

AD 725951

Reproduced by  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
Springfield, Va. 22151

Department of Psychology  
State University of New York at Albany

FINAL REPORT

Fear of Failure  
and  
General Achievement Behavior

August 1971

Principal Investigator: Richard C. Teevan  
State University of New York at Albany

Prepared for the Group Psychology Branch, Office of Naval Research,  
Contract No. N00014-70-0021, NR 171-803

A

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A  
Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

D D C  
RECEIVED  
JUN 25 1971  
RECEIVED  
C

21

In January of 1969, D. Van Nostrand-Reinhold published a book titled: Fear of Failure. This book was the result of Contract No. Nonr 3591 (01) NR 171-803 and brought our work up to date through 1967. This final report presents a brief skeleton of the research program documented in Fear of Failure and in Technical Reports #1-23. The remainder of the report presents an account of the research program which continued from 1967 through August 1971 under contract No. N00014-70<sup>A</sup>0021, NR 171-803.

The measurement of human motives has taken many forms. One of the most innovative and successful approaches to quantifying human motives is that of McClelland (1953). McClelland was dissatisfied with laboratory investigations of human motivation employing such variables as hunger and pain. He observed that, while motives such as these are amenable to operational definition, manipulation, and measurement, they are not "the kind of motives which actually are important in the lives of human adults." (McClelland, 1953, p. 319-320). The problem as McClelland saw it was lack of ingenuity.

In developing a methodology for the investigation of "secondary drives" McClelland drew from many areas in psychology. He made the assumption that the effects of motivation could be seen in fantasy. This was based on Freud's work on dreams, on years of psychoanalytic experience, and on the success of projective techniques. McClelland employed modified version of the Thematic Apperception Test (Murray 1938) as the stimulus for fantasy. The method of content analysis (Berelson, 1952) was utilized to score the fantasy productions for the presence of the effects of motivation. Drawing from Murray's (1938) conception of motives as needs and presses, McClelland began by arousing subjects need for achievement. This was based on animal work which suggested that

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D		
<i>Security Classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified</i>		
1. ORIGINATOR'S ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Dr. Richard C. Teevan Psychology Department State University of New York at Albany		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified 2b. GROUP
3. REPORT TITLE Fear of Failure and General Achievement Behavior		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report - Final Report September 1969 to August 1971		
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) Richard C. Teevan		
6. REPORT DATE August, 1971	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 18	7b. NO. OF REFS
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. N00014-70-0021, NR 171-803	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
b. PROJECT NO A	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
c.		
d.		
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Standard List		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Department of Navy Office of Naval Research Group Psychology Branch
13. ABSTRACT This final report is a summary of the work done on the contract for the time of its life. It documents research which resulted in the development and validation of the Hostile Press measure, a measure of avoidance motivation in achievement situations (fear of failure). Research which was generated by a network of theory surrounding the construct is also reported. Variables relevant to achievement situations which were investigated included: aspiration setting, risk taking, decision making, expectation, conformity, strategy and persistence. Methodological variables investigated included: method of arousal, response mode and type of stimuli. Other variables which were investigated include: self-concept, values, cognitive controls and locus of control.  A paradigm for a multi-motive analysis of human motivation is presented and illustrated with research on leadership. Research is summarized in the presentation of a profile of persons highly motivated by fear of failure.		

14 KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
avoidance conformity decision defenses engagement expectation fear of failure hostile press leadership level of aspiration need achievement need affiliation need power outcome performance task TAT						

"motives could be experimentally aroused and their intensity controlled by manipulating arousal conditions" (McClelland 1953, p. 3). The effects of this arousal were sought in the analysis of the content of the fantasy productions. The result was the development and validation of a measure of need achievement (NAch).

The utility of McClelland's innovative paradigm for measuring human motivation is apparent in that it has provided the model for measures of other motives. Shipley and Veroff (1952) developed a measure for need for Affiliation. Veroff (1957) continued with a system for measuring need for power which was modified by Winter (1968). A measure of fear of failure (Birney et. al. 1969) began our own program of research.

The work of McClelland and his associates had suggested that there was probably both negative and positive motivation operating in the achievement situation. Some of the persons were working positively because they wanted whatever rewards were available in the situation but others were working only because, if they didn't work, they would fail. This is a key point since, if one does not recognize what these latter persons are trying to do, their behavior sometimes makes little sense. They are not trying to succeed; they are merely trying not to fail.

Some work in this area was done prior to this contract. An attempt was made to find a way of measuring "fear of failure" through use of the McClelland, et. al. measure of Need for Achievement (NAch). Most of these attempts failed and those which did not fail had very limited success. The initial work on this contract was therefore directed at building a measure of fear of failure (FF) which would not be tied to the NAch system. The measure that was developed, as a matter of fact, did not correlate at all with NAch. It took quite awhile to arrive at a measure of fear of failure, because of certain false assumptions (for instance that a need system of measurement for fear of failure such as the one used for NAch should be

employed). Finally a modified Thematic Apperception Test was developed which seemed to have promise. The kinds of stories written by persons high in the measure of fear of failure, suggest press rather than need (Murray 1938). The measure was accordingly called Hostile Press (HP). Persons high on the measure wrote stories in which the central figure was being acted upon (rather than acting) by the environment and the environment itself was hostile to the central figure.

Once the measure had been developed and tested out on level of aspiration tasks, a shift study was completed. This requires some explanation. As far back as 1930 Hoppe had speculated that persons on a level of aspiration task were showing a kind of fear of failure. Ever since then, it has been argued that persons who set a negative LA (set their "expect" score below the preceding actual score) and those who set an unrealistically high "expect" score were actually defending themselves against failure rather than trying to succeed at the task. Persons high in HP fit this description on LA tasks. In a shift study, one selects two equal groups, gives one a "neutral" TAT and the other an "aroused" TAT and then looks at the difference in total score and also the difference in each of the category scores. If the arousal takes, and if the measure is a good one, the score should go up in the aroused condition. The HP system passes this test.

A program of research was begun to see if the measure made sense in terms of other things. The measure of fear of failure, if valid, should be related in certain ways to other measures and to actual behavior. For instance, a person who is afraid of failure -- whose only goal in an achievement task is to avoid failure -- should not seek out achievement tasks. As a matter of fact he should avoid them whenever possible. A study was conducted asking for volunteers. Individuals scoring high in HP volunteered less often than those scoring low. But what would happen

if the persons were forced into the situation? If they were required to show up, but given some control over the situation, they did whatever made sense to them in order not to fail. Some used defensive tactics on the LA task. Some did not try. Some denigrated the tasks. The high HP persons were significantly more defensive than the lows. But suppose persons were required to participate in the situation and the experimenter decides who succeeds and fails. It seemed that the best situation of this type (one in which no real escape was possible) took place in the public schools. Several checks were run on the correlation between grades and HP score. Since the only way the person in a school situation could be sure of not failing was to work hard to succeed that is what the high HP person should do. In every case this prediction was borne out. The high HP person had higher grades than the lows.

The research program then returned to the area of level of aspiration. A new measure of LA was needed since every method asked the person for a single expect score. Is it possible that when he gives this score that he is really using a range of scores for an expect and that he only gives the single score because that is what is required? If so, is there any advantage in using some kind of range? Initially research was designed to ascertain whether a range made any sense in terms of the subject response. The subject was asked for the usual expect score: then asked how high a score he could get without being surprised; then asked for the lowest score he could get without being surprised. It was assumed that any score within that range really confirmed his expectation and any score outside it disconfirmed the expectation. For this reason the range was called a "confirming interval" (CI). In the first study it was argued that persons receiving scores above the CI should feel pleased, those receiving scores below the CI should feel displeased and those receiving scores within the CI should feel neutral (or slightly pleased since they made a correct prediction). It was also argued that

the CI should decrease with experience with the task. These are both very common sense predictions and both were borne out. Now that some confidence in the CI as a measure had been developed, we related it to HP. The prediction was that the HP Persons would use the CI as a defense and thus would have wider CIs than would the lows. Obviously the wider the CI, the less chance of failing. This prediction was also borne out. Finally, a study which predicted that the more important an ability to a given person the more experience he would (in general) have with that ability was designed. Since the more experience a person has with a task, the narrower his CI, then the more important the ability, the narrower the CI associated with that ability. This proved out. Then in the HP dimension was added. Although in general the more important the ability, the narrower the CI remember that the more important the ability the more important it would be not to fail at that ability. Thus the more important to defend. It had been shown that the high HP person used a wide CI as a defense. Therefore, within the population of high HP persons, the more important the ability is the wider the CI should be. Using only the top half of the HP distribution this hypothesis was tested and the prediction was found to be correct. This work added a potentially valuable measure of level of aspiration to the literature and supported the validity of the measure of fear of failure.

The next area of interest was that of conformity. The idea that the high HP person had his anchors in the external world rather than the internal world provided a point of departure. McClelland and his associates had argued the persons high on NAch were internally oriented: that their rewards and punishments were awarded by themselves. The person high on HP was oriented towards other people: they awarded the rewards and in TAT stories the environment is acting on the person rather

than (as in the NACH system) the person acting on the environment. Two studies were run and both of them verified the hypothesis -- the person high in HP was externally oriented. Now if the high HP person was externally oriented did this fact have any implications for conformity? Since the external world (and usually this meant persons) controlled the reinforcements then the person would be loath to disagree with the controllers. Several studies were run on conformity vs HP and supported the prediction that high HP persons did indeed conform more than the lows but that it seemed to be a personal kind of conformity. In other words then he would not necessarily conform to the standards of a culture if the persons close to him were not so conforming. He conforms to the persons he sees as controlling the reinforcements in his world. One of the interesting findings here is that the Viet-Nam protesters and draft card burners tend to be high HP. They conform fiercely to their small groups while conforming not at all to the larger society. Here is a whole host of experimental problems about the conditions under which conformity takes place. To paraphrase an old saying, it is very important to note who is conforming to what and to whom.

All of this led to wondering about the genesis of HP. It would seem that a variable which is this consistent in elementary school, high school and college students could be found in some early parental behavior patterns. To begin with, a technique quite like the one used by Winterbottom to explore the early years of the person high in NACH was used. Parents who put accent on early achievement tended to have children who were high in either HP or NACH. If they did not put any accent on early achievement they tended to have children low in both motives. This suggested some differences in the reinforcement pattern. Mothers who said that they were neutral when the child came up to expectations but punishing when he did not tended to have children high in HP. If they said that they were

rewarding when the child came up to expectations and neutral when the child did not, they tended to have children low in HP. If they said they were punishing when the child did not come up to expectations and rewarding when he did, there was no tendency in terms of HP. This study was replicated from the child's point of view (the achievement accent and reinforcement pattern questions were asked of the college student) and came out with the same results. This made more sense out of the earlier results when volunteers were asked for and found that the high HP persons did not volunteer. It would seem that they would feel that an achievement situation is a place in which they can fail (punished for not coming up to expectations) but could not succeed (neutral when they did come up to expectations).

Much of the material already mentioned leads one to think that the high HP person might be fairly miserable in this culture and maybe even less stable than the lows. One study which bears directly upon this point, and this involves accepting an assumption of Rogers. He argues, using the Stephenson Q-Sort, that if persons sort for their ideal self and their real self that a large discrepancy relates to poor mental health. A study using a fairly large N found that high HP persons tended to have larger discrepancies. The word "tended" in this report means, in every case, that the findings were significant at least the .05 level of confidence.

The rest of the book, *Fear of Failure*, is taken up with discussions of the Heckhausen system, the Atkinson system, and theorizing about what it all means and how the systems relate. Although this work was also done on this contract, it is impossible to reproduce it here without going into more length than should be done in a report such as this. Anyone wishing to see material should examine the book. It is also obvious that in the condensation of the above material references should have been complete had the book not existed. However, it is easy to trace down any of the references through the use of the book.

Up to this point no physiological studies had been done, mainly due to a lack of facilities. In Technical Report #24, Fischer and Teevan report the first study having to do with HP and heart rate in a stressful situation. It was hypothesized that since high FF individuals defend against the perception of their own failure by projecting their inadequacies upon the environment, they would react to stress with patterns of autonomic responsivity similar to those of "anger-out" individuals as defined by Funkenstein, King and Drolette. The results showed no mean differences between the high and low groups but the high FF group was significantly more variable in heart rate levels than the low FF group. These results were interpreted in terms of the possible defensive postures available to the high FF individual in achievement situations.

Throughout this contract a good deal of time and effort was spent trying to improve and refine the measure. Most of these were written up in unpublished papers, though Technical Report #13 reports on one such effort. Technical Report #25 tries to get at the effect of aroused testing conditions on the measurement of fear of failure. For a long time there has been a controversy among members of the groups who have worked with NACH and HP as to whether the aroused measure or the neutral measure was the best one to use when predicting other variables. No closure had ever been achieved and the studies necessary to achieve this closure have just not been done. In Technical Report #25, Teevan and Dapra did an exploratory analysis of TATs given to the same subjects under neutral and aroused conditions. The HP scores increased significantly under the aroused condition (thus again replicating the original shift study) but further analysis showed that the scores of subjects categorized low HP under the neutral condition increased significantly under the aroused condition while the scores of subjects categorized as high HP under the

neutral condition significantly decreased under the aroused condition. The subjects categorized as high HP under the neutral condition still had higher HP scores under the aroused condition than did the subjects who were categorized as low HP under the neutral condition, but this raised the question of what would happen under fairly extreme arousal conditions. The results were discussed in terms of the FF subjects interpretation of the situation and his defensive posture (under arousal he may not even want to write about such things -- see Clark's findings about sex on the TAT).

In 1968 one of the graduate students working on this contract was a former Marine captain just back from Viet Nam. His rapport with the ROTC at Bucknell was excellent and this led to a study which had been contemplated for some time, but it had not become salient enough to get done. In the very nature theorizing about FF were some assumptions about the relationship of HP to leadership. Teevan and Dapra used the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire of Fleishman and the subject's leadership evaluations from ROTC summer camp as their measures of leadership and ran these against HP. In Technical Report #26 they reported that FF individuals tended not to structure their own roles or the roles of their subordinates toward goal attainment. Also, they did not show the ability to take necessary and appropriate actions on their own during summer training. The findings were discussed in terms of the FF individual's concern over the opinion of others and his need to submit to gain approval. This suggests, then, that high HP persons make less than ideal leaders, at least in the military situation.

Ever since the Teevan and McGhee (Technical Report #15) and Teevan and Fisher (unpublished paper, Bucknell University) work on the development of HP, interest in the variables relating to the growth of HP had been building. In Technical Report #27, Dapra and Teevan found some significant relationships between family relations variables and HP and also between socioeconomic status and HP. For example, HP is related to the parent's over insistence on achievement (see Technical Report #15 for more on this variable). It is also true that parents who over insist on

achievement and who tend to have a lower occupational or educational status seem to foster HP motivation. The rest of the relationships were derived from multiple correlations and should be checked in the Report itself -- it would take too much space to report on them here.

It would seem that high and low HP persons would differ in terms of the ideal conditions for work. It had been shown that high HP persons should prefer those situations which do not lead to easy comparisons between themselves and others. Thus one might expect them to prefer to work in isolation if working with others will expose them to such comparisons. In Technical Report #28, Portnoy and Teevan tested this hypothesis and found that high HP persons prefer to work in isolation but low HP individuals prefer to work in a communal setting. These results were discussed in terms of the relationship between the social contingencies of different work conditions and the high HP person's fear of failing in the eyes of others.

As discussed in the book, Fear of Failure, there are at least three measures of FF extant at the present time. Research on the similarities and differences had not been done. Fischer and Birney made a beginning in comparing our measure with that of Heckhausen (which was developed and validated in Germany). In Technical Report #29, they tested three hypotheses: I. That FM (Furchtmitterflog -- Heckhausens measure of fear of failure) and HP subjects would have scores indicating internal and external orientations respectively. II. That FM and HP subjects would express these orientations as well as indicate relative approach and avoidance tendencies, respectively, in response to questionnaires concerning a real achievement situation. III. That HP subjects, being avoidant of achievement situations, would not persist as long as FM subjects at a task which they thought to be difficult, but possible (which, in reality, was unsolvable). These hypotheses were based on the idea that HP is an achievement situation avoidance motive while FM is a motive which leads one

to accept or approach the achievement situation but to work within that system to avoid failure rather than to achieve success. The first hypothesis was not confirmed. The other two were confirmed. It was concluded that the general differences between HP and FM subjects which had been hypothesized had a good degree of validity but that the extent of the effect of HP subject's need for social approval had been underestimated.

One of the studies which led to the postulation of a fear of failure person in the achievement situation was that of Atkinson, who found that subjects in the middle third of the NACH distribution tended to remember completed tasks on the Zeigarnik while high NACH persons tended to remember the incomplete tasks. Moot and Teevan (Technical Report #30) replicated this study and added in the HP variable. They found that Atkinson's results replicated, but that his interpretation of the results of the middle third on NACH didn't fit because the HP measure of FF did not relate to the middle third on NACH and also the HP measure related to the Zeigarnik in the same way as did the NACH measure. Moot and Teevan explained this by the difference between fear of failure and the reaction after failure. They argued that the high HP person avoided achievement situations because of his past history, which included failures. Before he failed, he would avoid the situation if possible. After failing, he might well remember the failures since this reinforced his behavior of avoiding achievement situations.

A natural extension of the work on conformity seemed to be the work being done in hypnosis. The literature on hypnosis was examined to try to relate it to the ideas of HP. Since the high HP person was externally oriented, he should be more susceptible to hypnosis than the lows. However, a look at the literature on hypnosis reversed this idea. Hilgard's description of the person who is susceptible to hypnosis

argues that the general outline of the susceptible person is one who can be a responsible leader or follower, one who could work with those under him and those over him without hostility, one who could take the initiative in leadership.

Since Teevan and Hartsough (Technical Report #5) found that the high HP person tended to show hostility toward authority and Teevan and Dapra (Technical Report #26) found that there was a tendency for leadership initiative to be lacking in high HP persons, this description of Hilgard's (together with other evidence from the field of hypnosis) lead to the hypothesis that the high HP individual would be less susceptible to hypnosis than the low. In Technical Report #31 Teevan and Manganello tested this hypothesis and found it to be valid.

Technical Reports 7, 14, and 32 tried to determine the effect of probability of success on the incentive value of success. Atkinson makes the simple assumption that incentive equals one minus the probability of success. It can be argued, with data, that this is only true under special circumstances and that the relationship is complex. In general, incentive has a positive distorting effect upon expectations of success but also that as incentive increases, the degree of distortion decreases. At low levels of incentive, then, incentive of success and probability of success are positively related (as one might expect from some dynamic theories (--e.g. Freudian) while at high levels this relationship deteriorates. Atkinson's model seems is too simple in this regard and data from this research program tends to confirm this.

Teevan and Mergen (Technical Report #34) investigated the relationship between common-place fear situations and fear of failure motivation. The results showed that high HP SS had higher overall GFSS scores (fear inventory scores) especially on items central to the fear of failure construct.

In an effort to continually improve the HP measure Teevan, Ruoff, and Poffenberger (Technical Report #33) investigated the effect of Chromatic Pictures on scoring of NACH and HP. The results showed no significant difference for the whole group of SS

and between or within sex groups. Brenner and Teevan (Technical Report #36) produced important implications for methodology in future designs involving motive measures and perceptual selectivity. Several other studies completed during the past months have been directed at improving our measure. Allowing subjects to remain entirely anonymous did not effect results significantly. A "picture effects" study confirmed once again the need for a standard measure and methodology. An area of our research which has always been troublesome concerns female behavior in an achievement situation. We have recently completed two pilot studies which explored females perception of achievement and failure experiences through a questionnaire. Both studies significantly discriminated between high and low HP women. We have pulled these results into our conceptualizing about female achievement behavior. Corbin (Technical Report #37) found differences in field dependence in college females manipulating HP, NAch, and introversion - extroversion as the independent variables.

Most recently the scope of the research program has been changed to provide a complete and comprehensive analysis of motivation profiles. This was facilitated by the development of other motive measures and by the development of personnel who are competent scorers of multi-motive measures. The general strategy of the most recent research has been to use motivational analysis as the independent variable in designs employing dependent variables which have proven to be incentive to more restricted antecedent conditions. The comprehensiveness of this method of analysis permits the investigation of areas of behavior whose functional variables have proven difficult to delineate.

To begin with a seminar and workshop was hold for graduate assistants on motive scoring systems. Experts in the field who were in attendance include Teevan,

Birney, Veroff and Winter. Secondly the research team (already highly competent in HP and NACH was sub-divided into two groups one responsible for literature and scoring of Power, the other group responsible for NAff. In addition the team decided to focus the motivation study on the area of leadership. This was decided for two reasons. First it makes sense that motivation should play an important role in leadership behavior. Second studies of leadership in the past have been relatively unfruitful with respect to motivation. Thus, it was felt that this new broad approach could make an important contribution to knowledge in the field. Accordingly the research team conducted an extensive literature search covering research on leadership and motivation over the past 30 years. This provided the jumping off place for the most recent research.

Motivation profiles were developed on a subject pool of student leaders (office holders) who were also judged by a faculty advisor as being "motivated toward leadership positions." Studies of leadership were being carried out which employ modifications of Cattell's 16PF and Edward's Personal Preference Scales. Motivational differences in subjects who report that they are aspiring to position of leadership were also examined.

This recent research has been the most exciting because for the first time a comprehensive net of motive measures has been developed which deals with "the kind of motives which actually are important in the lives of human adults," (McClelland, 1953, p. 319).

In summary the HP measure presumed to assess a construct, a network of theory was formulated (described in Fear of Failure) and predictions were made and tested.

Behavioral variables relevant to achievement situations about which predictions were made included: aspiration setting, risk taking, decision making, expectation, conformity, strategy and persistence. In general the predictions were borne out and the validity of the measure of the construct supported.

The second area on which research focused was constant re-evaluation and improvement of the measure. Variables such as method of arousal, response mode and type of stimuli were examined. In addition a category analysis of the scoring system was performed. Significant results from this research were incorporated into the methodology.

Finally the network of theory permitted research to be focused on a third area. Here the relationship between motivation studies and more global constructs were examined. Variables in this phase of research included: self-concept, values, cognitive controls, MMPI profiles and locus of control. In addition several studies which attempted to elucidate the childhood development of fear of failure were conducted.

Finally to further summarize past research and complete this final report an up-to-date profile of the high hostile person is necessary.

#### The High HP Person: A Profile

The fear of failure personality may be described in terms of a taxonomy of variables of the achievement situation. The taxonomy is composed of six variables: engagement, choice of task, performance, subjective experience, reaction to outcome, and subsequent achievement task behavior. The High HP person's typical reluctance to participate in competitive achievement situations is an example of engagement behavior (Teevan, 1963). This means he is unlikely to volunteer. He is more apt to engage with an achievement situation if it is cooperative, (where success doesn't depend on him alone); has a high probability of success, and in which comparisons are not stressed. He most likely to engage in a task when success is almost certain,

his responsibility for the performance is minimized, and where a need for his cooperation is expressed.

The next variable is choice of task. One of the things to consider in task choice is the conditions surrounding the task. The High HP person would be more likely to choose a task at which he can work alone than one which is performed in groups where his performance may be evaluated by others (Tech Report #28). Another task determinant is the probability of success. The High HP person will choose the task with the highest probability of success. Although, Tech Report #4 suggests that the High HP person will choose a task in which the risk of failure is high and further that his evaluations of success will be realistic (i.e. that he will not succeed). While these ideas seem to be contradictory, it will be noted that both conditions provide the person with a defense against failure: in the first he is highly unlikely to fail and in the second he cannot be expected to succeed. In the same vein, the High HP person prefers to compete with groups which are so much better than he is that he can't be expected to do well or with groups that are less competent than he is against whom he can succeed.

The task chosen by the the High HP person is most likely to be one without accurate measures such as stop watches, tape measures and questionnaires. It is also likely to be one in which he need not take responsibility for success or failure.

The third variable in the scheme is performance. Birney, Burdick and Teevan found that High HP people do not perform well in unfamiliar, complex, special, and non-game (threatening) situations. Tech report #23 supports these findings. In general competition produces poor performance, but where the person is rewarded and where he is concerned with his relationship to the experimenter or called upon to cooperate with others, his performance improves. Tech report #26 indicates that High HP people are not able to initiate actions which would make them good leaders.

Another factor affecting the High HP persons performance is group pressure. He will be likely to sacrifice task success for group acceptance as he sees it. This is most likely to happen in situations with direct social contact (i.e. Asch vs Crutchfield, Tech report #18). Tech report #28 shows that task difficulty is important to performance. High HP individuals do not persist long at difficult tasks.

Subjective experience is the next variable, although little is known about this aspect of behavior, some areas have been investigated. In unfamiliar, complex, speeded and threatening achievement situations the person's aspiration levels are known to fluctuate in a manner having little to do with his performance. Tech report #12 shows that high HP individuals (males) have wider confidence intervals. Tech report #9 indicates that where individuals are high in both NAch and HP, they have unrealistically high expectations of success. Birney, Burdick and Teevan have found that memory and perception may be used as defensive mechanisms. The High HP individual does not seem to perceive failure cues in a situation and may tend to forget uncompleted tasks although that effect was not supported in the results of Tech report #30. Here High HP and high NAch subjects remembered incomplete tasks. Studies in self esteem, indicate that it also fluctuates in ways about which little is known.

The next variable in the taxonomy is reaction to outcome. Birney, Burdick and Teevan have found that the high fear of failure individual rejects responsibility for the outcome of his performance. This is supported by Tech Reports #19 and #29 which indicate that the High HP individual externalizes the responsibility and criteria for success or failure; the High HP person was also found to reduce the importance of the task at which he performed poorly. He further misjudged his performance, seeing it as better than it actually was and saw himself in terms of his past performance. He would tell others of his successes but not his failure,

and make excuses if he would lose face both by avoiding the task and failing at it.

Finally the achievement situation can be discussed in terms of subsequent achievement task behavior. There is little research in this area and most of what has been done has yielded conflicting results. It is difficult even to conjecture about this aspect of behavior without more definitive results.

From the above outline a clear picture of the High HP individual's behavior in an achievement situation can be drawn. He will avoid achievement situations wherever possible. If forced to participate he will attempt to set his goals in such a way that he either cannot fail or cannot be expected to succeed. He will choose tasks which help to insure this. He prefers to work alone if he will be evaluated by working with a group, but he also desires group support and the ability to force the group to take responsibility for success or failure. If he fails he will tend to see the task as important and the responsibility for failure as belonging to someone or something in the situation. Thus his behavior can be seen as totally defensive.

In general, then, the High HP person has been threatened by the world around him since childhood. He would like to see it as controlled and predictable as possible, with some authority figure responsible for things in general, but where his own needs would take precedence over the general welfare. He tends to be practical, introverted and hostile as well as self critical, submissive and superstitious.

Throughout this profile reference has been made to the "High HP person." We have done this merely as a convenience and it should be noted "we mean a person motivated by fear of failure, rather than a particular type of personality." This profile then, should not be read as a description of a type of person, but, rather, a description of all people when they are motivated by fear of failure.