/LFS	LFS/HFS	HFS/HFS	HFS/LFS
.95-.99	4	0	4	0
.90-.94	2	0	3	0
.85-.89	5	1	2	0
.80-.84	2	1	4	0
.75-.79	2	0	1	1
.70-.74	0	2	0	1
.65-.69	0	0	1	1
.60-.64	2	0	2	0
.55-.59	0	0	2	0
.50-.54	2	1	1	1
TOTALS	19	5	20	4

LFS/LFS - low fear of success S's statistically classified low
LFS/HFS = low fear of success S's statistically classified high
HFS/HFS = high fear of success S's statistically classified high
HFS/LFS high fear of success S's statistically classified low

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The results of this study support the contention that fear of success as measured by the Althof (1973) projective technique exists in males and the belief by Althof that fear of success varies in intensity. Scores ranging from 0 to 17 were attained from the projective technique. Scores of zero were used for the low fear of success group and scores of five or higher were used to designate the high fear of success group. Given that Horner's (1968) original study used the presence or absence of fear of success imagery on one story, it is felt that the range of scores in this study are sufficient to identify males with low and high fear of success.

It is interesting to note that one lead was an unusually fine discriminator of fear of success. The political lead elicited fear of success imagery in 70 percent of the males with scores other than zero. It is believed that a significant factor in this is the political turmoil which exists in our society at this time. However, it is reasonable to assume that this factor helped the lead become a good discriminator. That is, that males who did not respond to the cue were truly low fear of success males

since the chances of negative consequences due to being a political success now are quite apparent and realistic. On the other hand, well defended males who might not have shown fear of success imagery to other cues may have responded to this cue for the same reasons. At the high end of the range, the cue would elicit responses which would merely add to the score.

In contrast, the verbal lead on sports (Ken wins the sportsperson of the year award) was the least successful at eliciting fear of success responses. Only 15 percent of males scoring above zero gave fear of success imagery in response to this cue. This is interpreted to be adequate since good tests require both easy and hard items (Anastasi, 1968). That is, the lower response number was elicited mainly from males with high fear of success scores and not endorsed by males with low scores, generally. Thus, it too was a good discriminator of high and low fear of success. The other leads covered the middle range of scores with the dating lead second highest (48%), the losing weight lead and newspaper story lead next with 31 percent and 26 percent, respectively.

The fact that only two variables were significant at Step 0 out of 77 possible is very close to chance. Therefore, conclusions must be made with caution. However, these two variables plus the other four variables which were selected as the best predictor variables had a predictability of .79 for low fear of success and .83 for high fear of

success. This means that the six variables selected as the best predictors classified 79 percent of the low fear of success males correctly and 83 percent of the high fear of success males correctly.

The first two variables which discriminate high and low fear of success males are at Step 0 of the analysis. The high fear of success male is significantly different on both variables. He is more likely to come from a rural area than low fear of success males and his father's occupational level is significantly higher. However, it is interesting to note that the high fear of success male has almost equal likelihood of coming from the first four areas, large city, city, town, or rural area, while the low fear of success male is most likely to come from a city of over 10,000 population. Nearly 75 percent of the low fear of success males came from areas of this size. The hypothesis might be put forth that individuals from more urban areas are less likely to fear success, especially if their fathers are working in a lower occupational level. That the fathers of the highs were in a higher occupational level should not be surprising. In light of the literature cited (e.g., Murray, 1955; Rosen, et al, 1959; Winterbottom, 1958) it supports the theory of the higher achieving, perhaps harder driving father.

In addition to these two variables, the four variables added in Step 6 of the analysis as best predictors were the father's educational level, mother's occupational level,

mother's favorite - no difference (in contrast to yes or no) and the T/F ratio on the TSCS. The fact that high fear of success males' mothers work at a significantly higher occupational level than the low fear of success males' mothers lends some support to the hypothesis cited above about the high achieving father. The fact that the high fear of success males' father has a significantly higher educational attainment goes along with the higher occupational level. The inference that mother did not have a favorite was also a predictor of the high and low fear of success groups. A significantly higher number of low fear of success males reported this fact. This variable lends some support to psychoanalytic theory of sibling rivalry and of disturbances in the mother-child relationship causing fear of success (e.g., Berliner, 1940; Menaker, 1956). That is, it is reasonable to suppose that if mother had no favorites, the mother-child relationship might have less conflicts and there would be less sibling rivalry, at least over mother's attentions. However, this is still highly speculative and needs further validation.

The T/F ratio is the weakest predictor variable in the analysis in actual significance but still has interest. The high fear of success males had a significantly higher T/F ratio than lows with lows being closer to the middle range of 1:1. According to Fitts (1965), the T/F scale, when high, can be interpreted to mean an individual who is achieving self definition or description by focusing on

what he is and is relatively unable to focus on what he is not. Individuals who have a balanced T/F ratio are achieving this by a more balanced employment of both tendencies. Thus, the low fear of success group seems to have a more balanced approach towards self. The high fear of success group seems to have an unbalanced approach to self definition.

An interesting finding of this study is that five of the six predictor variables came from the BDQ. Only one (T/F) was from the TSCS and no variables were selected from the OPI. Thus the theoretical factors of anxiety, social rejection, and self-image as measured by the scales of the TSCS and OPI were not selected as significant predictors in this study. Therefore, no support was given to theories involving self-concept or anxiety with fear of success.

One of the facets of this study which must be discussed in relation to fear of success is the population used. It can be argued that college men represent a truncated distribution in our population and are less likely to show high fear of success. That is, the high male in this study had a fear of success imagery score of 17, and it is possible that a sample representing a cross-section of our society might have yielded scores more toward the upper limit of 35. It is possible that men who go to college are likely to be less afraid of success or they would not go to college. On the other hand, these were men in the first two years of college who had not yet succeeded in the college world

completely. It may be argued that with the pressure exerted on males for success today, they might go to college regardless of fear of success. Since they have not finished school and obtained degrees, one cannot speculate on how many will succeed. Given that a high number of young men enter college today, it may not be as restricted a population as one initially supposes. Nevertheless, these are considerations to be looked at in any future replications of the study.

In summation, the predictability into high and low fear of success groups was good and the variables which best discriminated the groups lend support to inferences about high fear of success males coming from families which are more achievement motivated. That is, the father and mother's higher occupational levels and father's higher level of education indicate persons who are more success-oriented, at least as this society seems to define success today. This is somewhat supportive of Murray's (1955) study of American Icarus whose high-achieving father was cited as cause for the young man avoiding achievement. However, the results do not lend direct support for any of the previous theories about fear of success. It might be hypothesized that males who grow up in larger cities with lower status and perhaps less money are much more likely to look at the positive consequences of success than the negative ones. In addition, males who have fathers that have attained a higher level of success by educational

standards or higher occupational levels which have more status may have seen or be more likely to look at the negative aspects of success in this society. Another hypothesis is that men with high-achievement fathers who live in rural areas may have a peer group which would negatively sanction success. That is, peers whose fathers are less highly motivated toward success might be the group most likely living in rural areas. Thus, they would be less likely to sanction success in a peer. The data does not suggest this, but it is a hypothesis that is consistent with the data.

The final conclusion to be drawn from this study is that more research in the area is needed to further identify factors which cause fear of success in males. Additionally, replication of this study is needed to test the reliability of the predictor system and the stability of the six predictor variables.

REFERENCES

Althof, S. E. "The Effect of Competitive and Non Competitive Conditions in High and Low Fear of Success in College Women on Verbal Problem Solving Ability." (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Oklahoma State University, 1973.

Atkinson, J. W. and Feather, N. T. (Eds.) A Theory of Achievement Motivation, New York: Wiley (1966).

Bateson, G., Jackson, D., Haley, J., and Weakland, J. "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia," Behavioral Science 4:251, 1956.

Berliner, B. "Libido and Reality in Masochism," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. IX, 1940, 322-323.

Birney, Burdick, and Teevan Fear of Failure, New York: Van Nostrand, 1969.

Fitts, W. H. Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Nashville, Tenn: Counselor Recordings and Tests.

Freud, S. "Those Wrecked by Success," Standard Edition, In Complete Works, London: The Hogarth Press, Vol. 14, 316-331.

Freud, S. "The Economic Problem of Masochiem," Standard Edition, In Complete Works, London: The Hogarth Press, Vol. 19, 157-170.

Heist, P. and Yonge, G. Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual. New York: The Psychological Corp., 1968.

Hoffman, Lois, "Fear of Success in Males and Females: 1965 and 1972," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, in press.

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

Horner, M. S. "Toward and Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflict in Women," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 28, 1972, 157-175.

McClelland, D. C. The Achieving Society, New York: Van Nostrand Press, 1961.

McClelland, D. C. "Risk-taking in Children with High and Low Need for Achievement," in J. W. Atkinson (Ed.) Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society, Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand Press, 1958, 306-321.

Menaker, E. "A Note on Some Biologic Parallels Between Certain Innate Animal Behavior and Moral Masochism," Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 43, 1956, 31-41.

Murray, H. A. American Icarus, in A. Burton and R. E. Harris (Eds.) Clinical Studies in Personality, New York: Harper, Vol. 20, 1955, 615-641.

Ovessy, L. "Fear of Vocational Success," General Archives of Psychiatry, Vol. 7, 1962, 30-40.

Rosen, B. C. and D'Andrade, R. G. "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, 1959, 22, 185-218.

Schuster, D. "On the Fear of Success," Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. XXIX, 1955, 412-420.

Tresemer, D. "Fear of Success: Popular but Unproven," Psychology Today, Vol. 7(10), March 1974, 82-85.

Warner, S. Self Realization and Self Defeat, New York: Grove Press Inc., 1967.

Winer, B. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

COMPLETE LISTING OF THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE SCALES

1. Self Criticism Score
2. True-False Ratio
3. Net Conflict Score
4. Total Conflict Score
5. Total Positive Score
6. Row 1 P Score -- Identity
7. Row 2 P Score -- Self Satisfaction
8. Row 3 P Score -- Behavior
9. Column A -- Physical Self
10. Column B -- Moral-Ethical Self
11. Column C -- Personal Self
12. Column D -- Family Self
13. Column E -- Social Self
14. Total Variability Score
15. Column Total Variability Score
16. Row Total Variability Score
17. Distribution Score
18. Distribution Score -- 5
19. Distribution Score -- 4
20. Distribution Score -- 3
21. Distribution Score -- 2
22. Distribution Score -- 1
23. Defensive Positive Scale
24. General Maladjustment Scale
25. Psychosis Scale
26. Personality Disorder Scale
27. Neurosis Scale
28. Personality Integration Scale
29. Number of Deviant Signs Scores

APPENDIX B

THE FOURTEEN OPI SCALES

1.	TI	Thinking Introversion
2.	TO	Theoretical Orientation
3.	Es	Estheticism
4.	Co	Complexity
5.	Au	Autonomy
6.	RO	Religious Orientation
7.	SE	Social Extroversion
8.	IE	Impulse Expression
9.	PI	Personal Integration
10.	Al	Anxiety Level
11.	Am	Altruism
12.	PO	Practical Outlook
13.	MF	Masculinity-Feminity
14.	RB	Response Bias

APPENDIX C

BIOGRAPHICAL-DEMOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE*

1. My age is _____.

2. My current marital status is _____.
   a. single, b. married, c. divorced and remarried, e. widowded

3. The duration of my current marriage is _____ years.

4. "I tend to prefer..."
   a. male children, b. female children, c. do not particularly like children, d. does not matter as to whether the child is male or female

5. My religious preference is _____
   a. Protestant, b. Jewish, c. Catholic, d. None

6. I am in my _____ year at Oklahoma State University.

7. My overall grade point average is _____.

8. I have changed my major _____ times while enrolled in college.

9. I am the _____ child in my family.
   a. first born, b. second born, c. third born, d. fourth born, e. if greater than fourth born list number

10. I have _____ brothers in my family.

11. I have _____ sisters in my family.

12. Were you your mothers favorite child _____?

13. Were you your fathers favorite child _____?

14. Indicate on the continuums below the closeness you felt toward your parents <u>when you were a child</u>.

    very close _____ very distant
    father

APPENDIX C (CONTINUED)

very close _____ very distant
mother

15. My father's occupation is _____.

16. The highest grade my father completed in school was _____.

17. My mother's occupation is _____.

18. The highest grade my mother completed in school was _____.

19. I was raised in _____.
a. a large city (pop. over 50,000), b. small city (pop. 10,000-50,000), c. town (pop. 5,000-10,000) d. rural area (pop under 5,000), e. very rural area (pop. under 300).

*Dichotomous variables were always scores yes = 1, no = 0.

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS

You are going to see a series of verbal leads or cues, and your task is to tell a story that is suggested to you by each cue. Try to imagine what is going on in each. Then tell what the situation is, what led up to the situation, what the people are thinking and feeling, and what they will do.

In other words, write as complete a story as you can--a story with plot and characters.

You will have twenty (20) seconds to look at a verbal cue and then four (4) minutes to write your story about it. Write your first impressions and work rapidly. I will keep time and tell you when it is time to finish your story and to get ready for the next cue.

There are no right or wrong stories or kinds of stories, so you may feel free to write whatever story is suggested to you when you look at a cue. Spelling, punctuation, and grammar are not important. What is important is to write out as fully and as quickly as possible the story that comes into your mind as you imagine what is going on in each cue.

APPENDIX D (CONTINUED)

Notice that there will be one page for writing each story, following the page on which the verbal cue is given. If you need more space for writing any story, use the reverse side of the previous page--the one on which the cue was presented. Do not turn or go on the to the next page until told to do so.

APPENDIX E

A COMPLETE LISTING OF THE VARIABLES EMPLOYED IN THE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

Variable Number	Measure	Scale
1	OPI	TI
2	OPI	TO
3	OPI	Es
4	OPI	Co
5	OPI	Au
6	OPI	RO
7	OPI	SE
8	OPI	IE
9	OPI	PI
10	OPI	Al
11	OPI	Am
12	OPI	PO
13	OPI	MF
14	OPI	RB
15	BDQ	Age
16	BDQ	single
17	BDQ	married
18	BDQ	length of marriage
19	BDQ	prefer male child
20	BDQ	prefer female child
21	BDQ	don't like children
22	BDQ	no preference children
23	BDQ	protestant
24	BDQ	catholic
25	BDQ	no religious pref.
26	BDQ	year at OSU
27	BDQ	GPA
28	BDQ	changes in major
29	BDQ	ordinal position
30	BDQ	no. of brothers
31	BDQ	no. of sisters
32	BDQ	mother's favorite - yes
33	BDQ	mother's favorite - no
34	BDQ	mother's favorite - no diff.
35	BDQ	father's favorite - yes
36	BDQ	father's favorite - no
37	BDQ	father's favorite - no diff.

APPENDIX E (CONTINUED)

38.	BDQ	closeness to father
39	BDQ	closeness to mother
40	BDQ	father's occupation
41	BDQ	father's highest grade
42	BDQ	mother's occupation
43	BDQ	mother's highest grade
44	BDQ	large city
45	BDQ	city
46	BDQ	town
47	BDQ	rural area
48	BDQ	very rural area
49	TSCS	SC
50	TSCS	T/F
51	TSCS	Net conflict
52	TSCS	Total conflict
53	TSCS	Total positive
54	TSCS	Row 1 P
55	TSCS	Row 2 P
56	TSCS	Row 3 P
57	TSCS	Column A
58	TSCS	Column B
59	TSCS	Column C
60	TSCS	Column D
61	TSCS	Column E
62	TSCS	Total V
63	TSCS	Column Total V
64	TSCS	Row Total V
65	TSCS	Distribution Score
66	TSCS	Dist. 5
67	TSCS	Dist. 4
68	TSCS	Dist. 3
69	TSCS	Dist. 2
70	TSCS	Dist. 1
71	TSCS	Defensive Posture
72	TSCS	Gen. Maladjustment
73	TSCS	Psychosis
74	TSCS	Personality Disorder
75	TSCS	Neurosis
76	TSCS	Personality Integration
77	TSCS	Number of deviant signs

VITA

RONNEY EARL SMALLWOOD

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATED TO FEAR OF SUCCESS IN COLLEGE MEN

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in McAlester, Oklahoma, February 21, 1944, the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Smallwood. Married, wife, Beverly, and children, Keith, Jenny, and Spencer.

Education: Graduated from Redrock High School, Redrock, Oklahoma, in May, 1962; received Bachelor of Science degree in Journalism from Oklahoma State University in 1967; completed requirements for Master of Science Degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1974.