

VARIATION in the NATURE of ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

Kayhan Mutlu*

The objectives of the present study are to examine the association of independence training as originated by father during childhood, with both individualism and achievement motivation, and the associations among personality variables; namely, individualism, achievement motivation (need for achievement), and concern-for-others. In particular, it is proposed to investigate under what conditions there is a positive association of independence training with both need for achievement and individualism.

Past studies indicated that : (1) There are contradictory findings of the association between independence training and need for achievement. Some studies found that there is a positive association between independence training and achievement motivation (Winterbottom, 1958; Rosen and D'Andrade, 1959; Mc Cleland, 1961; Rosen, 1962 and 1961 and 1956; Bradburn, 1963), other studies found that there is no association of independence training with need for achievement (Cansever, 1968; Melikian, 1971; De Vos, 1973). It has been suggested that more than one child-rearing practice can develop need for achievement as a personality trait. (2) There is a variation in the nature of need for achievement. It has been theoretically argued that there are self-motivated (individualistic) achievement motivation and concern-for-others achievement motivation (De Vos, 1973). It has been further argued that individuals would have individualistic need for achievement, if they have been exposed to training in independence, which would be the case in Western countries. But, individuals would have concern-for-others need for achievement if they have not been exposed to independence training, which would be the case in non-Western countries. Thus, it would be an ethnocentric fallacy to assume that only Western psycho-social conditions can be responsible for the

* Assist. Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Department of Social Sciences, Ankara. This article is a summary of the dissertation study, submitted to Utah State University for the degree of Ph. D. in Sociology.

development of high need for achievement personality characteristic.

The concept of achievement motivation has been developed by the discipline of psychology, and applied to an explanation of the process of economic growth at the societal level (Mc Clelland, 1961). In order to explain the economic growth at the societal level and of a progressive (achieving) economic orientation at the individual level, researchers have studied countries which have already demonstrated a high level of economic progress and then tried to see what these countries have in common as opposed to less developed countries. The agreement is that unless a given population has individual members high in achievement motivation, it cannot progress. Values conducive to economic growth, abundant natural resources, capital, and skilled manpower cannot guarantee a high rate of economic development without achievement motivation at the individual level. Motivational factors at the individual level are also involved in the economic progress at the societal level. Thus, it is accepted that where individual achievement motivation is strong and widespread, the economy will develop rapidly.

Emergence of achievement motivation is determined by child rearing practices. It has been argued that only the Western value system and Western child-rearing practices (Rosen, 1962; Bradburn, 1963; Cansever, 1968) carry necessary elements which develop high need for achievement among the individuals. This notion is accepted and empirically demonstrated by Mc Clelland and his followers. Consequently, they conclude that under developed countries can progress if those countries adopt the Western value system, and the Western child-rearing practices. In particular, Mc Clelland and followers stress institutionalized individualism (Parsons, 1973) at the societal level and independence training at the individual level, which are main characteristics of the Western societies, and differentiate the Western societies from others. Mc Clelland's universalistic generalization points out that lack of independence training at the individual level, which is a consequence of lack of institutionalized individualism at the societal level, causes poor development of achievement motivation for individuals in less developed countries. Therefore, those countries have difficulties in economic development, unless they adopt Western values and the Western child rearing practices, which emphasizes training in independence.

On the other hand, alternative studies argue that Mc Clelland's theory does not have a universalistic validity. De Vos (1973) argues that achievement motivation is possible as a personality trait, without either training in independence at the individual level and institutionalized individualism at the societal level. De Vos showed that Japan is a developed country, and Japanese people have high need for achievement but Japanese children are not exposed to training in independence. Japanese people identify themselves with their own traditional values, which are based on mutual responsibility, obligation, and role dedication as defined by Japanese norms. The social order in Japan is not based on institutionalized individualism, but is still able to produce individuals high in need for achievement. Similar findings have been obtained in the case of Turkey (Cansever, 1963).

De Vos (1973) sees a variation in the nature of achievement motivation; namely, individualistic (self-motivated) achievement motivation and concern-for-others achievement motivation. Mc Clelland and followers say that there is no high need for achievement if there is no training in independence. De Vos argues there are two types of achievement motivation according to socialization processes. There is self-motivated achievement motivation if the individual is exposed to training in independence. There is concern-for-others achievement motivation if the individual is not exposed to training in independence. De Vos suggested that what Mc Clelland and followers are talking about is individualistic need for achievement, which is the case in the Western societies.

Thus, this study is concerned with empirically testing De Vos' theoretical argument. In particular, I shall investigate the development of self-motivated need for achievement. If De Vos' argument at the societal level is correct, then it is expected that exposure to training in independence is responsible for the development of individualism as well as achievement motivation as personality traits. Integration of individualism and need for achievement in the same personality will be the self-motivated need for achievement to which De Vos refers. De Vos' theoretical argument suggest that there should be a positive empirical association between independence training and need for achievement, as well as a positive association between both of these and individualism, in a culture in U.S.A. (Parsons, 1973). It is expected that an individual exposed to training in independence will have both high need for achievement and individualistic personality characteristics. I will also study

concern-for-others need for achievement from a different perspective. I will test if individualistic need for achievement and concern-for-others need for achievement can be personality characteristics of the same person at the same time.

De Vos assumes that achievement motivation is not to be found in the same social and psychological context of values in every culture. Therefore, a given personality trait will be integrated into the totality of personality structure differently from one individual to another in accordance with differences in the socialization processes, which will be operationalized by exposure to training in independence. Thus, the empirical findings of this study will clarify if Mc Clelland and followers are only talking about self-motivated need for achievement, which is the case in Western societies. If they are, then it will be an ethnocentric fallacy to assume that only Western psycho-cultural conditions could be readily transmitted into a modern industrial economic social system.

DEFINITIONS of ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION and INDEPENDENCE TRAINING: Need for achievement is defined as a concern for success in competition with standards of excellence, doing the job well and doing things better.

The literature indicates an important differentiation between actual achievement and achievement by achievement motivation. The actual success itself cannot be an index of need for achievement as a personality characteristic. The actual success (achievement) can be the result of many other variables such as need for affiliation, social approval, or need for power. Mc Clelland argues that if we try to increase the level of need for achievement in a given population, what had been done out of a desire to please, or to make money, might now be converted into an activity in which standards of excellence were defined and pursued in their own right. Viewed in this light, it should not be at all surprising to imagine that an increase in need for achievement should promote economic growth. Viewed in this light, it is even likely that those who are attracted into the market place primarily in pursuit of wealth or a higher standard of living are not the ones who are most likely to produce economic development. They are not oriented enough toward achievement, toward doing a good job for its own sake. If focused on rewards, they may stop working when they acquire rewards.

Empirical studies show the behavioral consequences of need for achievement as follows: a) There is a positive association of

need for achievement with performance (Rosen, 1959; Winterbottom, 1958). A person high in need for achievement performs better, works harder, is more persistent in solving a problem. b) Individuals high in need for achievement perform better if there are challenging elements in the situation (French, 1958, 1964; Rietman 1961). Therefore, they can identify themselves with the achievement, and satisfy the need for achievement (Smith, 1964; Strauss, 1960). A high need for achievement person can get a sense of personal achievement if a challenge exists (Hancock, 1964; Trickett 1971) c) People high in need for achievement do a good job for its own sake, not to have a public recognition of their success (French, 1955; Sistrunk, 1965). d) The high need achiever needs to see how well he does, or needs to see the consequences of the action (Schneider, 1972). Here, is where Mc Clelland points out that Western capitalists are actually motivated primarily by the need for achievement. We can now understand why they are so interested in money and profit. It is because money or profit are seen as a means to satisfy need for achievement. It is the indicator of the results of actions. It gives them the concrete knowledge of the outcome of their efforts. Money is a symbol of achievement.

However, some studies (Andrews, 1967; Crockett 1962; Martire, 1956; Miller, 1956; Nuttall, 1964; Silverman, 1964), showed that it is only conditionally correct. Those studies accepted the notion that not only need for achievement but also other variables such as powerlessness, past experiences and self-esteem, hope of success, are also responsible for performing things better. An individual, for example, strongly motivated to excel and willing to plan and work hard could set his heart on being the best barber, while an equally endowed person could aspire to become the best surgeon. The expressions of need for achievement is limited by available opportunities and chances in the environment of the persons.

The problem is not only the problem of motivation at the individual level. But, at the societal level, there is a problem of a modern value orientation, of an institutionalized distribution of equal opportunities and chances (Silverman, 1964).

Independence training as originated by the father in the home environment, could be defined as follows (Rosen, 1959, 1961; Bradburn, 1963; Cansever, 1968): The father teaches the son to do things on his own without asking for help. He expects the son to be self-reliant, to compete on his own grounds, to test his skill, and

to gain a sense of confidence. The father provides his son opportunities, so that the son might experience self-reliance. The father, gives the son autonomy in decision-making situations. He trains and permits his son to exercise a certain amount of freedom of action in decision-making. The son experiences freedom from the father's control, and freedom of action and responsibility for success and failure.

By definition "independence training" refers to what is institutionalized in the Western value system and refers to institutionalized individualism at the societal level (Parsons, 1973). As a consequence, the literature interprets independence training as an indicator of egalitarian-democratic versus authoritarian father dominated family structure at the institutional level (Rosen 1961, 1962). The authoritarian father is the source of low independence training for his son, since he stresses specific and pushing statements and dominates the decision-making process telling the child what to do and how to do things. Low independence training takes place in a father-dominated family environment in which the father is a privileged person and other members only obey him and cannot argue with him or contradict him.

Institutionalized individualism refers to social values which enhance the capacity of the individual and provide a frame for the realization of individual self-expression. It indicates a minimum degree of subordination of individual interest to group interests. It indicates a realization of the individual interest and self-expression within the framework of the social order. In a traditional society, thus expression of self-interest is more likely to be subject to sanctions, since it is generally viewed as a break-down of the social order.

HYPOTHESES: The first objective of this study is to elaborate the association between independence training and need for achievement, in respect to the conflicting findings of the association of independence training and need for achievement. Some empirical findings showed that the higher the independence training, or the more democratic the familial atmosphere, the higher the development of need for achievement is (Rosen, 1961; Goode, 1965). However, other empirical studies found that there is no association of independence training with need for achievement, consequently the development of need for achievement is possible in a traditional authoritarian family environment (Cansever, 1968). The conflicting

findings can be clarified if we can specify the conditions on which it depends. Thus, the first hypothesis is that the association between independence training and need for achievement will depend on such contingent conditions. A "contingent condition" is defined as a situation (specified by particular variables) in which there is an association of given variables which does not hold outside that condition.

The second objective of this study concerns the association between independence training and individualism. Concerning De Vos' argument, the development of individualistic need for achievement is associated with exposure to independence training. If De Vos' argument is correct, it is expected that exposure to training in independence is responsible for the development of both individualism and need for achievement. Integration of individualism and need for achievement in the same personality will be the self-motivated need for achievement. Specifically, the second hypothesis is that there is a positive association of independence training with individualism. If there is a positive association of independence training with both individualism and need for achievement, De Vos' argument regarding self-motivated need for achievement will be supported.

The development of concern-for-others need for achievement is not direct subject of this study. I shall however, study concern-for-others need for achievement and test whether self-motivated need for achievement and concern-for-others need for achievement can be characteristics of the same person at the same time. Thus, the third hypothesis is that there is a positive association of need for achievement with both individualism and concern-for-others. If this hypothesis is accepted, then I will be suggesting that it is possible to have both self-motivated and concern-for-others need for achievement personality characteristics simultaneously.

METHODOLOGY: The hypotheses indicate that there are three personality variables; namely, need for achievement, individualism, and concern-for-others. The personality variables are dependent variables. Independence training stands for the socialization variable, which is an intervening variable, between personality variables and background characteristics; namely, urban-rural residence, L.D.S. (Mormon)-non L.D.S., religion, sex, father's occupational status, and family size, are independent variables. The classification of the variables as dependent and intervening and independent were based

on time-order procedure. When an individual has been exposed to a given variable was the index.

Collection of the Data · A questionnaire was administered to 240 freshmen in an introductory sociology class at Utah State University. This was a nonprobability sample and thus does not permit any statistical generalization beyond the group studied. However, the universal relationships as indicated in the literature, between independence training and the personality variables should hold for this group as well as any other group, since they refer to entire human population. Previous empirical studies in this area have also been based on such small, purposively selected groups (Winterbottom, 1958; Rosen, 1959; Cansever, 1968).

The questionnaire was group-administered to the entire class at one time. This procedure emphasized the anonymity of responses, thus creating an atmosphere in which subjects might feel free to answer the questions, which are moral in character, since a given subject in a group-administered questionnaire procedure would realize that no one else can see how he answers the questions except himself. In the instructions given to respondents, it was also pointed out "..... answer the questions as you yourself feel. Do not just give the answers you think others would say are right".

The questionnaire began with 12 simple background questions and then proceeded to 43 Likert-type questions, each answered with a 4-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with no neutral position. The "concern-for-others", "individualism", and "need for achievement" scales, which are moral in nature, were intermingled in order to disguise the purpose of the questions.

Measurement of the Variables : The dependent variables; namely, individualism, concern-for-others and need for achievement were measured by the scales available in the literature. The "concern-for-others" personality characteristic was measured by a concern-for-others scale developed by Torgoff and Tesi (1968). The individualism personality trait was measured by an individualism scale developed by Kahl (1968, p. 30). The need for achievement personality characteristic was measured by an achievement motivation scale developed by Smith (1973). He stated (p. 140) "Mc Clelland's projective test was administered to the same group of 89 subjects. A correlation of .48 was obtained between the objective test score and the projective test score. Although this correlation is not high, it compares quite favorably with a corrected splithalf correlation

of .58 obtained by comparing the scores of the 89 men on the first and third stories with the scores on the second and fourth stories. In other words, the objective test correlates almost as well with the projective test as the latter correlates with itself."

Independence training is measured by the use of children's perceptions of their parents' attitudes and behavior. Although parents' behavior is an objective event in the real world, it affects the child's ego development only to the extent and in the form in which he perceives it (Ausubel, 1954). Consequently, a perceived independence training scale was developed in a likert format by the author. A Pearson correlation coefficient for odd-even item reliability of .82 was obtained when applied to the responses of the total sample of 223 subjects. An item analysis of each item with scale score yielded Pearson correlation coefficients of .50 and above.

Information for independent variables (background variables) were gathered by simple questioning. The data were categorized as follows: Those subjects who indicated that they have spent most of their life in a city (population over 20,000) and in suburbs of a city were defined as urban and the others as rural. The subjects who indicated that their fathers' occupations belong to the high status white collar category were defined as high status. Those who responded that their fathers' occupation were in either low status white collar, or high status blue collar, or high status farm occupation were defined as middle status. This classification was based on Duncan's socio-economic status scale (Robinson 1974, p. 9 and p. 343). The subjects with three or less brothers and sisters were defined as from relatively small sized families, and the remainder were categorized as from large families. The subjects who share protestant, or catholic, or Jewish religious background were defined as non-L.D.S. (non-Mormon).

The data were scored and analyzed using Fortran and SPSS on the Utah University Burroughs 6700 computer.

ANALYSIS and TESTING the HYPOTHESES: The goals of the analysis are to establish: 1) whether or not the association between independence training and need for achievement depends on contingent conditions; 2) if training in independence is responsible for the development of both individualism and need for achievement; and 3) if there are positive associations of need for achievement with both individualism and concern-for-others.

Zero-Order Correlations : The Complexity of the relations among the variables will be studied beginning with a discussion of zero-order correlations (no control variable) between the variables, and then proceeding to causal analysis leading to expressing the interrelationships among variables in a path diagram.

A first indication of the relationships among the variables can be obtained from the zero-order correlations. Our purpose will be to eliminate spurious conclusions due to inter-associations among independent variables (background variables). The possible interrelationships among those variables could influence the findings.

Zero-order correlation coefficients among the variables were calculated (Nie 1975, p. 374). I will summarize here only some of the findings as follows : Urban subjects have a higher father's occupational status. There is a .37 correlation between residence and father's occupational status. Rural subjects are more likely to be L.D.S. than urban subjects. There is a .25 correlation between residence and religion. L.D.S. subjects come from larger families. There is a .26 correlation between religion and family size. As a result, those findings show that there are statistically significant associations among the independent variables. For example, subjects who are L.D.S. are also more likely to be rural, female, and have middle father's occupational status and come from large family size background. This suggests that to test my hypotheses with simple bivariate relationships might lead to spurious conclusions. The possibility of such spurious conclusions due to cross associations among independent variables can be eliminated by multivariate analysis.

Regressions : The zero-order correlations among the independent variables show that background variables are interrelated. Then, the problem is to indicate which of these independent variables have significant associations with which dependent variables, when the other independent variables are controlled. Step-wise multiple regression enables us to order the independent variables from most significant to least significant with respect to a given dependent variable while providing the needed statistical control. Therefore, we proceed to multiple regression analysis.

First, we examined how the various background variables influence our socialization variable "independence training". It was found that with independence training as the dependent variable, the only significant independent variable (at .05 level)

is religious background, but not urban-rural residence or sex, or father's occupational status, or family size. Even religion, however, is not strongly related to independence training ($R=.14$). It explains only almost 2 % of the variation. It appears that a serious attempt to explain independence training would have to include individual characteristics of the parents, such as parental values, that would go beyond the general background characteristics examined here.

Second, we looked for the factors influencing "concern-for others". Sex (male-female) was the most important independent variable for predicting concern-for-others (Beta = .26), followed by urban-rural residence (Beta = $-.16$). Religion (L.D.S. — non L.D.S.) was third (Beta = $-.13$), falling just short of the .05 level of significance, but so close that we shall include it in our consideration. Together, those three variables explain 11 % of the variation in concern-for-others. We note that concern-for-others is higher among female, urban and L.D.S. respondent. One might be surprised that urban residents show more concern-for-others than rural residents until it is remembered that we are dealing ordinarily with Utahns where the distinction is between rural communities that remain largely traditional and isolationist versus moderately large towns rather than over crowded population centers like New York city.

Almost as interesting is the finding that father's occupational status, family size and independence training did not influence concern-for-others personality trait. In particular, it is noteworthy that training a child to become independent does not produce his concern-for-others.

Third, we considered the factors affecting the development of need for achievement. As expected, independence training was the most important independent variable (Beta = .20), followed by religion (Beta = $-.16$) and urban-rural residence (Beta = $-.12$) which was almost significant. Need for achievement as a personality trait was higher for those with high independence training, L.D.S. and urban residence.

Finally, we investigated the factors influencing the development of "individualism". Independence training was the most important independent variable (Beta = .13), although its effect was weak and fell just short of the .05 level of significance. It explains only 2 % of the variance in individualism. The next most important variable

is religion ($\text{Beta} = .11$). These findings show that individualism was higher for those with high independence training and non-L.D.S. religious background.

The degree of associations among the personality variables was calculated by a fourth-order partial correlation coefficient controlling the background variables (residence, sex and religion), and independence training. There was a positive association (.28) between concern-for-others and need for achievement, but a negligible association (0.9) between need for achievement and individualism.

All these findings are summarized by a path diagram. The path diagram shows that all causal relationships are direct except those between religion and need for achievement, and between religion and individualism. There is an intervening variable which is independence training, partially mediating these two relationships.

Our analysis has borne out our original cautions concerning zero-order correlations and served to clarify the causal relations among our variables. Now, we will proceed to specific consideration of the hypotheses proposed earlier.

Independence Training and Need for Achievement: The findings earlier showed that urban-rural residence may have a direct causal effect on need for achievement. Urban-rural residence may be the contingent condition for the association of independence training with need for achievement, I am looking for. Therefore, it is expected that controlling on residence background, there will be a positive association of independence training with need for achievement for urban subjects but not for rural subjects. Indeed, it was found that there is a positive association (.28) between independence training and need for achievement for urban subjects, only. But, there is no significant association (.14) between independence training and need for achievement for rural subjects. The residence background is one condition without which there is no significant association of independence training with need for achievement in the manner predicted by the hypothesis.

I conclude that the problem of conflicting findings regarding the association between independence training and need for achievement has been generated by lack of control of background characteristics of the subjects. Thus, for example, the studies which had more urban subject would be more likely to show that there is a positive association between independence training and

need for achievement. On the other hand, the studies which had more rural subjects would be more likely to show that there is no association of independence training with need for achievement. Consequently, Mc Clelland's universalistic conclusions may be conditionally correct if the subjects are urban.

Independence Training and Individualism: The hypothesis is that there is a positive association of independence training with individualism. The regression analysis earlier showed that L.D.S. — non L.D.S. religious background may have a direct causal effect on both independence training and individualism. This suggests that the relationship between independence training and individualism may only hold for the non-L.D.S. subjects. We may have identified contingent condition for this hypothesis as well.

Consequently, it is expected that controlling religion, there might be a positive association of independence training with individualism for non-L.D.S. subjects rather than L.D.S. subjects. Indeed, we found that there is a significant positive association (.24) of independence training with individualism for non-L.D.S. subjects, but not significant association (.09) for L.D.S. subjects.

I conclude that exposure to training in independence is responsible for the development of both need for achievement and individualism for only urban and non-L.D.S. subjects. I suggest that like Mc Clelland's universal generalizations, De Vos' argument must also be qualified in terms of back-ground characteristics of the respondents.

Individualism, Concern-for-Others, and Need for Achievement: I argue that it might be possible for some people to have both self-motivated and concern-for-others need for achievement at the same time. Thus, I used separate scales for individualism and concern-for-others variables. Therefore, we can investigate whether or not some people have both individualistic and concern-for-others need for achievement at the same time.

The path diagram showed that concern-for-others is positively associated (.28) with need for achievement, although the correlation of both these variables with individualism is not significant. It appears that as integrated into the personality structure, the kind of need for achievement we have found is more likely concern-for-others need for achievement. The findings earlier indicated that urban-

rural residence, sex and religion directly effect concern-for-others. Thus concern-for-others is higher for urban, L.D.S., and female subjects. We have also, earlier, shown that need for achievement is higher among urban residents. These considerations lead me to believe that we may be able to identify a subgroup for which both individualism and concern-for-others are positively associated with need for achievement. It would appear that even within American society with its individualistic norms it is possible to find concern-for-others need for achievement as well as self-motivated need for achievement for some respondents. In particular, I suspect that this should be the case for urban females. Indeed, we found that there is a positive association (.21) between individualism and need for achievement, and a positive association (.25) between concern-for-others and need for achievement for urban females. On the other hand, there is a positive association (.19) between individualism and need for achievement, but no association (.05) between concern-for-others and need for achievement for urban males. Thus, I conclude that it is possible to have both self-motivated and concern-for-others need for achievement personality characteristic in a manner predicted by the hypothesis. We find this is true for urban female subjects only, but not urban male subjects who have only self-motivated need for achievement.

Conclusions : This study showed that background variables (religion, sex and urban-rural residence) influence the associations among independence training, need for achievement, individualism and concern-for-others personality traits. Therefore, I conclude that : 1) In view of the fact that all samples in the literature are ad hoc, such background characteristics could define the contingent conditions under which the relationship between independence training and need for achievement holds. 2) Mc Clelland's and De Vos' universal generalizations are correct only conditionally. 3) It is an ethnocentric fallacy to assume that only Western psychocultural conditions could be readily transmitted into a modern industrial economic social system, evidenced by the variation in the nature of achievement motivation, as self-motivated versus concern-for-others need for achievement.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, John D.W. (1976) "The achievement motive and advancement in two types of organizations", **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology** Vol. 6: 163-168.
- Ausubel, David P. (1954) "Perceived parent attitudes as determinants of children's ego structure", **Child Development** Vol. 25: 173-182.
- Bradburn, Norman M. (1963) "The achievement and father dominance in Turkey", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 67: 464-468.
- Cansever, Gökçe (1968) "The achievement motive in Turkish adolescents", **The Journal of Social Psychology** Vol. 76: 269-270.
- Clark and Teevan (1956) "Hope of success and fear of failure as aspects of need for achievement", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 65: 208-211.
- Crockett, Harry J., Jr. (1962) "The achievement motive and differential occupational mobility in the United States" **American Sociological Review** Vol. 27: 191-204.
- De Vos, George A. (1973) **Socialization for achievement**. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- French, Elizabeth, G. (1955) "Some characteristics of achievement motivation", **Journal of Experimental psychology** Vol. 50: 232-236.
- French and Thomas, (1958) "The relation of achievement motivation to problem solving effectiveness", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 56: 45-48.
- French and Lesser. (1964) "Some characteristics of achievement motive in women", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 68: 119-128.
- Goode, William J. (1965) **The Family**, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hancock and Teevan (1964) "Fear of failure and risk taking behavior", **Journal of Personality** Vol. 32: 200-209.
- Kausler, Donald H. (1959) "Aspiration level as determinant of performance", **Journal of Personality** Vol. 27: 346-351.
- Kahl, Joseph A. (1968) **The Measurement of Modernism**. Austin: The Steck Company.
- McClelland, David C. (1961) **The Achieving Society**. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company Inc.
- Martire, John G. (1965) "Relationship between the self-concept and differences in the strength and generality of achievement motivation", **Journal of Personality** Vol. 24: 364-375.
- Miller and Worchel, (1956) "The effects of need achievement and self-ideal discrepancy on performance under stress", **Journal of Personality** Vol. 25: 176-190.
- Melikian, L. (1971) "Achievement motivation in Afghanistan, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey", **The Journal of Personality** Vol. : 83: 183-184.

- Nie, Norman H. (1975) **Statistical package for the Social Sciences**. New York : Mc Graw Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Nuttall, Ronald L. (1964) "Some correlates of high need achievement among Urban Northern Negroes", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 68 : 593-600.
- Parsons and Platt. (1973) **The American University**. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press.
- Rietman and Williams. (1961) "Relationships between hope of success and fear of failure, anxiety and need achievement", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 62 : 465-467.
- Robinson, John P. (1974) **Measures of occupational attitudes and occupational characteristics**. University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Ann Arbor.
- Rosen, Bernard C. (1962) "Socialization and achievement motivation in Brazil", **American Sociological Review** Vol. 27 : 612-624.
- Rosen and Andrea, (1959) "The psychological origins of achievement motivation", **Sociometry** Vol. 22 : 185-218.
- Rosen, Bernard C. (1956) "Race, ethnicity and the achievement syndrome", **American Sociological Review** Vol. 21 : 203-211.
- (1961) "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation", **American Sociological Review** Vol. 26 : 574-585.
- Schneider and Delaney. (1972) "Effect of individual achievement on group problem-solving efficiency", **The Journal of Social Psychology** Vol. 86 : 291-298.
- Sistrunk and McDavid. (1965) "Achievement motivation, affiliation and task difficulty as determinants of social conformity", **The Journal of Social Psychology** Vol. 66 : 41-50.
- Silverman, Irwin. (1964) "Self-esteem and differential responsiveness to success and failure". **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 69 : 115-119.
- Smith, Charles P. (1964) "Relationships between achievement related motives and intelligence, performance level and persistence", **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** Vol. 68 : 523-532.
- Smith, J.M. (1973) "A. Quick Measure of Achievement Motivation", **British Journal of Clinical Psychology** Vol. 12 : 137-143.
- Strauss and Houghton. (1960) "Achievement affiliation, and cooperation values as clues to trends in American Rural Society, 1924-1958", **Rural Sociology** Vol. 25 : 394-403.
- Torgoff and Tesi. (1968) "Effect of differences in achievement motivation and Social responsibility on responses to moral conflict", **Journal of Personality** Vol. 36 : 513-527.
- Trickett, Edison. (1971) "The interaction of achievement motivation, task difficulty, and confidence-enhancing information in producing conformity behavior", **The Journal of Social Psychology** Vol. 84 : 233-242.
- Veroff and Feld. (1962) "Achievement motivation and religious background", **American Sociological Review** Vol. 27 : 205-217.
- Winterbottom, Marian (1958) "The relation of need for achievement to learning experiences in independence and mastery", Atkinson and Nostrand (eds), **Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society**, New Jersey : Princeton.

ÖZET

BAŞARI GÜDÜSÜNÜN DOĞASINDAKİ DEĞİŞİK DURUMLAR

Bu araştırmada, bağımsızlık eğitimi ile bireycilik ve başarı güdüsü arasındaki ilişkiler; ve başarı güdüsü ile bireycilik ve başkalarını düşünme arasındaki ilişkiler tartışılmıştır.

Başarı güdüsü üzerinde yapılan görgül araştırmalar, bir toplumun ekonomik üretkenliğini arttırabilmesi ve gelişebilmesi için, o toplumu oluşturan bireylerin kişilik yapılarında başarı güdüsünün yüksek olması denencesini göstermişlerdi. Buna bağlı olarak, gelişmiş toplumların gelişmiş olmalarını o toplumlardaki bireylerin kişiliğinde yüksek başarı güdüsü varlığı ve geliştirmekte olan toplumların geliştirmek için karşılaştıkları zorlukların bir nedeninde o toplumlardaki bireylerin kişiliğindeki düşük başarı güdüsü varlığından kaynaklandığını savunmuşlardı.

Oysa, bu araştırmanın sonuçları aşağıdaki olasılıkları görgül olarak göstermiştir :

1. Literatürdeki görgül araştırmalar başarı güdüsünün doğasında özgüdüllü ya da başkalarını düşünmeye yönelik başarı güdüsü biçiminde değişik kişisel yapılar olabileceğini göstermemişlerdir. Bu araştırma, bağımsızlık eğitimi ile özgüdüllü başarı güdüsü arasında doğrudan orantılı, bağımsızlık eğitimi ile başkalarını düşünmeye yönelik başarı güdüsü arasında ise ters orantılı bir nedensel ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir.

2. Literatürdeki denencelerin evrensel bir geçerliliği olmayabileceği, bu araştırmadaki, "başkalarını düşünmeye yönelik başarı güdüsünün bireylerin kişilik yapılarında yüksek düzeyde gelişmesi ile, o toplumun da üretkenliğini arttırarak gelişebileceği denencesi ile desteklenmiştir."