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A review of the current literature on the motive to avoid success (Horner, 1972) reveals that no research has focused on how the motive to avoid success relates to masculinity and femininity when they are conceptualized in other than a bipolar dimension. The present study was designed to ascertain the extent to which the motive to avoid success relates to sex-role identifications. The hypotheses that a high motive to avoid success would occur with feminine sex-role identification and that masculine or androgynous sex-roles would be related to low or absent motive to avoid success scores were not supported. The presence and absence of the motive to avoid success were not related to masculinity and femininity either as orthogonal variables or as gender determined variables.
The Relationship Between the Motive to Avoid Success and Sex-Role Identification

The motive to avoid success, or the internalization of negative expectations concerning the consequences of achievement which inhibit success, has been correlated with measures of femininity and traditionality among women. These measures of traditionality and femininity have been scales that conceptualize masculinity and femininity as two ends of a continuum. No research has looked at how the motive to avoid success relates to femininity and masculinity with those traits conceptualized as having other than an inverse relationship.

The motive to avoid success was first conceptualized in the mid-1960's by Matina Horner (1968) within the framework of an expectancy-value theory of motivation which holds that the strength of a person's motivations is determined by the expectations of the nature of the consequences of his or her actions in light of particular motives. Popular thought has held femininity and achievement as two desirable but mutually exclusive goals, according to Horner, and this inconsistency between femininity and achievement has been internalized by women and expressed as a motive to
avoid success or fear of success. The motive to avoid success is the disposition to become anxious about achieving success, and the end result is the inhibition of achievement strivings and motivation. According to Horner (1972), the motive to avoid success is a "latent, stable personality disposition acquired early in life in conjunction with standards of sex-role identity" (p. 159).

Women high in the motive to avoid success expect negative consequences of achievement such as social rejection or loss of femininity. This does not imply that women seek out failure but rather they have negative feelings about success in light of the consequences that they expect, and these negative feelings inhibit achievement motivation. Masculinity, on the other hand, has been seen in popular thought as virtually synonymous with achievement (Horner, 1972). Horner (1968) hypothesized that men should have few negative feelings about success.

Horner assumed that a projective cue depicting high achievement would tap a person's feelings and motives concerning achievement. Using a thematic cue to elicit motive to avoid success imagery, Horner (1968) tested 90 males and 88 females enrolled in undergraduate classes at the University of Michigan for the motive to avoid success. Stories were written by male subjects to the cue:

"After first term finals, John finds himself at the top of his medical school class."

Females wrote stories in response to the cue:
"After first term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class."

Horner's (1968) scoring system scored the motive to avoid success as present if there was:
1) negative consequences of success.
2) anticipation of negative consequences because of success.
3) instrumental activity away from present or future success, including leaving the field for more traditional feminine work.
4) negative affect because of success.
5) any direct expression of conflict about success.
6) denial of the situation described by the cue.
7) bizarre, inappropriate, unrealistic, or non-adaptive responses to the situation described by the cue.

Of the 90 males, only 8% exhibited the motive to avoid success, whereas 65% of the 88 females exhibited the motive. Horner took this as confirmation of her hypothesis that a major reason that women are lower achievers than men is this internalized set of negative feelings and expectations about success.

Much of the research following Horner's original study has been conflicting and contradictory in nature, questioning both the validity of the proposed motive and the reliability of Horner's findings. One of the major criticisms made of her research by Tresemer (1974) is that the scoring of protocols in her study regarded virtually all negative
imagery as indicative of the motive to avoid success and scored the motive in a present/absent system rather than calculating the weight of the motive. Scoring has become more sophisticated since then, and a scoring system that gives the strength as well as the presence or absence of the motive to avoid success has been developed (Horner, Tresemer, Berens, and Watson, 1973).

Spence (1974) has argued that something as complicated as women's failure to achieve as highly as men in a male-dominated society cannot be explained by only one motive. "The motive to avoid success serves well as a metaphorical label for the constellation of internal and external factors associated with sex-role expectations whose end result is often to lessen women's achievement strivings" (Spence, 1974, p. 428). The motive to avoid success is not a single disposition and to call it such is a "Procrustean solution" (Spence, 1974, p. 428).

The thematic cue used by Horner could have possibly tapped female's feelings about entering a male-dominated field such as medicine (Zuckerman and Wheeler, 1975). The success of a woman in medical school is culturally out of place although Tresemer questions the use of the "outdated medical school cue" (Tresemer, 1974, p. 85) and wonders if the goal of medical school is as indicative of success as it once was. Tresemer's criticism does bring to the fore the issue of culture loading in thematic cues. Culture loading in thematic cues would be difficult if not
impossible to eliminate as achievement motivation is largely if not entirely socially determined. Medical schools, however, are still full and are having no trouble in obtaining bright and highly motivated students, and although the profession of medicine may not be on the pedestal that it once was and the family practitioner is no longer a revered deity, the profession of medicine is still quite prestigious.

If medical school is too much of a bastion of male domination, speculation held that a cue from a less traditionally male-dominated field would cause different results to be obtained. Perhaps less cultural disapproval would be found if a cue from a more egalitarian field were given. Hoffman (1974) introduced three variations in the thematic cue into an explication of Horner's original study. A sample of 121 male and 87 female university undergraduates were divided into four groups, and each group was given a different cue. The first group was given the original medical school cue. The second group received a cue from a less traditionally masculine area that said:

"After first term finals, Anne (John for the males) finds that she (he) is the top child psychology graduate student" (Hoffman, 1974, p. 354).

Achievement was communicated privately rather than publicly in the cue given to the third group:

"After first term finals, Anne (John) received in the mail her (his) grade report which says that she (he) is at the top of her (his) medical school
class" (Hoffman, 1974, p. 354).

The fourth group received the cue in which the competitive aspect was minimized by saying:

"After first term finals in medical school, Anne (John) finds that she (he) has made the honor list since she (he) is one of the very few students with an average over 95" (Hoffman, 1974, p. 354).

Variations in the cues did not alter the percentage of females with a motive to avoid success, but the percentage of males exhibiting the motive to avoid success increased from the 8% reported by Horner (1968) to an average of 77%. Examination of the thematic content of the stories revealed a difference in the way in which males and females expressed a motive to avoid success; the theme of affiliative loss was present in 42% of the females' stories but in only 15% of the males' stories, and many more males than females expressed doubt over the value of achievement, indicating that medical school was not where everyone wanted to go and that everyone did not seek a career in academia.

Rejection of academic success was in 30% of males' stories but in only 15% of females' stories. In less than a decade, males' internalized negative feelings about success increased, but an apparent sex difference in causes of negative feelings was evidenced in themes of stories written by males and females: females were more likely to write stories that envisioned negative consequences of success such as social rejection or loss of femininity,
whereas males were more likely to write stories that contained the theme of rejection of status quo values (Hoffman, 1974).

Spence (1974) also varied the cues presented to groups of students and also gave the male cue to females and the female cue to males. To a group of 50 males and 53 females she gave the thematic cue:

"Susan was married right after she graduated from college. Later when both their children were in school, Susan and her husband decided she should go ahead with her ambition to become a doctor. She was accepted at the medical school of the local university" (Spence, 1974, p. 430).

Not only was Susan a "normal" woman in the sense that she had fulfilled the cultural expectations of marriage and a family, but her husband had endorsed her going to medical school. This cue, however, does not show the female in as high achieving situation as the previously used cues; the cue subject was accepted into medical school, a much more passive action than is becoming head of one's medical school class.

Males' responses to the Susan cue were 33% negative, and females' responses were 31% negative. Forty percent of the males gave negative responses to the standard Anne medical school cue in contrast to only 27% for the females. Only 18% of the males gave negative responses to the standard Bob medical school cue. Different cues
are regarded differently, said Spence, indicating that cultural stereotypes and expectations rather than internalized motives are being elicited. The thematic cues used here are probing not some personality attribute or trait but differing attitudes toward achievement in men and women.

The motive to avoid success and cultural expectations are not mutually exclusive. Achievement is very culture-bound in the sort of consequences that are expected to follow achievement, the value of those consequences, and in the very nature of what constitutes achievement. American culture does posit different values for men and women, and for subjects to project different expectations for success for men and women indicates they had discriminated among and internalized the expectations and values of the culture. As each of the cues would have a different cultural value for each situation, the fact that Spence found different expectations indicates the use of such cues does elicit feelings about success and achievement.

Solomon (1975) also found that female cues were more likely to elicit negative responses from males and females, and males are more likely to foresee failure for the female cue subject than are women. Solomon gave the "John" cue to 117 male and 114 female university students and the "Anne" cue to 119 male and 125 female students. More males (64%) than females (50%) gave negative responses to the "Anne" cue, but both sexes tended to foresee success for John. The cultural tendency exists for women to be regarded as
less likely to succeed or more likely to face negative consequences of success, and this is being evidenced by the stories.

Other evidence that the thematic cues are eliciting cultural attitudes and expectations was found by Feather and Raphelson (1974) in a cross-sectional study of Australian and American students. As in Solomon’s study, cues were given on a cross-sexed basis, and the cues were the standard John/Anne medical school cues. Findings at the University of Flinders in Australia indicated that only 28% of the 66 males tested and 20% of the 41 females saw negative consequences for John, but 51% of the 61 males and 47% of the 47 females saw negative consequences for Anne. At the University of Michigan, 30% of the 44 males and 23% of the 57 females saw negative consequences for John, and 49% of the 39 males and 29% of the 56 females tested saw negative consequences of success for Anne. Males attributed more negative consequences of success if the cue subject were female than if it were male, and females tended to predict success more if the subject of the cue were male rather than female. The sex of the actor, it seems, is more important than the sex of the subject.

Midgley and Abrams (1974) found a relationship between the motive to avoid success and the locus of control. They gave the standard Anne medical school cue to 108 female undergraduates at the University of Vermont along with Rotter’s Internal Locus of Control Scale. Their findings
indicated that women with an external locus of control wrote stories containing the fear of success and women with an internal locus of control did not write stories containing the motive to avoid success. This is congruent with the expectancy - value theory of motivation within which the motive to avoid success was conceptualized. Women who are more influenced by their environment would tend to see success and their femininity as incompatible as this is the prevailing attitude toward men.

Cultural factors seem to affect a person's attitudes toward cross-sexed and same-sexed achievement. The presence or absence of the motive to avoid success appears to be related to a woman's place on a traditional-nontraditional continuum; Alper (1973) found that traditional women gave more negative statements about success to Thematic Apperception Cards than did women who were nontraditional. Traditionally was measured by the Wellesley Role-Orientation Scale, a 24-item scale designed to tap three aspects of women's role preference:

1) traits that college women generally regard as feminine rather than masculine.
2) role activities for women that college females find acceptable.
3) male appropriate career-oriented activities.

This scale, however, conceptualized masculinity and femininity as being bipolar or on opposite ends of the same trait.
Moore (1972), in a study of 64 females enrolled in schools of law, nursing, and graduate arts and sciences, found that the presence or absence of the motive to avoid success appears to be a function of the degree to which a woman identifies with the socio-cultural norms for women.

The motive to avoid success was first conceptualized as an aid in explaining why women are not as high achievers in this culture as are men. Much of the recent research on the motive to avoid success (Hoffman, 1974; Heilbrun, Kleemeir, and Piccola, 1974; Lunneborg and Rosenwood, 1972; Monahan, Kuhn, and Shaver, 1974; Solomon, 1975; Spence, 1974) shows an increase in the motive to avoid success among men. While cultural expectations and stereotypes are becoming less restrictive for women in the recent years and available latitudes of behavior for women are increasing, possibly accounting for the drop in the motive to avoid success, the converse cannot be said for men. Men's roles are not becoming more restrictive but rather are becoming more flexible as well.

Sex roles for men and for women are becoming more diverse. Changes associated with the feminist movement are part of the changes that have taken place in sex-role ideology. The past few years have seen the rise of the concept of psychological androgyny as an alternative to traditional masculine or feminine sex-role identification. Traditional thought has seen sex-role identification as either masculine or feminine; the two roles typically have
been conceptualized as fixed at two ends of a dimension. A person's functioning was dictated largely by his bipolar sex-role orientation. A masculine-typed person was able to function better in traditional male activities than in feminine roles, and a feminine-typed person was able to function better in feminine roles. Each person’s functioning was limited by his particular polarity.

More recent thought has seen masculinity and femininity as two orthogonal dimensions rather than as two ends of a single dimension, and strength in both dimensions would make a person androgynous and give him or her a larger repertoire of skills or traits to draw from than a person strong only in one area. Bem has stated that "an androgynous personality would represent the very best of what masculinity and femininity have each come to represent" (Bem, 1976, p. 51), and the androgynous person would not be limited in potential experiences as would a masculine or feminine-typed person. Success, typically seen as masculine, would not constitute a threat to an androgynous person who has masculine as well as feminine traits to draw from.

Although the motive to avoid success has been related to femininity when it has been considered in a traditional sense, none of the research has looked at the relationship between masculinity or androgyny and the motive to avoid success.

The present study was designed to ascertain to what
extent the motive to avoid success related to different sex-role orientations when masculinity and femininity were seen as two independent dimensions rather than when femininity was seen as a weak form of masculinity. As this orthogonal conceptualization of masculinity and femininity allows for persons to be seen as androgynous, the study also determined the extent to which the motive to avoid success related to androgynous sex-role orientation.
Method

**Subjects.** Subjects were 106 males and 146 females enrolled in freshman and sophomore level psychology classes at Western Kentucky University. Ages for the sample ranged from 17 to 36 years with a mean of 19.5. Both the fear of success measure and the sex-role orientation measure were administered during regular class sessions to avoid a bias that a sample composed solely of volunteers would lend, but subjects were all given the option of refusing to participate in the experiment. Only a small number of persons chose not to participate. After subjects completed taking tests but before they returned their protocols, they were told the nature of the experiment and were again given the option of not participating in the study by writing "Do not use" on their protocol. In addition to revealing the nature of the study to the classes, individual feedback was made available.

**Task materials.** Sex-role orientation was measured by the PRF ANDRO Scale (Berzins, Welling, and Wetter, 1978), which is composed of 85 true-false items containing the MASCULIN and FEMIN subscales from Jackson's (1967) Personality Research Form (PRF) along with a 20 item SELF-ESTEEM subscale, five items from the PRF Infrequency Scale, which constitutes a rough check on careless or random responding.
and four filler items. Masculinity is seen in this scale as including the themes of social ascendancy, intellectual ascendancy, autonomy, and orientation toward risk, and femininity is seen as including the themes of nurturance, affiliative-expressive concerns, and self-subordination. Sex-role orientation on the PRF ANDRO Scale is categorized as either masculine-typed (high masculine/low feminine), feminine-typed (high feminine/low masculine), androgynous (high masculine/high feminine), and indeterminate (low masculine/low feminine).

Welling (1975) indicates that the MASCULIN and FEMIN scales are empirically independent, or are minimally correlated, and are internally consistent. Both the MASCULIN and FEMIN scales are minimally biased by socially desirable responding.

The MASCULIN and FEMIN constructs used in selecting the items for the two scales were based upon analysis of the items in the Bem (1974) Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). The comparable MASCULIN and FEMIN scales of the PRF ANDRO Scale and the BSRI have high correlations: a correlation of .68 was found between the MASCULIN scales, and a correlation of .61 was found between the FEMIN scales. Androgyny scores on the two instruments had a correlation of .75 (Berzins, Welling, and Wetter, 1976). As the PRF ANDRO Scale was developed at the University of Kentucky and norms are available for this area, the PRF ANDRO Scale was used rather than the Bem Sex Role Inventory.
The motive to avoid success was measured in the stories written in response to the thematic cues:

After first term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class. (for females)

and

After first term finals, John finds himself at the top of his medical school class. (for males)

Medical school is still indicative of success and achievement in American culture, but it is not as formidable a bastion of male domination and supremacy as it was a brief ten years ago. The medical school cue was used because it depicts a high achievement situation in the present culture and is used in most of the present body of research on the motive to avoid success.

In addition to these two measures, subjects were asked to give their age, sex, and intended major.

Procedure. Subjects were first asked to answer the 85 item PRF ANDRO Scale. Instructions, which were printed at the top of the PRF ANDRO Scale test booklet, were as follows:

On the following pages you will find a series of statements that a person might use to describe him or herself. Read each statement and decide whether or not it describes you. Indicate your answer on the separate answer sheet. If you agree with a statement or decide that it does describe you, circle TRUE on the separate
answer sheet. If you disagree with a statement or feel that it is not descriptive of you, circle FALSE on the answer sheet. Indicate your answers by circling the TRUE or FALSE even if you are not completely sure of your answer.

On the back of the answer sheet for the PRF ANDRO Scale were the following instructions:

Below is a sentence telling something about a person. Your task is to write a paragraph or two telling how the person feels, what the person thinks, what happens to the person in the future; in other words, tell a short story about this person starting from right now.

Following this was the "John" cue for the males and the "Anne" cue for the females.

Motive to avoid success protocols were scored according to the SCORING MANUAL for an Empirically Derived Scoring System for the Motive to Avoid Success (Horner, Tresemer, Berens, and Watson, 1973). Two judges working independently scored the motive to avoid success protocols. These two judges had an interrater reliability of .86. The interrater reliability was determined by having both judges score over thirty protocols independently of one another and then a coefficient of correlation for the two groups of scores was computed.

Although the motive to avoid success scores range from -2 to 6, the present analysis dealt only with the presence or absence of the motive to avoid success. The
motive to avoid success was determined to be absent if the score was zero or less and present if the score was one or greater. Data analysis was conducted using the full range of motive to avoid success scores but is not presented here; no differences in significance were found on any of the statistics when the full range of motive to avoid success scores was used, and the present/absent system is more easily compared to existing literature.
Results

As can be seen in Table 1, there is no significant difference between males and females in terms of the motive to avoid success.

Scores on the MASCULIN and FEMIN scales were widely distributed, ranging from 2 to 28 on the MASCULIN scale and from 5 to 25 on the FEMIN scale. High MASCULIN scores and high FEMIN scores were seen as scores above the median for each scale (15 and 17, respectively), and low MASCULIN and low FEMIN scores were seen as all scores below and including the median. Androgynous persons are those having high MASCULIN and high FEMIN scores, masculine persons are those having high MASCULIN and low FEMIN scores, feminine persons are those having high FEMIN and low MASCULIN scores, and indeterminate persons are those having both low MASCULIN and low FEMIN scores.

More persons were masculine than any other sex-role category, and very few people were androgynous, as can be seen in Table 2. Approximately the same number of people were feminine and indeterminate.

As can be seen in Table 2, few males were feminine, and few females were masculine. There is no difference in the percentage of males and females who are indeterminate and androgynous.
Table 1
Distribution of the Motive to Avoid Success
Among Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive to avoid success</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>38(^a) (36%)(^b)</td>
<td>59 (40%)</td>
<td>97 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>68 (64%)</td>
<td>87 (60%)</td>
<td>155 (62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 106 | 146 | 252 |

\(^a\) The first number represents the number of persons in the category. Total sample size is 252.

\(^b\) Numbers in parenthesis represent the percentage of persons of that sex in category.
### Table 2
Distribution of the Number and Percentage of Persons in the Sex-Role Category for the Total Sample and for Each Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>56 (53%)</td>
<td>15 (14%)</td>
<td>27 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>59 (40%)</td>
<td>25 (17%)</td>
<td>20 (14%)</td>
<td>42 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67 (27%)</td>
<td>81 (32%)</td>
<td>35 (14%)</td>
<td>69 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square statistic performed on the relationship between sex and the four sex-role categories shows that the two variables are not independent, $\chi^2 (3) = 49.28$, $p < .001$. Males tended to be classified as masculine and females tended to be classified as feminine. Sex-role categories and the motive to avoid success were found to be independent of one another, $\chi^2 (3) = 4.62$, $p < .20$.

When the sample is broken down by sex and the relationship between the presence and the absence of the motive to avoid success and sex-role categories is again explored, no relationship is found for either sex. For males, $\chi^2 (3) = 3.19$, $p < .30$, and for females, $\chi^2 (3) = 2.89$, $p < .30$. The lack of relationship between the motive to avoid success and sex-role categories can be seen in Table 3.

Males tended to score higher on the MASCULIN scale than did females, $t (250) = 6.44$, $p < .001$. Females scored higher on the FEMIN scale, $t (250) = -6.27$, $p < .001$.

Negligible relationships existed between the motive to avoid success and the MASCULIN, FEMIN, and ESTEEM scales. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for the relationships between the motive to avoid success and the MASCULIN, FEMIN, and ESTEEM scales can be seen in Table 4.

The hypothesis that the presence of the motive to avoid success would be higher among feminine sex roles and lower among masculine and androgynous sex-roles was
Table 3
Relationship Between the Motive to Avoid Success and Sex-Role Categories for the Total Sample and Each Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive to avoid success</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Androgynous</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>24(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Numbers represent the number of subjects.
Table 4
Correlation of the Motive to Avoid Success to the MASCULIN, FEMIN, and ESTEEM Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive to Avoid Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MASCULIN                | -0.05758<sup>a</sup>  
| FEMIN                   | 0.02039  
| ESTEEM                  | -0.06874  

<sup>a</sup>Numbers are Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients.
not supported by the data. Neither was the motive to avoid related to gender or to any aspect of sex roles as was measured by the PRF ANDRO Scale.
Discussion

While previous studies have reported a relationship between gender and the motive to avoid success, i.e. females tend to exhibit the motive to avoid success and males tend to not have the motive to avoid success (Horner, 1968; Hoffman, 1974), no relationship was found between gender and the motive to avoid success in the present study. The motive to avoid success was not found to be related to masculinity and femininity when these two traits were viewed independently of one another. Several explanations exist as to why this study failed to confirm earlier findings.

The sample of students at Western Kentucky University may differ from samples of populations at other universities. Few people in this sample were classified as androgynous whereas an unexpectedly large number of people were classified as having indeterminate sex-role orientations. Welling (1975) reports 19% of the males and 20% of the females in a University of Kentucky sample of 2,046 students as being androgynous. The present study reports only 14% of the males and females as being androgynous. Whereas the present study reports 25% of the males and 29% of the females as being classified as indeterminate, Welling (1975) reports only 22% of the males and only 18%
of the females as being classified as indeterminate. The small size of the androgynous group in the present study could have affected the results. A weak relationship may have been found had the androgynous group been larger.

Horner's original study (1968) was conducted at the University of Michigan, and many of the studies which followed were conducted at large universities such as Harvard. The differences in students at these universities and at Western Kentucky may have affected the results. Many of the stories obtained from the Western Kentucky sample were very brief and had very little content, and more than a few of the stories reflected a poor writing ability. The brevity, lack of clarity, and the generally low quality of the stories made the task of scoring the stories for the motive to avoid success more difficult.

The failure to find a relationship between the motive to avoid success and masculinity and femininity or between the motive to avoid success and gender raises a question as to the theoretical framework concerning the motive to avoid success. The present study suggests that the motive to avoid success is not related to sex-role identity as Horner (1968, 1972) has stated regardless of whether sex-role identity is determined by gender or by one's masculinity and femininity. Although the motive to avoid success does exist, at least as it is operationally defined, it is not related to sex-role identity as hypothesized.
Sex-role orientations have changed drastically since Horner's (1968) study, and this cultural change may have affected the distribution of the motive to avoid success among males and females. Other studies have reflected the gradual change in the distribution of the motive to avoid success among males and females (Hoffman, 1974; Solomon, 1975; Spence, 1974). Hoffman's (1974) study in particular reflected the ease with which projective research can be affected by cultural changes. More males wrote stories that were scored for the motive to avoid success than Hoffman expected, and an analysis of the themes in these stories indicated that more males than females wrote stories in which the theme was one of rejection of academic success and status quo values. Rejection of success was in 30% of the males' stories but in only 15% of the females' stories. Hoffman suggested that the results were due to the counter-culture movement.

In short, cultural changes may have affected the distribution of the motive to avoid success among males and females in the present study. The present study indicates that the motive to avoid success is distributed equally among males and females as well as among sex-role categories based upon factors other than gender.

If the motive to avoid success is not related to sex-role identity regardless of how sex-role identity is conceptualized, what is it related to? Other seemingly obvious
areas have not been explored and the motive to avoid success has not been put into a larger perspective. How, for instance, does the motive to avoid success relate to other traits within the greater constellation of achievement? If further research is conducted within the area, perhaps it should be in relation to the fear of failure and the need for achievement.

Horner originally conceptualized the motive to avoid success in 1966 as an explanation or partial explanation for the fact that women are not as high achievers in American culture as are men. Patterns of achievement for men and women have changed since her original conceptualization of the motive to avoid success, and the motive to avoid success does not function as an aid in explaining differing patterns of achievement in men and women. Judging by the equal distribution of the motive to avoid success among men and women and among the various sex-role categories, negative feelings about achievement and perhaps feelings about achievement in general have changed over the past decade and should again be explored. There are still differences in achievement among males and females, but the motive to avoid success is no longer useful in explaining these differences in achievement.

Problems with using a projective cue to tap the motive to avoid success and with the PRF ANDRO Scale were encountered in the present study, and these problems may have in-
fluenced the results. The use of a projective cue to measure the motive to avoid success was awkward and perhaps misleading. Scoring the motive to avoid success protocols was very time consuming, and, as previously mentioned, the brevity and generally low quality of the stories made the task of scoring the stories for the motive to avoid success more difficult. Some of these problems might be avoided if the subjects responded orally to the cue and the examiner tape recorded their response.

The PRF ANDRO Scale is not without its drawback as well. There is, at present, no way to combine the MASCULIN and FEMIN scales in any way other than the masculine, feminine, androgynous, and indeterminate classifications. Such a classification system is crude at best but may be the only way to combine the two traits of masculinity and femininity. A test of androgyny could perhaps be derived using one scale, but then this scale would not give any insight in terms of the male traits or female traits of the person. The crudeness of the sex-role classifications and the problems in using a projective cue may have affected the results.

Several factors, then, may have led to these results. Differences between the Western Kentucky sample and samples at other universities may have led to the difference in sex-role classifications and in the distribution of the motive to avoid success among males and females. Cultural change in the area of sex roles may have affected the results, and
what was being measured was perhaps influenced by how it was measured. All of these factors may have contributed to the results of the present study.
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