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ABSTRACT

Previous research has suggested a high positive correlation between agentic characteristics and self-esteem. Psychotherapists have noted, however, that as women clients become more agentic, they experience distress and heightened concerns about betraying their mothers. The present study utilized a non-clinical sample of adult women engaged in the process of personal change (i.e., women re-entering college) to explore relationships among the variables of Self-esteem (SE), Fear-of-success (FOS), Educational Goals (EG), Agency (A), Communion (C), agentic similarity to mother (ASI), and comfort with agentic attributes (ACI). In addition, More Advanced and Less Advanced students were compared on these variables. One hundred and fifty-six participants completed a questionnaire which contained measures of the variables under study. No significant relationships were found among the three dependent variables, SE, FOS, and EG. None of the predictors contributed significantly to EG, and FOS was found to be correlated slightly but significantly with ASI. SE was significantly predicted by Agency, with some contribution by ACI. Agency and ACI were highly correlated. The More Advanced student group was found to be significantly higher than the Less Advanced group in ACI and EG. The significant relationship between SE and Agency
supports the empirical literature and disconfirms the clinical literature. The findings were discussed in terms of the social value of Agentic attributes, possible bias in therapists' interpretations of their women clients' distress over non-traditional behaviors and non-traditional choices, and differences between clinical and large N research methodologies. The findings also suggest that women involved in an agentic environment for longer periods of time experience more comfort with self-described agency than women in such environments for briefer periods.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The present research examines a phenomenon that both I and others (Hoffman, 1972; Sassen, 1981; Schecter, 1979; Stiver, 1983; Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson, & Miller, 1979) have noted in doing psychotherapy with women. This phenomenon can best be described as follows: A woman enters psychotherapy with considerable doubts about her self-worth. As she defines her needs and desires more clearly, she begins to act on her own behalf. For some women this has meant applying for and receiving promotions at work, furthering their education, or ending unsatisfactory personal relationships. Paradoxically, yet closely on the tail of the new-found self-definition, the woman plunges into a state of depression, anxiety, and fear. She talks about how selfish and bad she is, and how she is hurting others. Some women also express fear that they are betraying their mothers by feeling effective. One client suggested to me that she would have to kill her mother (in a metaphorical sense) in order to feel better about herself.

It seems paradoxical that as these women experience heightened self-esteem and feelings of competence, intense
fears and concerns arise. The uniformity of these concerns is very striking. Fears of being selfish, bad, hurtful, destructive, and of betraying their mothers have been reported by therapists as their women clients experience more personal and work-related effectiveness.

The present investigation has several goals. One is to present, compare, and integrate theoretical positions and empirical research relevant to the relationship between self-esteem and competence, and the influence of maternal characteristics on these attributes in adult women. The second goal is to test hypotheses regarding the relationships among these variables in a non-clinical sample.

Review of the Literature

Some psychological theorists have suggested that women tend to be affiliative and therefore define themselves and evaluate their self-worth in terms of their relationships (Chodorow, 1974, 1978; Gilligan, 1979, 1982; Hoffman, 1972; Sassen, 1981; Stiver, 1983; Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson, & Miller, 1979). Women are said to manifest these values not because of their biological natures, but as a result of socio-political and psychological factors in their early development. One factor influencing the development of the value of connectedness in women stems from their primary responsibility for childrearing. Chodorow (1974, 1978) has suggested that this social arrangement creates a
qualitatively different relationship between mothers and daughters as compared to that between mothers and sons. Since mothers are also daughters, and since they share a gender category with their daughters, mothers develop a relationship with their daughters characterized by a "double identification" (Hammer, 1975). Because mothers have more in common with their daughters than with their sons, they identify more closely with their female children. Chodorow believes that this special closeness, involving more flexible ego boundaries and self-other distinctions, forms the model for all the daughter's relationships to come. The daughter internalizes this model and seeks out relationships based on sameness, identification, and closeness. In this way, women develop a sense of themselves "in relation" rather than "in separation." Men, on the other hand, are said to value autonomy, having experienced being different in gender and separate from their original caretakers. Thus, in contrast to women, men experience themselves as independent, separate, autonomous, and competitive. Parents (primarily mothers) raise their children in ways that will maximize in their girls the characteristics appropriate to motherhood (and in their boys the characteristics appropriate to being breadwinners). Inasmuch as this model equates autonomy with men and affiliation with women, it can be criticized for gender stereotyping. It nevertheless represents a dominant view in the field of adult development at the
present time, and is relevant to the present investigation.

Writers endorsing this model explain the phenomenon of interest here, described in the opening paragraphs, as one involving a conflict of basic values. Women, they write, are affiliative, and therefore any separation-related, competitive, or achievement-oriented behaviors will cause conflict and dysphoria. In other words, when women choose to act in any way other than in the service of maintaining or promoting relationships, they are likely to experience acute distress. Sassen (1981), for example, has suggested that success anxiety in women is related to their inability to construct reality in situations requiring competitive actions when they result in loss for another person.

Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson, and Miller (1979) have argued that self-assertive acts in women are experienced as harmful and destructive, "inevitably carrying the implication of the intent to hurt or destroy another" (p. 13). They suggest that the destructive element of assertion contributes heavily to the dysphoria with which it is associated. These authors, as well as Thurman (1982), have noted that one of the themes that frequently emerges for women in psychotherapy as self-esteem increases and becomes more integrated, is betrayal of the mother. When women struggle to develop what the authors call "aggression," or "impulse and action towards mastery and even cruelty which enables the individual to realize his/her own aims and/or to have an effect on others" (p.
16), they experience a "profound psychic separation from the mother, and even a rejection of her" (p. 14). This phenomenon is said to be especially intense when a woman has identified with a passive, self-demeaning mother. In such cases, the daughter is faced with the choice of identifying with her mother and becoming devalued herself, or working to develop good self-esteem and confidence, and she experiences conflict over giving up the mother vs. the need to remain attached to her. Action taken to further herself will weaken the bond with a mother who feels poorly about herself. The rupturing of this bond is experienced by the daughter as being harmful to the mother, and as bad and disorganizing. It is this conflict, these authors state, which is hidden behind many women's choices to remain in unfulfilling relationships, and to adopt overtly passive, self-demeaning stances.

Similarly, Menaker (1974) has written about the struggle for women "against the incorporations of the mother's devalued self-image, against the mother's self-hate which would, if taken into herself, become part of the daughter's conception of herself" (p. 241). The social derogation of women is suggested as one source of the mother's devalued self-image. Therefore, Menaker believes that this struggle is common to the majority of women who live in a culture where women are devalued.

Walters (1982), too, has suggested that "in order to feel comfortable with her power, autonomy, and competence,
the daughter needs her mother, her primary source of identification, to have comfort and confidence in her own competence, autonomy, and strengths" (p. 28). Altman and Grossman (1977) and Baruch (1976) have noted that women need competent models with good self-esteem in order to integrate these characteristics into themselves in a nonconflictual way.

Stiver (1983) has presented a similar analysis in exploring women's work conflicts. She suggests that women who choose to achieve instead of supporting and empathizing with others will feel that they are harming others and are destructive. These feelings are related to the women's beliefs that if they move ahead, they will have betrayed and hurt their mothers.

Gilligan (1982), in describing adult development in women, has emphasized the importance of attachment and the ethic of care, in contrast with men's values of independence, autonomy, and self-fulfillment. While women define themselves and solve dilemmas by considering their relationships and responsibility to others, men are concerned predominantly with logical solutions based on principles and rules. Gilligan's theory emphasizes that the existence of these divergent values in men and women forms the basis of different developmental sequences for the genders.

In a study of 29 women facing a decision regarding abortion, Gilligan (1980) described the conflicts they
faced and how their views of themselves and their relationships with others were involved in their decision making process. Gilligan found that many of the women tended to define the problem as one involving the necessity for exercising care and avoiding hurt of others. Acting in terms of these concerns was considered by the women to be the "moral" choice, while inflicting hurt was considered to be selfish. Gilligan noted the repetitive use of the word selfish (an adjective also used by the women making choices for self-improvement in psychotherapy as noted earlier) and she interpreted the escalating concerns about selfishness as a symbol of developmental transition. For example, in the phase in which goodness is equated with caring for others and in which the self-image is measured by one's ability to protect others from hurt, the other person in a relationship assumes primary importance over the self. However, due to the tension created by excluding oneself from decision making and by suppressing one's own needs and wishes, a transition into the stage characterized by "moral equality of the self and others" is launched. During this transition, as the woman struggles with the dilemma regarding how to include her own needs in an ethic of care, words such as selfish appear in her self-descriptions. As Gilligan noted, "when uncertainty about her own worth prevents a woman from claiming equality, self-assertion falls prey to the old criticism of selfishness" (1982, p. 87). Such an analysis assumes that cooperation and
nurturance are diametrically opposed to autonomy and competition, and that women have typically integrated the former values into their identities, while men have adopted the latter. This model assumes, further, that when women choose to act in a way not congruent with the value of affiliation, they interpret such behavior as destructive and harmful, and experience distress.

The problem investigated in the present study may also be viewed from a different theoretical model. Bakan (1966) has suggested that agency and communion represent "two fundamental modalities in the existence of living forms" (p. 15). Agency, characterized by separation of persons who are seen as individual/autonomous units, is manifested in self-assertion and self-expansion. Communion, on the other hand, acknowledges that individuals participate with one another in a social context, and is manifested in union and lack of separation. Agency is further identified with isolation, alienation, and aloneness, the urge to master, and the repression of thought, feeling, and impulse. Contact, openness, noncontractual cooperation, and the removal of repression are described as elements of communion.

Bakan has suggested that the optimal personal state is one in which these two modes are integrated. From this, it follows that "unmitigated agency," or the existence of pure individuality and self-assertion, is a dangerous state of affairs likened to the "destructive proliferation of
cancer cells" (Carlson, 1971, p. 271). The consequences of "unmitigated communion" are not directly addressed by Bakan, but one can imagine that pure union, openness, or fusion with another could also be problematic. Loss of a sense of self, excessive dependence, and extreme conformity are possible forms this might take.

Applied to the psychotherapy phenomenon described earlier, Bakan's model suggests that as women in therapy become more agentic they develop fears that they have (or will) become purely agentic and lose their communal competencies. That is, it appears as though they fear a state of "unmitigated agency." Although a woman may be strongly communal at the start of therapy, and the increase in agency may not be sufficient to reach even a balance, the emerging agentic competencies may be a source of anxiety and conflict.

Research on androgyny (with some conceptual modification) is also relevant to the present discussion. Since the term androgyny and its use of the concepts "masculinity" and "femininity" ties gender to behavior and thus perpetuates sex-role stereotyping (Lott, 1981), these concepts will not be utilized as such in the present research. However, the attributes tapped by "masculinity" scales are suggestive of agentic skills, while communion and "femininity" are roughly parallel. In fact, Spence and Helmreich (1980), authors of a frequently used androgyny measure (the Personality Attributes Questionnaire, or PAQ),
have recently concluded that rather than assessing "masculinity" and "femininity," their scales measure instrumentality and expressiveness, respectively, which are conceptually equivalent to agency and communion.

It has been proposed that self-esteem is highest in "androgynous" individuals who self-describe as equally "feminine" (communal/expressive) and "masculine" (agentic/instrumental) (Bem, 1975; Heilbrun, 1976; Spence et al., 1975; Orlofsky, 1977). Assessing agency and communion directly with an adjective checklist measure, White (1979) found that women training to be nurse practitioners who endorsed high levels of both agency and communion in describing themselves were most "well-adjusted."

On the other hand, many recent studies have found that it is not agency-communion balance but the self-report of instrumental or agentic competencies by both men and women which is related to well-being (e.g., Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Lee & Scheurer, 1983; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981; Orlofsky, 1977; Orlofsky & Stake, 1981; Silvern & Ryan, 1979; and Tayler & Hall, 1982; Whitley, 1983, 1984). These findings suggest that agentic characteristics are related to psychological well-being regardless of the level of communion, and that balance is irrelevant.

Both hypotheses, whether stressing agency-communion balance or agency, predict that endorsement of agency is positively related to self-esteem. Why, then, have
psychotherapists consistently reported that the well-being or self-esteem of women clients diminishes when they begin to exhibit agentic competencies? That this phenomenon is noted primarily in the clinical literature may be important. Perhaps women who do not fear the outcome of autonomy and success-enhancing behaviors (in work and relationships), who do not believe that it will lead to a loss of relatedness to others or to a disavowal of their mothers are unlikely to be found in psychotherapy. Identical themes, however, have been reported in the "fear-of-success" literature (Tresemer, 1977; Sassen, 1981) suggesting that similar dynamics are operating within non-clinical populations of women who fear and withdraw from competitive success.

Horner (1968) concluded that women experience fear when anticipating success in competitive situations. She believed that the fear derived from the anticipated negative consequences of success, such as the loss of femininity and social rejection. Sassen (1980), in a review of the fear-of-success (FOS) literature, questioned this conclusion. She noted that FOS was found only in women who were in competitive situations where their gain meant another person's loss, and she suggested that women's fear-of-success grows out of the awareness of the costs of competitive success. Thus, according to Sassen, FOS is experienced only by women in situations in which power and achievement are in direct opposition to intimacy and
relatedness.

Research on the links among FOS, achievement motivation, and sex-role identification has produced contradictory results. Alper (1974) reported that FOS is positively related to traditional (or communal) self-concept in women, while several other researchers have found FOS to be more characteristic of nontraditional (or agentic) women (Caballero, Giles, & Shaver, 1975; Heilbrun, Kleemeier, & Piccola, 1974; Major, 1979). Major (1979) reported that "androgynous" (i.e., high agency-high communion) women showed the least FOS, and Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) found no relationship between FOS and self-concept. To confuse matters further, Orlofsky (1981) reported that when using TAT measures of FOS, no relationship was found with sex-role identification or self-concept, but that objective measures produced significant differences between "feminine" (low agency-high communion) and "undifferentiated" (low agency-low communion) women on the one hand, and "masculine" (high agency-low communion) and "androgynous" (high agency-high communion) women on the other. This latter group obtained lower scores on objective measures of FOS (similar to Major's findings). Thus, some research suggests that women who self-describe as predominantly communal have the highest levels of FOS, while other findings point to agency as the crucial element in elevated levels of FOS, or suggest that agency-communion balance is necessary for
minimal levels of FOS.

The present research is concerned with reconciling these contradictory hypotheses and findings, namely: that agency-communion balance is crucial to well-being; that agency alone contributes to well-being; and that psychological distress increases as highly communal persons begin to enact agentic behaviors. Perhaps an important mediating variable is the degree to which persons are comfortable with the characteristics or behavioral tendencies with which they describe themselves. It is suggested here that persons vary in the extent to which they experience discomfort regarding their specific competencies, regardless of the degree to which agentic and communal attributes are balanced. Further, it is suggested here that such discomfort is more likely among women who see their personal characteristics as divergent from those of their mothers'.

Although both parents undoubtedly play a role in the formation of their children's self-concepts (Heilbrun, 1976; Lynn, 1976; Pleck, 1975), recent literature points to the crucial importance of the mother-daughter relationship (Baruch, 1976; Miller, 1982; Chodorow, 1974, 1978; Costos, 1983; Friday, 1977; Hammer, 1977; Kahn, 1981; Menaker, 1974; Kelly & Worell, 1976; Orloffsky, 1979; Stiver, 1983; Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson, & Miller, 1979). Some research has shown that this attachment continues well into the adult years among "normal" women (Low, 1981), and that the
daughter's perceptions of her mother and her mother's satisfaction are central to the choices she makes about her life (Altman & Grossman, 1977; Costos, 1983; Kahn, 1982) and her feelings about herself.

Kelly and Worell (1976) and Orlofsky (1979) found that parental influence follows different patterns for men and women. Whereas for men, fathers' behaviors (Orlofsky) and parental warmth/affection (Kelly and Worell) were essential elements in the self-concept, women reported that maternal encouragement of intellectual development and achievement was the crucial factor in their development. In both studies, "androgynous" women were differentiated from all other groups by the report that their mothers encouraged intellectual development. Orlofsky reported that such mothers were also described as "androgynous" by their daughters. Similarly, Baruch (1976) found that adolescent and pre-adolescent girls whose mothers felt competent about themselves and encouraged this in their daughters, rated themselves as significantly more self-assured than daughters of mothers who reported feeling low in competence.

A study by Costos (1983) has particular relevance to the present research because Bakan's model of agency and communion has been used as an alternative to the "masculinity-femininity" model of the androgyny researchers. In this study, parent socialization practices and level of psychological development were examined as
predictors of agency and communion (measured by a checklist derived from the Bem Sex Role Inventory). For men, the crucial predictive factor in their agency-communion balance was their level of psychological development. However, for women, the mother's socialization and modeling practices were most predictive of self-descriptions. Women who described their mothers as highly communal were likely to describe themselves as communal, while women who described themselves as having high agency and high communion reported their mothers to be similar. This research supports the findings of others that mothers' personal characteristics play a major role in the self-concept of adult women.

Research on achievement motivation in women has found that mothers who value independence and assertiveness-related traits in their daughters are likely to have daughters who feel competent and who self describe as assertive and independent (c.f., Baruch & Barnett, 1975), and that daughters of working mothers perceive themselves as more confident, independent, and autonomous, and have higher academic and/or professional goals than daughters of homemaking mothers (Hoffman, 1977). These findings also suggest that mothers who value agency in themselves and in their daughters have daughters who experience a greater sense of well-being. Furthermore, there are indications that women who receive contradictory messages about power and success from their mothers (Thurman, 1982) and women
whose achievements surpass their mothers' experience severe work conflicts (Stiver, 1983). Perhaps mothers who are more comfortable with their own agentic qualities are able to provide their daughters with the positive model of which Walters (1982) has written.

In the FOS literature, one finds mother-daughter themes similar to those noted in the achievement and self-esteem literatures. For example, Miller (1980) found that fear-of-success in a sample of women was significantly related to the perceived negative response from both parents, but especially from mothers, to success-oriented behaviors. The correlation between the perception of mother's disapproval for success and FOS was very high for women, but not significant for men. Gilroy, Talierco, and Steinbacher (1981) in a related study, found that daughters of working mothers were characterized as "androgynous" (i.e., high in both agentic and communal attributes) significantly more often than daughters of non-working mothers. In addition, these daughters were also found to demonstrate less FOS than daughters of non-working mothers. Again, it appears that mothers who model agentic behaviors have daughters who are less likely to be ambivalent about success than daughters of low agentic women. Schecter (1979), using a more psychodynamic analysis, suggested that fear-of-success in a woman derives from her fear that the attainment of success will precipitate a break with her mother. Furthermore, women who believe that success is
attained at the expense of the mother will feel overwhelming guilt and depression if they choose to succeed.

Taken together, these studies suggest that the level of a daughter's FOS is influenced by her mothers' competence and attitudes toward success and success-enhancing behaviors. However, we know that women do make choices that are different from their mothers'. What variables help to predict the psychological consequences of these decisions?

The Present Study

The present research examines agentic and communal self-descriptions in a sample of women who are not psychotherapy clients but who are involved in a process in which their agentic competencies are likely to be increasing. These are adult "re-entry" women who have returned to college to complete their baccalaureate educations. Agency and communion descriptions of self and of mother were obtained from two samples of such women, one group at the beginning and one group more advanced in their academic programs. Daughter-mother similarity in agency was assessed, as well as the degree of comfort associated with the self-perceived characteristics. Self-esteem indices, FOS measures, and a measure of educational aspirations were also obtained.

The following hypotheses were tested: if comfort with
self-perceived agency is high, and if mother and daughter are rated similarly in agentic attributes, then (regardless of the level of self-described communal attributes):

I. agency is positively related to self-esteem,

II. agency is negatively related to fear-of-success, and

III. agency is positively related to educational goals.

It was therefore predicted that among two independent samples of adult re-entry women, self-esteem and educational goals will be greatest while FOS will be lowest in women who describe themselves as high in agency, high in experienced comfort with regard to agentic attributes, and high in perceived similarity to mother in agentic attributes. In other words, high self-esteem and educational goals will be predicted by high agency, high comfort with agency, and high similarity to mother in agentic attributes; and high FOS will be predicted by low agency, low comfort with agency, and low similarity to mother in agentic attributes. These predictions were tested on the sample as a whole, and separately on the two independent samples composed of less advanced and more advanced re-entry women.

In addition, the less advanced re-entry women were compared with the more advanced re-entry women to assess changes in agency-communion self-descriptions, reported comfort with self-described attributes, fear-of-success,
and educational aspirations. It was predicted that:

IV. the more advanced women will differ from the less advanced women in manifesting:

A. higher scores on agency;
B. greater comfort with agentic attributes;
C. lower fear-of-success;
D. higher levels of educational aspirations, and;
E. no difference in self-described communal attributes.
CHAPTER TWO

Method

Participants

Selection Criteria

All women in the College of Continuing Education (CCE) at the University of Rhode Island who were enrolled in a degree granting program were selected for participation. This group of women was chosen because their decision to pursue academic degrees suggests that they have made a commitment to developing agentic attributes. Thus, as these women are in the process of change involving increasing agentic attributes, they are seen as similar in this respect to women in psychotherapy.

At the time of this study (the Spring semester of the 1983-84 academic year), approximately 1,000 students were enrolled in degree-granting programs in the College of Continuing Education, 420 of whom were women. Ages ranged from under 20 to above 50, with the median for women in the 30-39 age group. Approximately one-half of the women were also in full-time paid employment. The three most frequently reported occupations were: student, homemaker, and office worker (Malone, 1983).

Of the 420 eligible women, 156 agreed to participate
in the investigation by returning mailed questionnaires. These participants were divided into two groups on the basis of the number of credits they had completed. All women who had completed less than 73 credits (the median number) were placed in the "less advanced" group; those who had completed more than 73 credits were placed in the "more advanced" group. (The number of credits required for a bachelor's degree is 120).

Procedure

All degree program women students in the College of Continuing Education were solicited via a mailed letter (Appendix A) and a packet of materials sent to each woman's home address. Stamped envelopes for their responses were also included. The packet contained the introductory letter and research instruments in the following order:

1) Cover letter with detachable consent form to be returned with the materials;

2) Personal Data Questionnaire (Appendix B). This questionnaire was designed to gather data relevant to educational goals and to provide demographic information with which to describe the sample. In addition, an open-ended question aimed at eliciting information regarding motivations for entering or re-entering school was included;

3) The White Agency-Communion Scale (Appendices C & D) with three different sets of instructions:
a) mother description;
b) self-description;
c) level of comfort instructions for self-description;

4) Stake's Performance and Social Self-Esteem Scale (Appendix E); and

5) Fear of Success cues (Appendix F).

Participants were assured of complete anonymity; each was assigned a number from a master list and was identified on the questionnaire materials only by that number.

Instruments

Independent Variable Measures

The White Agency-Communion Scale. The White Agency-Communion Scale (WACS) consists of 35 personality characteristics selected by White from the Adjective Checklist (ACL) (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) as representative of agentic and communal competencies (White, 1979). Following item analyses, adjectives which had poor correlations with the total score or high correlations with the opposing scale were omitted from the final list, leaving 17 adjectives on the Agency scale, and 18 on the Communion Scale. Respondents are asked to check the adjectives that describe themselves.

White has reported the average item-total correlations for the Agency scale as .50, and for the Communion scale as .46. (Internal consistency was assessed for each scale in
the present investigation and will be reported in the Results section.) Since items in one scale are not highly correlated with those in the other scale, the Agency and Communion scores are empirically independent. A factor analysis performed by White (1978) revealed the presence of three factors: Agency, Communion, and Efficiency. The first two factors included all items belonging to their designated categories. The Efficiency factor included four adjectives (efficient, dependable, conscientious, and organized), two of which belong to each scale. As the items were judged by White to be valuable contributions to the scales and were equally distributed between the two, they were retained in the final version of the checklist.

White (1978) found evidence for the validity of the agency and communion scales in a study using 166 women. A four-fold categorical division resulting from a mean-split of Agency and Communion scores produced the following significant differences: the high agency-high communion group was "more responsible, dominant, dependable, caring, assertive, and inner-directed" (p. 304), as measured by the California Psychological Inventory than all other groups. In addition, this group reported a greater sense of well-being, greater tolerance of others, and feeling more competent about, and satisfied with, their professional abilities. The high agency-high communion group also differed from the low agency-low communion group on
portions of the California Personality Inventory (CPI) (Gough, 1957), the Personality Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1966), and the ACL. On the ACL, the high agency-high communion group used more favorable and less unfavorable adjectives, reported better personal adjustment, and were higher in achievement, endurance, intraception, nurturance, affiliation, heterosexual interests, exhibitionism, and dominance. They also scored as less in need of succorance and abasement. On the CPI, the two groups differed on a factor measuring "mature responsibility," and on well-being, responsibility, socialization, self-control, and tolerance for others. The POI reliably separated the high agency individuals from the high communal individuals on items measuring inner-directedness, desire for independent responsibility, self-actualizing value, spontaneity (agency group higher than communion group), feeling reactivity, and lack of assertion (communion group higher than agency group). The ACL also differentiated between agentic and communal groups, with the former scoring as more self-confident, higher in achievement, exhibitionism, autonomy, aggression, and dominance, and lower in nurturance, self-control, succorance, abasement, and deference. The CPI produced a similar pattern, with the communal group scoring lower than the agentic group on variables related to outgoing assertiveness (less dominance, less sociability, less social presence, less self acceptance, but greater self
control). In the same study, a Nurse Practitioner Competence Scale devised by White significantly differentiated between high agency-low communion and low agency-high communion groups in terms of self-perceived competence, and also between the high communion and high agency groups on a number of other variables. No significant age, stress, developmental, motivational, or SES differences were found.

In the present investigation, the WACS was modified somewhat and presented as an alphabetized list of adjectives. Respondents were instructed not simply to check, but to indicate on a scale of 1 (never or almost never true) to 7 (always or almost always true) the extent to which each adjective is self-descriptive of themselves in general (i.e., across work and social situations), and on a separate measure, the extent to which each adjective is descriptive of their mothers.

Agency Comfort Index (ACI). Participants were asked to indicate on a 1 (never or almost never) to 7 (always or almost always) point scale the degree to which they experience comfort with regard to each adjective which they described as characteristic of themselves on the WACS. An Agency Comfort Index was derived for each participant by summing the comfort ratings on all of the self-described agentic attributes indicated as "characteristic" (i.e., those rated 5, 6, or 7, or as often, usually, or almost always true). Internal consistency of these scores was
assessed. (In a similar fashion, a Communion Comfort Index, or CCI, can be derived, but no predictions were made in this study for how CCI scores relate to other variables.)

**Mother-Daughter Agency Similarity Index (ASI).** A measure of similarity on agentic attributes between participants and their mothers (as perceived by the participants) was obtained from responses to the two WACSSs. Each participant supplied information regarding her own agency and her mother's agency on separate questionnaires. The 17 items of the two Agency scales were correlated for each participant, providing an index of how similarly the participant perceived herself and her mother.

**Dependent Variable Measures**

**Self-Esteem (SE).** Stake (1979) proposed two complementary measures of self-esteem, the Performance Self-Esteem Scale (PSES), a 40 item scale designed to measure the agentic dimension of self-esteem, and a 7 item Social Self-Esteem Scale (SSES) designed to tap communal self-esteem.

The PSES items, presented as adjectives or short phrases, refer to abilities and behaviors, and are phrased both negatively and positively. Originally consisting of 51 items derived from other self-concept measures, 46 items were retained on the basis of discriminant validity when administered to two criterion groups, and 5 more items were
deleted after a cross-validation study was completed. A final item was eliminated due to excessive redundancy with the total score. The reported index of internal consistency is high (coefficient alpha = .90). The scale has been related to a number of variables for both men and women: career motivation and perceptions of past compliments for ability and performance (Stake, 1979); dominance behavior in task-oriented dyads (Stake & Stake, 1979); and high levels of self-described "masculinity" (Orlofsky & Stake, 1981). In addition, gender differences have been obtained with men scoring significantly higher than women on the entire scale (Stake, 1979), and with upper level undergraduate men scoring significantly higher than lower level undergraduate men and all women students combined. Stake found that the PSES is unrelated to the SSBS, to defensiveness as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory "K" scale, and to general sex-role attitudes. A principal axis factor analysis revealed that the first unrotated factor accounted for 56% of the total variance, and no other item accounted for more than 5%. Thus, the PSES is taken as a unidimensional measure of agentic self-esteem.

For each item on the PSES, participants are instructed to indicate on a 7 point scale (ranging from "never or almost never true" to "always or almost always true") how they would describe themselves. A total PSES score is derived by summing the individual's responses to the
positive PSES items, summing the responses to the negative items, and subtracting the latter from the former.

In constructing the SSES, Stake (1979) rationally derived seven items to tap communal self-esteem. These items are: "Friendly, neighborly, good sense of humor, pleasant, warm, sociable, and fun to be with." These items are embedded in the PSES (Appendix F), but are scored independently. Employed by Stake (1979) as a means of assessing the discriminative validity of the PSES items, the SSES scores were found to be unaffected by performance criteria, but were consistent with social self-esteem criteria. Scores for the SSES were found to have a low positive correlation with the PSES scores (r=.27). The SSES is therefore described as a unidimensional measure of communal self-esteem.

In the present study, a total self-esteem score was derived by summing, for each participant, the PSES and SSES scores.

**Fear-of-Success (FOS).** Critical of Horner's (1968) original Fear-of-success (FOS) cue ("After first term finals, Ann finds herself at the top of her medical school class") because of its lack of ambiguity, Tresemer (1977) devised four alternative verbal stems which have been utilized in the measurement of FOS. The cues include:

1) Joan has just successfully completed her own project, which she has been working on for several months.

2) After much work, Judy has finally gotten what she
3) Judy is sitting in a chair with a smile on her face.

4) Anne seems particularly pleased.

Tresemer has argued that these cues are more characteristic of projective methods, notably the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), in providing respondents with ambiguous cues.

Horner, Tresemer, Berens, and Watson (1977) derived a numerical set of scoring categories from a series of stories collected from college students. The categories are as follows:

1) Contingent negative consequences (+2): negative outcomes in the story plot for which the actor is made somehow responsible.

2) Noncontingent negative consequences (+2): negative outcomes which bear no relationship to any characteristic or action of the actor.

3) Interpersonal engagement (+2): people are actively involved with each other in the story.

4) Relief (+1): tension in the story suddenly or magically alleviated without any effort on the part of the actor.

5) Absence of instrumental activity (+1): no statement of any instrumental act toward attaining a goal within a story.

6) Absence of mention of other persons (-2): no character or group other than the person specified in the
cue are mentioned in the story. (This category is counterindicative of FOS.)

No reliability data have been reported for this new scoring system, but the authors recommend that an interrater reliability of .85 be used as a lower limit necessary for the inclusion of the system in research.

Griffone (1977) has reported that FOS measured by this scoring system does not correlate significantly with two objective measures of FOS, The Fear of Success Questionnaire (Pappo, 1972) and the Fear of Success Scale (Zuckerman & Allison, 1976). It was also found to be uncorrelated with Alpert and Haber's Debilitating Anxiety Scales (1960), a measure of fear of failure. Orlofsky (1981) obtained significant correlations among two objective FOS measures (Good & Good, 1973; and Zuckerman & Allison, 1976) and Horner's verbal TAT cue scored with the original criteria (Horner, 1968), but the correlations were considered too small to be important. Again the TAT measure was found to be uncorrelated with fear of failure. Orlofsky has suggested that the TAT FOS measure reflects ambivalence over success rather than active avoidance of success.

Despite unresolved problems, the proposed study utilized Tresemer's four verbal cues and the revised scoring system as described above. Each participant was instructed to write four four-minute stories in response to each of the cues. Stories were scored by the investigator,
and reliability was checked by having an independent scorer, trained in the Tresemer system, rate stories from 20 participants. A FOS score was derived for each participant by summing across the six categories for each story, and across the four stories. The FOS instructions are presented in Appendix F.

**Educational Aspirations.** As part of the Personal Data Questionnaire (Appendix B), each participant was asked "What is the highest level of education you wish to complete?". The following scale was used to score responses to these items:

1- Bachelor's degree;
2- Post-graduate work, but not leading to a master's degree;
3- Master's Degree;
4- Some work towards Ph.D. or other professional degree;
5- Doctorate or other professional degree (e.g., Law, Medicine, etc.).

Originally, this index was to be combined with a measure of Career Goals, also assessed in the Personal Data Questionnaire, and scored according to an index of social status. However, the majority of the responses received were not scoreable (e.g., "my goal is to advance my present career," or "?"), and therefore the Career Goal measure was not included in the final research.
CHAPTER 3

Results

Usable data packages were received from 156 of the 410 women to whom mailed packets were sent (and delivered by the post office) for a total response rate of 38%. In my phone calls to request cooperation, the women were queried regarding their reasons for declining participation. Several noted lack of time to complete the questionnaires, and three women stated that they found the materials to be "too upsetting." Two of these had experienced recent deaths of their mothers, and the mother of the remaining woman was seriously ill. No other information is available on non-respondents.

The obtained data were analyzed in a series of stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses (MRA) using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X) (1983). The MRAs tested the extent to which the independent variables (Agency, Communion, ACI, ASI) contributed to each of the dependent variables of Self-Esteem (SE), Fear-of-Success (FOS), and Educational Goals (EG). These analyses were performed on the entire sample, as well as on the separate samples of More Advanced and Less Advanced re-entry women, to test Hypotheses I-III.
MRA's were chosen over the original MANOVA design in order to utilize the sample more fully and to take advantage of the continuous data.

To test the fourth hypothesis, the More Advanced women were compared with the Less Advanced women, by means of a series of univariate t-tests on Agency, Communion, ACI, FOS, and EG.

Respondent Characteristics

Demographic and Family Data

Age. As can be seen in Table 1, the participants ranged in age from 20 to 72 years, with a mean of 39 years. There was no significant age difference between the Less and More Advanced groups \([t(151)=0.58]\).

Marital and Family Status. Of the participants reporting marital status (\(N=155\)), 54.2% were married, 19.4% were single, 18.1% were divorced, 4.5% were widowed, and 3.8% were separated. These women reported having from 0-8 children. There was no significant difference between the Less and More Advanced groups in marital status \([\chi^2(4)=3.38]\), or in number of children \([t(153)=-1.33]\). Twenty-seven percent lived with their spouse and children, 29% lived with a spouse alone, 17% with children alone, and 3% lived with parents, while 10% lived by themselves. Six and one-half percent lived with a group, and 4% each with an unrelated woman and an unrelated man. No significant differences were found between the Less and More Advanced
groups in distribution of women among these categories
$\chi^2(4)=5.34$.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>38.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Spouse and Children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Spouse</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unrelated Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unrelated Man</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With unrelated Woman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family of Origin Data. Information regarding parents' education and occupational status is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Parents' Educational and Occupational Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less Advanced</th>
<th>More Advanced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to education, 37.4% of their fathers had less than a high school education, 31.3% completed the 12th grade, 9.5% finished some years of college, 17% received their bachelors degrees, and 4.8% completed graduate degrees. No significant differences were found between Less and More Advanced women on this variable ($\chi^2(4)=2.63$). Of the participant's mothers, 33.3% had less than a high school education, 44% had a high school diploma, 12.7% completed some work towards a bachelors degree, 7.3% received their bachelors degrees, and 2.7% completed graduate work. Less and More Advanced groups were not significantly different in terms of their mothers' educational achievements ($\chi^2(4)=2.12$).

In terms of occupational status, 28.2% of participants' fathers can be classified as having had working class occupations, 38.9% were semi-skilled, and 24.4% worked as professionals. Eight percent were retired. In comparison, 21.7% of the mothers were laborers (e.g. mill workers, domestics, etc.), 24.6% held semi-skilled positions, 7.2% worked as professionals, and 38.4% worked in the home as homemakers. Eight percent were reported as retired. Less and More Advanced groups differed neither on fathers' occupational status ($\chi^2(4)=0.54$) or on mothers' occupational status ($\chi^2(5)=4.19$).

Thus, the women participants in this study will surpass 78% of their fathers and 90% of their mothers in terms of education when they receive their bachelors degrees.
Academic Majors. Participants represented a wide variety of declared majors. As can be seen in Table 3, the fields most frequently reported were: Psychology (N=31), Business Management (N=25), and Human Studies (N=13). Psychology-related majors accounted for 48.8% of the women in this sample, while 23.4% of the women endorsed business-related majors. Malone (1983), in a comprehensive survey of CCE students, found that 27.6% of the enrolled women declared psychology-related majors, while 20% endorsed business-related majors. When the Less and More Advanced

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Fields of Study Reported by Sample of Re-entry Women</th>
<th>Less Advanced</th>
<th>More Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development/ Human Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/Family Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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groups were compared on general fields of study (Business-related, psychology-related, Humanities, and "other"), no significant differences were found \( \chi^2(3) = 6.19 \).

**Educational Status.** The women in the present sample had, at the time of participation, completed a mean of 68 credits and a median of 73 credits; they expected to take 5.9 years on the average to complete their degrees. When asked about their reasons for entrance (or re-entry) into school, their reasons included: "to further my career;" "for self-fulfillment;" "to gain further independence;" "for economic reasons;" "to get the college degree I was unable to get when I graduated from high school;" and "to provide a good model for my daughter."

**Internal Consistency and Reliability Measures**

Cronbach alphas were computed for the three measures derived from the White Agency-Communion Scale (WACS): the Agency Scale, the Communion Scale, and the Agency Comfort Index (ACI). All alpha coefficients were found to be high: .86 for the Agency Scale; .88 for the Communion Scale; and .87 for the Agency comfort Index. Inter-rater reliability on the FOS measure was found to be .93. This correlation is of sufficient magnitude to include the FOS data in the present research.
Relationships among Independent and Dependent Variables

A series of Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for the seven variables of interest [Agency (A), ACI, ASI, Communion (C), Educational Goals (EG), FOS, and Self-esteem (SE)]. These correlations are presented in Table 4. It can be seen that no significant relationships were found among the three dependent variables [\( r(\text{FOS-SE}) = .08; r(\text{EG-SE}) = .13; r(\text{FOS-EG}) = .08 \)].

Table 4
Correlations Among Independent and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>ACI</th>
<th>ASI</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>EG</th>
<th>FOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

FOS correlated significantly with ASI (\( r = .19, p < .05 \)), suggesting that high FOS is positively related to
similarity between mother and daughter in agentic attributes. The correlation, however, is very small.

Significant correlations were found between Agency and Self-esteem ($r = .71, p < .001$), ACI and Self-esteem ($r = .70, p < .001$), Communion and Self-esteem ($r = .22, p < .01$), and between Agency and ACI ($r = .92, p < .001$). ACI was also found to correlate significantly with ASI ($r = .19, p < .01$).

Educational Goals were not found to be correlated with any of the independent variables.

Predictions

It was hypothesized that when comfort with one's own agency is high, and one perceives oneself to be similar to one's mother in agency, there is a positive relationship between Agency and Self-esteem (Hypothesis I), a negative relationship between Agency and FOS (Hypothesis II), and a positive relationship between Agency and Educational Goals (Hypothesis III). It was predicted that Self-esteem and Educational Goals would be highest, but FOS would be lowest, in women describing themselves as high in Agency, high in Agency Comfort (ACI), and high in similarity to mother in agency (ASI).

Self-Esteem

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to assess the relationship between the independent
variables [Agency, Communion, Agency Comfort (ACI), Agency Similarity to Mother (ASI)] and the dependent variable Self-Esteem (SE). Table 5 summarizes these findings. When the sample as a whole was considered, the combination of Agency and ACI was found to predict Self-esteem significantly and to explain 52% of the total variance. Agency similarity (ASI) did not account for any additional variance. Most of the variance (50.5%) in Self-esteem is predicted by Agency alone.

Table 5
Regression Summary of SE Score Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE.B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R 2 (adjusted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Advanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More Advanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N=155.
b women having completed less than 73 credits.
c women having completed more than 73 credits.
For both the More and Less Advanced groups, Agency alone was correlated significantly with Self-esteem, contributing 46% of the variance for the Less Advanced and 57% of the variance for the More Advanced re-entry women. None of the other independent variables contributed to the prediction of Self-esteem for these two groups.

The data thus indicate that Self-esteem is best predicted by Agency alone. Only ACI adds somewhat to the prediction of Self-esteem for the total sample.

Fear of Success

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to assess the relationship between the independent variables [Agency, Communion, Agency Comfort (ACI)] and the dependent variable of Fear-of-Success. Table 6 summarizes these findings. It was found that ASI contributed significantly to FOS in the group as a whole and in the group of More Advanced re-entry women. No other variables contribute to the prediction of FOS. While the correlation with ASI is statistically significant, it accounts for a small percentage of the variance in FOS, three percent for the sample as a whole and six percent for the More Advanced group. The data do not support the predictions regarding the relationship between FOS and Agency or ACI.
Table 6

**Regression Summary of FOS Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE.B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More Advanced Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N=125.
b women having completed at least 73 credits.

**Educational Goals**

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed to assess the relationship between the independent variables [Agency, Communion, Agency Comfort (ACI), Agency Similarity to Mother (ASI)] and the dependent variable of Educational Goals. No significant relationships were found between any of these independent variables and Educational Goals, nor were any combination of independent variables significant in predicting Educational Goals in the group as a whole, or among the Less Advanced students or the More Advanced students treated separately. Thus, the prediction regarding the relationships among
Educational Goals, Agency, Communion, ASI, and ACI was not supported.

**Comparisons between the Less Advanced and More Advanced Student Groups**

The 77 women in the Less Advanced group (women with less than 73 credits) were compared with the 78 women in the More Advanced group (73 credits or more) on the variables of Agency, Communion, Agency Comfort (ACI), Fear-of-success (FOS), and Educational Goals by means of five univariate t-tests. It was predicted that the More Advanced group would be significantly higher than the Less Advanced group in self-descriptions of Agency, Agency Comfort, and in Educational Goals. In addition, the More Advanced group was expected to have significantly lower levels of Fear-of-Success than the Less Advanced women. No differences were predicted between these two groups on Communal attributes.

Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations on the comparison variables and the two-tailed ts. Tests assessing homogeneity of variance on all five variables were non-significant, allowing for pooling of the variances for each t-test. Less Advanced women did not differ significantly from More Advanced women on Agency, Communion, ASI, and FOS. However, a significant difference was found between the groups on Agency Comfort (ACI).
[t(153)=2.13, p<.05], with the More Advanced students reporting a significantly higher level of comfort with their agentic attributes than Less Advanced students. A significant difference was also found between these groups on Educational Goals [t(153)=2.19, p<.05]. This difference reflects higher Educational Goals by women in the More Advanced group than those in the Less Advanced group.

Thus, predictions regarding significant group differences on ACI and Educational Goals and no difference on Communion were supported, while those regarding projected differences in Agency and FOS were not.
Table 7  
Comparison Between Less and More Advanced Re-entry Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>1.30NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95.04</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Comfort Index (ACI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75.84</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.86</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>107.12</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>1.46NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>109.27</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Success (FOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.20NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a since all Fmax values are non significant, variances are pooled in the calculation of t.

*b 1=BA, 2= work towards masters degree, 3=MA, 4=work after masters, 5=doctoral level degree.

*p < .05
The present study investigated the influence of self-reported Agentic characteristics, Communal characteristics, Agency Comfort, and Agency Similarity to Mother on measures of Self-esteem, FOS, and Educational Goals. Data were gathered from a group of adult women students working towards their bachelor's degrees in a college of continuing education. Most of the women were "re-entry" college students, having been homemakers and/or employed for many years before returning to school. In addition, many of the women in the present sample came from blue collar and lower-middle-class families, and a great percentage of them will exceed their parents' educational levels when they graduate. Insofar as these women were engaged in a process of self-improvement, this sample is seen as similar to women in psychotherapy who have been described in the clinical literature as experiencing conflict over achievement and self-enhancement.

The uniqueness of the present sample must be considered in interpreting the data. The demographic characteristics of the women and their re-engagement in university-level studies sets them apart from most women
and limits the extent to which the current findings can be generalized. However, the use of such a sample provides the opportunity for testing the hypotheses of this investigation on a group of adult women in a non-clinical setting who are engaged in a process of personal change.

The findings of the present study have come from mailed questionnaires which were returned by interested respondents. The response rate was only 38% despite personal phone calls and mailed reminders from the investigator. The low rate of returns may be a function of the length of time required to complete the materials (approximately one and a half hours), the time of year (the last half of the Spring semester), and as a few non-respondents noted, the affect-arousing nature of tasks requiring one to comment on one's mother.

The issue of sample bias can be addressed by comparing the respondents to the population from which they came. Forty-nine percent of the respondents reported majoring in human service-related fields including Psychology and Human Studies. This percentage is considerably higher than the twenty-eight percent of women majoring in psychology-related fields at the College of Continuing Education (Malone, 1982). Among the respondents, 23.4% reported themselves to be business-related majors, which is similar to the 20% of CCE women students who have declared majors in these fields. The present sample is similar to the URI CCE group in age, the median of which falls in the 30-39
age group. Data on other demographic variables regarding the URI re-entry women are unavailable.

Thus, the present sample differs from the URI CCE women in general in containing a higher proportion of Psychology and Human Service-related majors, but is similar on other known demographic variables. CCE students majoring in psychology and human services were likely to have found the questionnaire materials interesting, and to have taken the time to respond. That the participants were highly motivated and interested in the study is confirmed by the many personal notes accompanying the completed materials. Over eighty requests for results were received in addition to personal wishes of good luck with the project.

With respect to the findings, the prediction that Educational goals would be related to self-reported Agency, ACI, and ASI was not supported. None of these variables either alone or in combination contributed significantly to the prediction of Educational Goals. Educational Goals were also found to be unrelated to self-reported Communion, as well as to the other dependent variables, Self-Esteem and FOS.

Also not supported was the prediction that Agency, ACI, and ASI would be negatively related to FOS. In two groups (the sample as a whole and the More Advanced group), ASI was positively correlated with FOS, but this relationship, although significant, was quite small. For
none of the groups was Agency, ACI, or Communion related to FOS. FOS was also found to be unrelated to the other dependent variable measures, Self-Esteem and Educational Goals.

Significant relationships were found, as predicted, between Self-esteem and Agency, and ACI. Neither Communion, ASI, or the other dependent variables of Educational goals or FOS were found to be significantly related to Self-esteem.

When Less Advanced and More Advanced re-entry women were compared, the More Advanced women were found to score significantly higher than Less Advanced women on ACI and Educational Goals. They did not differ on Agency, Communion, or FOS.

The present findings on Self-esteem have relevance for the alternative hypotheses that have appeared in the literature: (1) that Agency and Communion together predict Self-esteem most accurately; (2) that Agency alone is positively related to Self-esteem; and (3) that Self-esteem is negatively related to Agency in women who are in the process of increasing their agentic skills. A fourth hypothesis, proposed by the investigator, is (4) that Self-esteem is best predicted by a combination of Agency, Agency Comfort (ACI), and Agentic Similarity to Mother (ASI). The results of the present investigation support the second and fourth hypotheses. Agency alone was significantly related to Self-esteem in both the Less and
More Advanced groups of women students considered separately, while Agency and ACI significantly predicted Self-esteem in the group as a whole. All correlation coefficients were high, suggesting that Agency and ACI represent important and meaningful factors in the prediction of Self-esteem.

These data are congruent with other findings that Agentic attributes are important to Self-esteem regardless of the level of Communal characteristics (Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Lee & Scheurer, 1983; Lubinski, Tellegen, & Butcher, 1981; Orlofsky, 1977; Orlofsky & Stake, 1981; Silvern & Ryan, 1979; Tayler & Hall, 1982). However, the present results also indicate that self-reported comfort with one's agentic attributes is an additional factor contributing to Self-esteem.

That Agency and Self-esteem are so highly correlated is not surprising. Inspection of the items composing the present Agency and Self-esteem scales reveals that ten adjectives are common to both. Eight of the Agency scale items appear on the Performance Self-esteem subscale of the Self-esteem measure, and the remaining two appear on the Social Self-esteem scale. While Communion is significantly and positively correlated with Self-esteem, and while the assessment of communal aspects of self-esteem contributes to the overall Self-esteem score, the present data strongly suggest that self-assertion and mastery far outweigh the communal aspects of cooperation and interpersonal
involvement in determining the level of Self-esteem. Thus, the results presented here indicate that Agentic characteristics have greater relevance than Communal characteristics for Self-esteem.

Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel (1970), Kenworthy (1979), and Miller (1976), have suggested that the aspects of personality traditionally associated with women, i.e., Communal attributes, are less highly valued than those traditionally associated with men, or Agentic attributes. Perhaps women have internalized these social values and therefore feel better about their independence and autonomy than about their relatedness and connection. Such social values are clearly reflected in the Self-esteem instrument used in the present research. Of the 47 items used to measure Self-esteem, 40 assess Agentic competencies while only 7 tap the Communal aspects of Self-esteem. Thus, almost six times more items are devoted to the measurement of Agency than of Communion.

Agency and ACI were found to be highly correlated, suggesting that these two variables measure the same characteristic. Other evidence, however, casts some doubt on this conclusion. Comparisons between the Less and More Advanced re-entry women revealed no significant difference on Agency, but ACI was significantly greater among the More Advanced women. The obtained data are cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, but suggest that as the re-entry women progressed in their academic programs, there were no
changes in Agency, but they become significantly more comfortable with agentic attributes. These results suggest that ACI measures an aspect of Agency different from a pure self-report of Agentic attributes, and that future research might well utilize such a measure and explore relationships with other variables.

The lack of significant correlations between ASI and any other measures suggests that similarity to mother in agency is not an important variable in the prediction of Self-esteem, FOS, or Educational Goals. These data are clearly at variance with the literature that describes women who surpass their mothers in Agency and competence as experiencing guilt and depression (Schecter, 1979; Stiver, 1983; Thurman, 1982; Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson, and Miller, 1979). The present findings do not support the clinical observations that have emphasized the importance of mother-daughter similarity, and suggest that the phenomenon noted in women psychotherapy clients does not occur in a more general sample of women. The extraordinary concerns about relationships with their mothers expressed by women in psychotherapy may relate to particular difficulties with feeling competent that bring them into therapy originally. In a sample of women furthering their educations and careers, the issues regarding loyalty to the mother and fears of betraying her as one improves oneself are not prominent insofar as they do not seem to affect measured Self-esteem levels.
One could argue that the measures employed in the current investigation do not allow assessment of the more subtle aspects of, and fluctuations in, Self-esteem. In addition, the present research design which uses group comparisons and cross-sectional methods rather than more indepth longitudinal case studies may not be sensitive to subtle changes in the measured variables over time. Agency similarity between mother and daughter may be only one aspect of a very complicated relationship, and one that is less important than other aspects such as a mother's encouragement of her daughter's agentic development. Thus, the mother's influence on her daughter's development may be important, but simple similarity on Agentic characteristics may not be the key to such influence, assuming that such similarity was adequately measured by the present ASI.

Many of the writers cited previously (Altman & Grossman, 1977; Baruch, 1976; Bielby, 1978; Schecter, 1979; Walters, 1982) have suggested that a mother's attitudes towards her own agentic attributes (i.e., her comfort with them), and not simply her agentic characteristics themselves, may influence her daughter's achievement and work effectiveness. Thus, while data were collected on mother-daughter similarity in agency (ASI) as reported by daughter, perhaps it would have been better to inquire about mother's agentic comfort and maternal encouragement of agentic development in her daughter.

One final aspect of the lack of support for the
predictions coming from the clinical literature must be considered. The writers who have suggested that as women become more agentic, they become distressed, anxious, and fearful that they are becoming selfish and will hurt others, especially their mothers, all come from a psychodynamic clinical tradition which places great emphasis on the role parents, especially mothers, play in their children's identities. These writers also share the perspective that the special complexities of the mother-daughter relationship contribute to the socialization of women as persons who value affiliation, connectedness, and closeness, and who are distressed by competition, achievement, and individual assertion. Perhaps such assumptions have led these writers to draw conclusions which are unwarranted and which reflect their theoretical biases.

Bias in psychotherapy has been found in relation to gender, race, and social class. Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970), asked clinicians to describe a healthy, mature adult, man, and woman. Results demonstrated that clinical judgments of healthy women differed from those of healthy men in that the former were described as more submissive, less independent, more excitable, more emotional, less objective, and more uncomfortable about being aggressive. A "double standard" of mental health was evidenced by the finding that the clinicians' descriptions of healthy men and healthy adults
were similar, while healthy women were described differently, and considered to be less healthy than the healthy adult. Recent literature reviews (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz, 1972; Sherman, 1980; Whitley, 1979) have concluded that clearly defined sex-role stereotypes for women and men persist in the general population, as well as among trained professional clinicians, and that agentic characteristics are less positively valued for women than communal competencies. It is possible, then, that as women clients move beyond sex-role stereotypical attitudes and behaviors and display the more non-traditional behavior of achievement orientation and assertion, they and their therapists misinterpret the source of experienced anxiety. The dysphoria of these clients may be due not to fear of the destructive power of their "aggression" as they differentiate themselves from their primary caretakers, but to the difficulties associated with personal change that is not socially supported.

The lack of meaningful relationships between the independent variables in this investigation and either FOS or Educational Goals is also of interest. FOS was found to correlate significantly only with ASI, while Educational Goals was significantly related to none of the other measures, although it reliably distinguished between the Beginning and Advanced students. These findings provide support for the research of Orlofsky (1981) and Zuckerman
and Wheeler (1975) who reported no relationship between Agency or Communion and FOS. The lack of a significant correlation between FOS and Educational Goals provides support for Orlofsky's argument that TAT-measured FOS assesses ambivalence over success rather than actual avoidance. TAT measured FOS does not appear to be related to goal-setting in terms of educational achievement.

A negative relationship between FOS and ASI was predicted, but a positive relationship was obtained in the present study. However, since only six percent of the variance in FOS was accounted for by ASI, the latter variable does not seem to have much practical significance.

One additional comment about the FOS measure employed here (Tresemer, 1977) relates to the scoring system. While Tresemer has suggested that the researcher tally the scores from each of the four projective stories to arrive at a participant's FOS index, this method is problematic in that much of the variability in a participant's responses is lost. For example, a participant may receive positive FOS scores for the presence of several themes on one story, but may earn FOS "deductions" on another (e.g., for material scoreable as "absence of other persons"). Such a phenomenon, where positives and negatives cancel each other out, may also occur within a single story. Perhaps a better measure might derive the FOS score by accumulating points for each category both within and across stories. In light of these measurement problems, and the lack of
obtained relationships with the other variables measured in this study, it is tentatively concluded that FOS is not useful in understanding changes in Agentic characteristics. Furthermore, Gelbort and Winer (1985) have reported empirical evidence for the general lack of validity of the FOS measure, and they concluded while there is intuitive appeal to the FOS concept, valid and reliable measurement (even when utilizing objective FOS measures) is not currently possible.

None of the measures of personal characteristics (Agency, Communion, or ACI) or mother-daughter similarity (ASI) were found to be related to Educational Goals. Since the present sample is composed of older women with families, other factors, such as family income, availability of time required to complete an advanced degree, and the woman's age, may have more bearing on educational aspirations. These women, who are on the average twenty years older than the typical undergraduate who enters college, may have a different perspective on their lives and goals. Since they expect to take six years to complete their bachelors degrees, pursuit and completion of an advanced degree in one's late 40's may depend heavily on the more practical factors noted above.

Comparisons between the Less and More Advanced women were made to assess what, if any, changes occur as women commit themselves to an educational process which presumably includes self-improvement. While the cross-
sectional method employed here cannot provide data on changes in individuals over time, these data can provide the basis for speculating about developmental changes in women who re-enter universities to complete their educations. The More Advanced women were found to be significantly higher than Less Advanced women in ACI and in Educational Goals, as predicted, and not to differ in Communion, also as predicted. Not supported were predictions that More Advanced women would be higher in Agency and lower in FOS.

Of particular interest is the lack of significant difference between the groups on Agency, especially in light of the significant difference on ACI. Although the women more advanced in their programs did not describe themselves as more agentic than Less Advanced students, they did report significantly greater comfort with these attributes. Since the major difference between these groups is the amount of progress towards their goal and the amount of time spent in an environment encouraging agentic competence, it appears that these environmental factors contribute heavily to obtained increments in agentic comfort.

Women who were more advanced in their programs planned to pursue higher levels of education than women beginning their educations. This result may indicate that when one's goal is almost attained, one tends to set one's next goal higher, perhaps as a function of having one's goal
within reach. However, the real significance of this finding is questionable since both groups endorse goals in the category of "work towards a master's degree." Thus, while significant differences were found, they may not actually translate into meaningful differences in attained levels of education.

Summary and Conclusions

Educational Goals and FOS were not significantly predicted by the independent variables investigated in this study: self-reported Agency, Communion, Agency Comfort, and Agentic similarity to Mother. The results of analyses on Self-esteem, however, clearly indicated a positive relationship between this variable and Agency and ACI. Agency comfort (ACI) was found to overlap considerably with Agency, but to contribute independently to the prediction of Self-esteem, and was significantly higher in More Advanced than in Less Advanced students while Agency was not. Since ACI seems to tap an aspect of Agency different from a simple self-description of Agentic attributes, this variable might well be useful in future research.

A new variable, derived from concepts in the clinical literature, ASI or similarity to mother in agency, was not found to contribute to the prediction of Self-esteem, FOS, or Educational Goals. This argues against theories such as espoused by Schecter (1979) and Zilbach, Notman, Nadelson,
& Miller (1979) that differentiation from and surpassing one's mother in achievement and agentic competence is an anxiety-provoking experience for women in general.

Several interpretations of the negative findings regarding the role of ASI have been offered. These include the measurement of ASI as derived from mother-daughter similarity rather than maternal attitudes toward achievement; and the use of a large N in the present investigation which may not be suitable for examining subtle nuances in personal change and development. The dysphoria expressed by individual women in psychotherapy may represent, like Gilligan (1977, 1982) and others suggest, a temporary developmental shift which goes unnoticed when large groups of women are studied, and gross measures of personality may not be sensitive to the brief psychological changes that mark transition. Another interpretation of the present findings is that the difficulties articulated by the women in psychotherapy may be characteristic of women who are particularly sensitive to the transition involved in achieving more than one's mother. Women not in psychotherapy may not experience such conflicts and concerns. Finally, it was suggested that clinicians may bring training or cultural biases to the interpretation of their women clients' distress when agentic competencies emerge. Assumptions about women's fear of their "aggression" and guilt over betrayal of their mothers may be related to the assumptions made by
clinicians that women are more comfortable being affiliative and cooperative. Attributing anxiety over increased agentic attributes to intrapsychic dynamics may be less accurate than recognizing that personal change in non-traditional directions is likely to meet with negative social consequences which may be anticipated by women in the process of change.

Future research might well test some of the interpretations presented here regarding contradictory findings from the clinical and empirical literatures on the impact of maternal characteristics and attitudes on their daughters' development, and the role of agentic competence in Self-esteem. A sample of women in psychotherapy might be compared directly with a non-clinical sample chosen for its involvement in processes of personal change by means of longitudinal, case study techniques to assess gains with respect to Self-esteem, personal relationships, and social expectation.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS

Dear:

I am a doctoral student in psychology, currently working on my dissertation. The project I am working on is concerned with adult women's perceptions and development. I am writing to you because you are enrolled in a degree-granting program at the College of Continuing Education at the University of Rhode Island.

I would like your help in my research. Your participation requires only that you fill out the enclosed questionnaires, which should take approximately one hour. I realize that you are probably involved in many activities with little time to spare, but I believe that you will find the questions on the enclosed surveys interesting. And your answers are very necessary for my research.

I hope that you will take the time to respond honestly and carefully. A separate sheet is included in the package of materials for your comments.

This project has been approved by both the Human Subjects Committee at URI, as well as a Review Committee at CCE. Be assured that you will never be identified by name, and that your answers are absolutely confidential. You have been assigned a number which will be applied to your information.

If you agree to participate, please sign and return the consent form below.

I have enclosed an envelope in which you can return the materials and consent form to me. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 617-738-4790. Thank you very much, in advance.

Sincerely,

Robin Hasenfeld

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understand the conditions for the research, and I agree to participate.

Date:_____________ Name:__________________________
APPENDIX B
PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

MARITAL STATUS: ____________________ AGE: ________

NUMBER OF CHILDREN: _________________

HOUSEHOLD ARRANGEMENT:
    living alone ________
    with another woman ________
    with spouse ________
    with children ________
    with man (not spouse) ________
    with group ________

DATE OF ENTRY INTO CCE AS A MATRICULATED STUDENT: ________

NUMBER OF CREDITS COMPLETED (not counting current semester): ________

ANTICIPATED GRADUATION DATE: ________

DEGREE SOUGHT: ________ MAJOR: ____________

WHY DID YOU DECIDE TO ENTER (or re-enter) SCHOOL? ________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION YOU WISH TO COMPLETE?
    Bachelor's degree ________ Masters Degree ________ Discipline: ________
    Post-graduate work without Masters ________
    Advanced Professional Degree (please specify medicine, law, (etc.)_________
    Doctoral Degree ________ Discipline: ________

HAVE YOU APPLIED FOR ADMISSION TO AN ADVANCED ACADEMIC PROGRAM? ________ Please comment: ________

WHAT IS YOUR CAREER OBJECTIVE (within the next ten years)? ________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

PARENTAL DATA:

Level of education attained: FATHER MOTHER

Occupation: ________ ________
APPENDIX C

White Agency - Communion Scale (WACS)
(Personal Attributes of Mother)

On the following page there is a list of personality traits which are useful in describing oneself and others. As you look at each adjective on this list, please consider the extent to which it describes your mother (or any woman who was in this role for you) in general (i.e., in many different situations), and indicate with an X on a scale of 1 to 7 how characteristic of her this adjective is.

Place an X on:

1 if the adjective is never or almost never true of her;
2 if it is usually not true;
3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true;
4 if it is occasionally true;
5 if it is often true;
6 if it is usually true;
7 if it is always or almost always true.

Example: If you feel that it is sometimes but infrequently true that your mother is "warm," place an X on 3 on the scale as follows:

1. warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

### YOUR MOTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td>individualistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adventurous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affectionate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>organized</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear thinking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>persevering</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>self-confident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>confident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>sharp-witted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprising</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair-minded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>thoughtful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>tactful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-natured</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>standing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>warm</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

White Agency - Communion Scale (WACS)
(Personal Attributes of Self)

On the following page there is a list of personality traits which are useful in describing oneself and others. As you look at each adjective on this list, please consider the extent to which it describes you in general (i.e., in many different situations), and indicate with an X on a scale of 1 to 7 how characteristic of you this adjective is.

Place an X on:

1 if the adjective is never or almost never true of you;
2 if it is usually not true;
3 if it is sometimes, but infrequently true;
4 if it is occasionally true;
5 if it is often true;
6 if it is usually true;
7 if it is always or almost always true.

Next consider how satisfied or comfortable you are with this description, and indicate this on the second scale. This time, circle the number on the scale that represents how comfortable you feel with this personal characteristic.

Circle:

1 if you are never or almost never comfortable;
2 if you are usually not comfortable;
3 if you are sometimes, but infrequently comfortable;
4 if you are occasionally comfortable;
5 if you are often comfortable;
6 if you are usually comfortable;
7 if you are always or almost always comfortable.

Example: If you feel that it is sometimes, but infrequently true that you are "aggressive," place an X on the 3 on the first scale. If you are usually comfortable or satisfied with your "aggressiveness," circle 6 on the second scale as follows:

1. aggressive 1 2 X 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>How Characteristic of You</th>
<th>Degree of Comfort with This Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adaptable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adventurous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affectionate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear-thinking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprising</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair-minded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-natured</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individualistic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organized</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persevering</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-confident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp-witted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughtful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tactful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Performance Self-Esteem Scale (PSES) and Social Self-Esteem Scale (SSES)

Please use the following adjectives to describe yourself on a scale of 1 to 7.

Place an X on:

1 if the trait is never or almost never true of you;
2 if it is usually not true;
3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true;
4 if it is occasionally true;
5 if it is often true;
6 if it is usually true;
7 if it is always or almost always true.

+productive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+creative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
able to give orders 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
logical 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+neighborly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-tough 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+indecisive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
self-reliant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
good sense of humor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+pleasant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+has initiative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
willing to take risks 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+self-conscious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-powerful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+pessimistic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-individualistic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
makes mistakes when flustered 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-sociable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
yielding 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+fun to be with 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-forceful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-unstable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+assertive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+clever 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-self-critical 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-nervous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+self-sufficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+likes responsibility 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+feels good about accomplishments 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+competent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-easily hurt 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-inefficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+enjoys a challenge 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+able to put ideas across 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+acts as a leader 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+persuasive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+good business sense 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+willing to take a stand 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-gullible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+ambitious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+businesslike 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+headed for success 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-avoids competition 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
-lacks confidence 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Note. Items designated with a "+" are scored in the positive direction and items designated with a "-" are scored in the negative direction. Items with no designation are Social Self-Esteem items.
APPENDIX F

FEAR OF SUCCESS INSTRUCTIONS AND CUES

Instructions: Please read the following sentences, one at a time. In the space provided below each, write a story about the sentence, including answers to the following questions:

1. What is the character thinking and feeling?
2. What happened before?
3. What will happen after?

In other words, tell a story with a beginning, middle, and an end, about each sentence.

Please spend no more that four minutes on each story. Time is very important. If you have a stopwatch available, please use it to time yourself. If not, a regular watch will do. Again, please limit your response to four minutes.

1. Joan has just successfully completed her own project, which she has been working on for several months.

2. After much work, Jane has finally gotten what she wanted.

3. Judy is sitting on a chair with a smile on her face.

4. Anne seems particularly pleased.