Achievement Motivation and Values: An Alternative Perspective

JACQUELYNNE E. PARSONS
The University of Michigan

SUSAN B. GOFF
The University of Michigan

Unequal participation of the sexes in the domain of employment has become increasingly difficult to ignore. Although increasing numbers of women are working, these women are still concentrated in the lower levels of the professional hierarchy in spite of attempts in recent years to decrease discrimination in hiring and salaries of women. For example, the percentage of women in professional and technical occupations has increased from 39% in 1968 to only 42% in 1976 while during the same time period the percentage of women clerical workers increased from 73% to 80%. It is interesting to note in 1970, when women occupied 40% of the professional and technical positions, more than 62% of these women were nurses, physical therapists, dieticians and elementary and secondary school teachers. In comparison, only 12.6% of men occupied these "female" professional occupations (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973). Even within the professional domain, women cluster in the lower realm of the status hierarchy. The underemployment of women implied by these figures is widespread.

Although highly important, institutional barriers and sex typing of jobs are not entirely responsible for this phenomenon. There is evidence that other factors might also contribute to the fact that women are underrepresented in

professional careers. Psychological investigations have high-lighted several such factors which could affect female professional participation by influencing career aspirations in such a way as to predetermine the training young women seek and the skills they acquire. Motivational factors are undoubtedly one of the key contributors.

Over the past several years we have become interested in the motivational factors influencing long range social goals such as career or occupational choice, major selection in college, decisions to have children, return to work, etc. Our interest in this area initially grew out of our concern over the under-representation of women in professional careers discussed above and the decisions of many college women not to pursue traditional masculine achievement paths. Like many of the contemporary researchers in this field, we started out trying to identify those characteristics of non-traditional women or role innovators which distinguished them from more traditional women and those factors which have constrained many women's efforts to attain non-traditional goals. We were particularly interested in high need achievement women who were capable of achieving these goals. But in the past few years, we have redirected our focus. It seemed to us that models which assumed that choosing a non-traditional career reflected maturity and enlightenment while choosing a traditional career reflected immaturity and sex-role rigidity were inherent-ly biased. How could a model predict an individual's achieve-ment behavior if it assumed that all non-competitive achieve-ment behavior, for example, was pathological? The question better suited to answering our inquiries was "*Why do women make the choices they make?*" and not "Why don't they act more like men?"

In an attempt to answer this question, we have returned to basic motivational models and have chosen to treat long range life-defining choices as analogous to task choices. Assuming that life choices can be conceptualized as task choices, we have focused most of our thinking around the expectancy × value models of Lewin and Tolman. Further, given our basic training in motivational structures, we began our thinking with Atkinson's original suggestion that the tendency to

approach a given goal (T_s) would be a function of a motivational component, an expectancy component, and an incentive value component. Finally, we have come to believe, as have many, that the likelihood of the selection of any particular goal will be a function of its T_s in addition to the T_s's of the alternative choices and the tendency to avoid each of these choices.

This paper shall focus upon three topics basic to a more complete understanding of achievement behavior: (1) an analysis of the traditional achievement model and its problems handling long range life goals; (2) a discussion of the role of values in motivation and the difficulty we had in distinguishing between values and motives; and (3) a discussion of Bakan's agency/communion dichotomy and its utility in aiding our understanding of men's and women's achievement oriented behavior.

Need Achievement Model and its Problems

Among the many factors that undoubtedly affect career aspirations (see Parsons, Ruble, and Frieze, 1978, for full discussion), the motive to achieve has received considerable attention. McClelland and Atkinson have been key figures in this research arena. Within the McClelland/Atkinson tradition, achievement behavior and career choice have been linked to two basic motives: the hope for success motive (M_s) and the motive to avoid failure (M_{af}). These motives are assumed to be latent, stable characteristics acquired early in life. They are aroused in situations in which the standard of performance is evaluated against some measure of excellence: M_s being aroused at the prospect of doing well and by the anticipated feeling of pride that accompanies success, and M_{af} being aroused by the prospect of failure and the shame that accompanies it. The strength of the positive tendency to approach success, T_s, and the negative tendency to avoid failure, T_{-f}, are multiplicative functions of their respective motives, incentive values, and the perceived chance of success or failure: $T_s = M_s \times I_s \times P_s$ and $T_{-f} = M_{af} \times I_f \times P_f$, respectively (Atkinson, 1958). The tendency to respond to an achievement situation is predicted

by the tendency to approach success minus the tendency to avoid failure plus tendencies aroused by extrinsic factors (e.g., peer pressure): $T_a - M_s \times I_s \times P_s - (M_{af} \times I_f \times P_f) + $ extrinsic factors (Ext.)

To simplify the model, Atkinson made the following assumptions about the relations between the various components: (1) the sum of the probability of success and the probability of failure is equal to one; (2) the sum of the incentive for success and the incentive for avoiding failure is equal to one; (3) the incentive for success is equivalent to one minus the probability for success. Notable among these assumptions is the inverse relationship between incentive value and the likelihood of or expectancy for success (i.e., easy tasks would have a low incentive value and difficult tasks would have a high incentive value). Incentive value is most clearly defined as an extension of one's expectancies, containing no independent significance. This model marked the beginning of the dominance of expectancies or calculated probability of success and failure in the investigation of the achievement motive.

While Atkinson's mathematical model predicted men's career aspirations and related adult achievement behaviors reasonably well, it did not predict reliably either women's adult achievement behavior or career aspirations. Inspection of this model suggests three basic problems that could account for its limited utility in explaining the long range life goals of women: *elimination of incentive value* as a key determinant of approach behavior, *oversimplification of the concept of probability of success* and *limitations on the range of achievement goals* considered in designing the formula. Each of these is discussed below.

First, by equating incentive value with one minus the probability of success $(1 - P_s)$, Atkinson had severely limited the explanatory power of the one factor that is most clearly linked to gender-role socialization, and thus, may account for the differing life goals of men and women. Atkinson's formulation had the effect of emphasizing the causal importance of expectancies and individual differences in motive strength at the expense of incentive value. Additionally, since Atkinson

did not originally define expectancies as a subjective variable, individual differences in expectancies for particular tasks have not been investigated systematically until quite recently. As a result subsequent work in traditional need achievement theory and its offshoots (e.g., Horner, 1968) have focused primarily on motives. Unfortunately, few consistent sex differences in motive strengths have emerged. Since sex-roles socialization is primarily aimed at creating a sex-differentiated perception of valued life goals, it seems that attention to the mediating role of task incentive values would move us closer to an understanding of the differences in achievement patterns of men and women.

Second, it is unlikely that people attach equal probabilities of success to the same life choices. Atkinson attached a stable probability of success estimate to different tasks according to his perception of the ease of accomplishment. In a ring toss task, his definition of the probability of success was based on the average ability of a group to succeed. For simple and highly controlled tasks, this interpretation of "probability of success" might be valid. However, in a more complex situation, such as deciding what type of job or career to pursue, the degrees of freedom increase to the point that a simple determination of probability of success according to task ease is a dramatic understatement of the reality of the situation. It is much more likely that evaluations of probability of success will vary greatly among people and between the sexes.

Third, at an even more basic level, it is not clear that the model can predict future oriented, life-defining choices. The model predicts that high need achievement individuals will select tasks with a 50% chance of success. While this prediction seems plausible for some tasks (primarily short term or recreational activities, M. Maehr, personal communication) it seems untenable for other tasks. In particular, it seems unlikely that we select long term goals at which we are as likely to succeed as to fail. The cost of failure is too great in relation to the amount of time and energy invested. Instead it seems more reasonable that we select life goals that are both challenging, reasonably probable, and important to us. Thus, it seems that Atkinson's derivation does not yield a model that intuitively

would predict life choices behavior.

It is apparent that there are a variety of reasons why Atkinson's model would not be very appropriate for an analysis of life goals in general and for an analysis of the difference between men's and women's life goals in particular. But few researchers have attempted to look at any of the aforementioned problems. Their investigations have centered, instead, on the motivational components and recently on the expectancy component; they have asked the question "How might men and women differ in their motivational structures and expectancies and what additional motives are needed to explain the differences in men's and women's life choices?"

As a case in point, Horner (1968) accounted for the failure of Atkinson's model to predict female adult achievement patterns by noting the exclusion of an additional avoidance motive: the fear of success motives (M_{-s}). She proposed that fear of success was higher in females than in males and that the inclusion of M_{-s} into Atkinson's model would increase its accuracy as a predictor of female achievement behavior. More specifically, Horner suggested that women are less likely to approach achievement situations not because of a weakness in the achievement motive but rather because potential success aroused their fear of success motive, which, in turn, created enough anxiety to impede the tendency to approach achievement situations. Responses to verbal leads such as "after first term finals, Ann finds herself at the top of her medical school class," were used to measure the "fear of success" motive. A response was considered high in fear of success if it contained negative imagery reflecting anxiety about the success. The negative imagery most frequently took the form of Ann's physical unattractiveness and lonely Friday and Saturday nights with her books. Horner interpreted these responses as a projection of the writer's fear of success.

Based on the differential response patterns of college women to the female cues and college men to the male cues and the relationships of these patterns to a measure of achievement behavior, Horner concluded that women have higher fear of success than men and that fear of success does interfere with achievement behavior in some settings. She generalized these

results to the broader domain of adult achievement patterns including career aspirations. Subsequent research and theoretical analysis have not substantiated these conclusions (Condry & Dyer, 1976). Thus, despite initial support and widespread enthusiasm, the fear of success model as conceptualized by Horner has not clarified our understanding of female achievement behavior or more general life choices.

The focus of the criticism of Horner's work has ranged from methodological inadequacies to conceptual disagreement. The criticisms have been adequately reviewed elsewhere (e.g., Condry & Dyer, 1976) and will not be reviewed here. We will focus, instead, on our evaluation of the two major shortcomings inherent in both the Atkinson model and in Horner's refinement: limiting the definition of achievement to the *agentic domain* (Bakan, 1966) and *ignoring the importance of incentive value* as a causal determinant in life goal selection.

Agentic Achievement

At a fundamental level, we believe that the failure of both of these achievement models to account for female adult achievement behavior lies in their narrow operationalization of success and achievement goals. The achievement tasks selected and the criterion of success were usually individual tasks on which success results from one's own actions and attributes rather than cooperative or group achievement tasks on which success results from *joint efforts*; the adult achievement tasks were generally careers with success being defined in terms of the status of the professions aspired to rather than familiar or social roles, or the intrinsic value of the task. Viewed from this perspective, it is apparent that the assumptions underlying both the traditional Atkinsonian achievement model and Horner's subsequent refinement reflected what Bakan (1966) has labelled an "agentic" perspective on achievement: a perspective of achievement in which success is defined by a personal achievement with a view of self as separate from others and success as a result of one's own actions and attributes.

Defining achievement in the agentic mode has had three

major consequences for this field of research, which have reduced the explanatory power of the existing models and related research for long range life choices of both men and women. First, because career status is so highly valued in our society, the research question asked by Horner and others led to the inclusion of a negatively valued, avoidance motive to explain why women were not attaining high career status. She neglected to identify the careers that women desired to pursue or the characteristics of their chosen careers that mediated these choices.

Second, the agentically biased models have, in the past, ignored motive systems other than the one stemming from a simple need to achieve. Douvan and Adelson (1966) and Hoffman (1972) noted the part that the motive to affiliate plays in the development of self-esteem. Hoffman proposed that affiliation was seen as success by women, and furthermore, was an affirmation of the self. But neither of these papers connected the woman's perceived value of social behavior with achievement motivation. When the female's affiliative orientation was applied to achievement motivation in Horner's (1968) thesis, it was negatively valued as "fear of success" instead of being labeled as a need for affiliation within the achievement setting. As suggested by Stein and Bailey (1973), we see affiliative factors as integral to female achievement motives.

In their recent work, Atkinson and Raynor (1974) have demonstrated the need to consider both more than one motive and the interaction of the individual's motive type with situational cues in predicting achievement behavior. Veroff has also argued that more than one social motivational force operates on any given choice. Finally, in a recent review of the motivational influence literature, Denmark, Tangri, and Mc-Candless (1975) discuss the importance of yet another motive: need power. They point to the work of Winter (1973) as clear support of a relationship between a need for power and career choice. Denmark et al. conclude their review with a plea for research on the interaction of these three motives: need achievement, need affiliation, and need power on life choice.

Third, the focus of achievement was directed to the goal itself, instead of the process involved in gaining the final

reward. Veroff (1977) has pointed out the importance of dissecting the more global concept of achievement into two levels: the process of achieving and the impact of the accomplishment. Traditional models of achievement have ignored the process of achievement, focusing instead on the outcome and its meaning for the achiever. For example, Horner directed her study to the projected effect of final success upon one's available social rewards. Fear of success was the fear of the negative consequences of success; but a careful look at some of the responses classified as evidencing fear of success actually suggest that the subjects were concerned with the costs of success in terms of the process of seeking success rather than the costs of success in terms of the social rejection following success. The lonely Saturday nights studying could reflect concern over the cost of succeeding in medical school rather than fear of being rejected once one had become a successful doctor.

Veroff (1977) discussed evidence that women and men may well differ in their orientation to process versus impact achievement orientation. For example, Zander, Fuller and Armstrong (1973) found that women's pride and shame about themselves were more influenced by their teams' efforts while men's pride and shame were more influenced by their competitive competence. Similarly, Veroff, McClelland and Ruhland (1975) have found that power achievement or the need for your achievement to have an impact on someone else was higher in males than females.

The concern over cost of becoming a doctor could also reflect an assessment of the relative worth of the ultimate goal. People have many goals for their lives. The likelihood of the selection of any one goal is dependent, to some extent, upon its impact on the whole constellation of goals an individual holds. For example, a woman might well desire both a professional career and a family. But if she sees these goals as conflicting, then her choice should reflect her relative priorities. The findings of both Parsons, Frieze, and Ruble (1978) and Poloma and Garland (1971) suggest that women's attitudes regarding the demands inherent in the wife mother role influence occupational aspirations. Professional career aspirations are more

probable when career obligations are not perceived as interfering with the fulfillment of the wife/mother role. If women believe that facilitative institutions and spouse support are available which can lessen the burden of childcare without harming the child, they may choose a nontraditional life style. However, if these institutions and support are not available or if existing childcare facilities are believed to be inadequate in quality, selection of a professional career is unlikely. Additionally, if a woman feels it is important to be the major socializer of her children during the preschool period and is committed to being available to her children throughout their childhood years, then she is unlikely to select a professional career that allows for little flexibility in both career commitment and time scheduling across those years.

In a study which tested these suggestions, we had women rate the importance of various careers including mothering. We found that male stereotyped occupations were seen as relatively more difficult than comparable female stereotyped occupations but were not seen as of any more importance to the women themselves. Further, success at mothering was rated as more important than success at any of the other occupations. In line with this finding, the women reported that they would be willing to exert the most effort to be "successful" mothers, would feel the best about this success, and the worst about failing to meet this goal. Finally, being a "successful" mother was seen as difficult but highly probable. It seems likely, given this pattern, that any occupation that seriously threatened these women's ability to become "successful" mothers would not be seen as very appealing.

In an attempt to explore this issue of the integration of family and career further, we interviewed 15 male undergraduates and 15 female undergraduates in the Spring of 1977. The open-ended interview schedule focused on the following topics: (a) marriage plans, (b) career plans, (c) plans to have children, and (d) plans for child-rearing. Given the data reported above, we felt it was especially important to assess career oriented college women's attitudes toward child bearing and rearing. We felt that high level professional commitment was dependent on either endorsement of and faith in daycare

arrangements or expectation of major involvement of the
father in childrearing. Further, we felt that future societal
change would be reflected in these students' current plans. To
our surprise, these college students did not endorse either of
these alternatives. All 30 students planned to have a career after
college. All of the men and 13 out of 15 women planned both to
marry and to have children. Of these, 11 of the females and 8 of
the males did not want their children in daycare centers.
Females cited the desire to raise their own children as the
primary reason for their reluctance to use daycare. Males also
stressed the importance of the family in raising the children. In
response to the question "If both you and your mate have full
time careers and you both want to have children, how would
you handle this situation?" Only 2 males and 6 females
expected the father to share the child rearing role. Nine of the
females and 11 of the males expected the mother to assume the
bulk of childrearing responsibilities. Taken together, these
results suggest that college students today expect that either
they (if female) or their spouse (if male) will take time out of a
career to raise the family. Further, given today's job market,
this goal, in essence, precludes a high level professional career
commitment during the early family years. Those women who
desire a professional career will be forced either to (1) lower
these aspirations, or (2) opt for a non-traditional (non-male)
career path—entering into the profession late or establishing
themselves in their career early and then taking time out for a
family. Both of these options will structure the career choices
available to these women.

Omission of Incentive Value

The most serious problem, in our estimation, with the
traditional achievement model is the omission of incentive
value. The question of underlying values, either personal or
those inherent in the task, was not handled in Atkinson's
original need achievement model. Viewed from within the
traditional achievement model, the failure of a highly able
individual to aspire to a high level occupation is incomprehen-
sible. For example, striving towards and achieving the top

position in one's medical school class is prophetic of future high-status, power, and financial security. Both Atkinson and Horner decided that any person with a strong need to achieve would view this type of success as highly desirable, more desirable, certainly, than affiliative success. A person designated as having high need achievement by their measures, but for whom these goals are not particularly salient is seen as an anomoly. However, the motive to approach a task is undoubtedly influenced by the *underlying value structures* of the individual or the task. In the past, need achievement models have failed to take into account variability on these values. Task values has been treated as a constant. In our egocentric way, we have assumed that "success" in life-defining roles like careers is simply fulfilling the requirements of the task according to the experimenter's perception of a common standard of achievement. The consequence of assigning a stable, agentic character to the motivational and incentive value components of an achievement task is instability within the model and a lack of predictive power for those individuals with a different value system than the experimenter. It is important to realize that the intrinsic value of a task may vary as a result of differences in underlying value constructs; and therefore that it must be considered as variable within the motivational construct, rather than constant.

But, why was task value overlooked in need achievement models? As was discussed earlier, it was algebraically eliminated. Largely as a consequence of this reduction, little research has been done on the impact of values on achievement choices. Career counseling researchers have devoted some attention to this issue but have done little more than identify a relationship between the global values one holds and the profession one is in. In one of the most comprehensive attempts to develop a typology of values and to relate individual differences on these global values to behaviors including occupation, Rokeach (1973) demonstrated that members of different occupations are discriminable in terms of their pattern of value endorsements. But it seems these studies are not really capturing incentive value as it is conceptualized within an expectancy × value model of task choice. None

studied the relationship between the value of various tasks and goals to the individual and that individual's task choice.

Work within the field of developmental study of achievement orientation, primarily that of the Crandalls (1962, 1969), has measured attainment value and has related it to task choice. Others have related attainment value to persistence on tasks (Battle, 1965, 1966; Stein & Bailey, 1973). In general these studies have demonstrated the relationship between attainment value and task choice in the experimental setting. But, they have not investigated the relationship between values and long range goal choices.

It is our belief that the failure of the need achievement model to illuminate women's achievement behaviors and life choices reflects these shortcomings. Most importantly, the failure of the need achievement model to consider individual differences in task perception and value system has severely limited the utility of the model. It is to this omission that we will direct the remainder of this paper.

Values and Life Choices

The first step in our investigation of values and long range goal choice is to define more clearly task value. Task value has been conceptualized broadly as *a quality of the task which contributes to the increasing or declining probability that a given individual will approach the task*. This quality of the task can be further defined in terms of three primary components: (1) the *utility value* of a given task in aiding the achievement of some long range goals, for example, the value of taking a high school math course in terms of its importance for becoming an engineer; (2) the *incentive value* of engaging in the task, for example, the value of taking a high school math course in terms of the enjoyment one gets from solving math problems; and (3) the *incentive value of successfully achieving one's goal*, for example, the value of taking a high school math course in terms of the enjoyment one gets from getting an A in a math course.

Incentive value itself can be further divided into several components, two of which are particularly important to us.

Incentive value can be conceptualized in terms of the imme-
diate rewards, intrinsic or extrinsic, that performance of a task
will provide for the individual. For example, tennis could be
intrinsically rewarding because it makes one feel healthy or
extrinsically rewarding because one is paid for the per-
formance. Incentive value can also be conceptualized in terms
of the global values that an activity fulfills. Tasks can be
perceived as related to certain global values such as compe-
tition, altruism, nurturance, power, status, or intellectual
quality. If one holds one of these values as very important, then
one may select activities that are related to that value. For
example, tennis could have a high incentive value because one
values competitive competence and tennis allows one to
demonstrate to oneself one's competitive competence. In order
to determine the incentive value of a particular task, the
researcher must first discover the individual's perception of the
values inherent in the task, or in other words, which kinds of
needs the individual believes that the task will fulfill. Then the
researcher must determine whether the individual believes that
participation in the task will lead to a fulfillment of needs or
will reaffirm the individual's self-concept.

The fact that incentive value can be conceptualized in this
latter way indicates the importance of the phenomenological
study of the relation between global values and task choice. If
the individual's task selection is influenced by the incentive
values of the task, and if the incentive value can be related to the
individual's basic value structure, then it is important to
measure both the individual's value structure and the individ-
ual's perception of the relationship of various tasks to these
values that should predict the incentive value of the task. If the
incentive value of a task is influenced by the congruity of one's
value structures and one's perception of the relationship of the
task to these structures, then one can reasonably assume that
the resounding effect of values upon task choice and task
persistence can be felt on multiple levels.

The implications of this analysis for our understanding of
the differences in life choices between men and women are
clear. Since sex role socialization has a major impact on
individuals' goals and values (Frieze et al., 1978), it is reason-

able to expect that women's value structure will differ from that of men.

In terms of task value, sex difference in value structure can manifest itself in several ways. For one, women and men could attach different incentive values for engaging in and successfully completing various activities. For example, women may place more importance on spending time with friends than men and, thus, be more likely to approach this activity.

Alternatively, women's hierarchy of values might differ from that of men's. That is, when asked to rank order the importance of various activities and adult life goals, women may display a different pattern than men. For example, as discussed earlier, if women see the parenting role as more important than a professional career role while men rate these roles as equally important, then it is to be expected that women would be more likely to resolve life decisions in favor of their parenting goals. This differential would be especially marked if women see the career options as not only of lower importance but also as detrimental to the successful completion of their parenting goals.

At a more fundamental level, sex role socialization could create a sex differentiated hierarchy of global values. That is, women and men could order their central core values differently. Consequently, various life tasks satisfying different core values would have different incentive values for men and women. For example, if women see "helping others" as a more important core value than do men, occupations which allow one to help others would have a higher incentive value for women than men.

The above mentioned example illustrates the impact of a sex-differentiated core value structure on the importance of both processes and goals. A sex-differentiated core value structure could also influence the very definitions of success and failure on a whole variety of tasks and activities. Men and women may well differ in their conceptualization of the requirements for successful task participation and completion. Consequently, men and women would attach different incentive values to the various options and would approach and structure their task involvement differently. The parenting

role provides an excellent example of this process. If males define success in the parenting role as an extension of their achievement roles, then they may respond to parenthood with increased commitment to their career goals and with emphasis on encouraging competitive achievement in their children. In contrast, if women define success in the parenting role as high levels of involvement in the children's lives, they may respond to parenthood with decreased commitment to their career goals.

Career roles can also be influenced by this process. If men and women differ in their definitions of career success they should structure their career activities quite differently. For example, if women are more likely to define the medical profession as an opportunity to help others and be involved with the patient's lives, while men are more likely to define the medical profession as an opportunity to achieve in a high status occupation, then women doctors should be more likely to structure their medical career around helping as many people as possible in as broad a capacity as possible while male doctors should be more likely to structure their career around high status specialities. This is, in fact, the case. Women are much more likely to become general practitioners and much less likely to seek out a speciality than men (Heins, 1978).

Given all of these influences on the incentive values of task choices, it is, to be expected that the utility value of various activities will also be sex-differentiated. If the utility value is determined, partly, on the basis of the usefulness of an activity for reaching a future goal, then sex differences in future goals will result in differences in the utility values of various activities. This, in turn, will result in differential approach behaviors. For example, high ability girls are more likely to drop out of math in high school than are high ability boys. While a host of reasons may be responsible, differentially perceived utility value is undoubtedly important.

One final issue that struck us as we researched the value literature was the distinction between values and motives. If one is focusing on incentive value as the anticipated reward for engaging in or successfully completing a given task, then incentive value is conceptually distinct from motive. But if one

is defining incentive value in terms of the congruence between one's basic value structure and one's perception of various tasks, then the distinction is less clear. M. Brewster Smith recognized this problem in 1969. He defined a value as a standard by which we judge our behavior. Because values act as a standard, they can influence effort, pride, shame and task choice. He concluded that *"In this sense a value may also be a motive, when one's values influence one's choices they do so by virtue of motivational force."* How, then, does a value differ from a motive? This remains an important question for those of us attempting to measure both and to develop a model relating each to task choice. But it is clear that incentive and utility values must be considered in any model of life choices.

Bakan's Model

We will turn now to a discussion of Bakan's model of agency and communion which we feel provides an alternative concep- tualization of the interplay between motives and values. Bakan (1966) suggested that there are two basic modalities of life that encompass both values and motivation: "communion" and "agency"; and that men and women, as collectives, differ in their orientation to these modalities. Women, much more than men, have been noted as conforming to the *"communion"* disposition of existence: characterized by *openness, noncon- tractual cooperation* and the *sense of being at one with others.* Within the traditional motive theories, communion could, then, be described as an integration of achievement and affilia- tion motives and values. In contrast, men's orientation to life goals conforms more to the "agency" modality: characterized by isolation, self-protection, self-assertation, self-expansion, by the urge to master, and to remain separate from others. Again within a motivational framework, agency could be considered as the segregation of achievement and affiliation. If there is such a tendency for men and women to cluster around the separate modalities, then it should affect many facets of behavior, including life and career goals.

In an investigation of college students' considerations for

choosing a particular career, Astin (1975) found that women appeared to be more motivated by intrinsic considerations and men by extrinsic considerations. In particular, women were more likely than men to endorse the following job characteristics influential in their career choice: relevance of the field to their intrinsic interests, the opportunity to contribute to society, to work with ideas and people, to be helpful to others, and to express one's identity. In contrast, more men than women rated the following as important job characteristics: the opportunity for high salaries, high prestige, rapid advancement, and a stable future. These value structures are similar to Bakan's descriptions of the "communion" and "agency" modalities. The desire to be at one with others, and to gain rewards through one's interaction with others reflects communal characteristics, while the desire to be both separate from "the people" and to ascend to a position which few attain and many respect reflects a more agentic orientation.

The degree to which the traditional model of achievement and success reflects an agentic perspective becomes increasingly clear. The achievement motive has been validated in studies of individual, goal oriented tasks. A view of achievement and success from a communion perspective raises issues which have not been considered fully in the past. Agentic rewards alone offer little reinforcement to a communally oriented person. Agency-type rewards can be defined as the fulfillment of long term goals. Attention is paid to the ultimate fulfillment of the goal rather than the characteristics of the task and the process of achieving it. A communion oriented person is perceived to attend to the factors mediating the actual achievement of the goal. The worthiness of the goal, for example, cannot be estimated without regard to continued intrinsic interest in the task, possible affiliative loss or gain, possible benefit or harm to others, and/or the likelihood that the pursuit of the task will lead to self-growth and realization of certain intrapsychic goals. In view of this, the woman's tendency to focus on the process of achieving an end (Veroff, 1977) may be directly applicable to life goals and career aspirations. Women may weight the procedural costs in an achievement setting more than men.

A communal perspective also points to the need to consider more than one motive system. The procedural costs alluded to above often take the form of affiliative losses: an inability to interact socially because of a task's demand on one's time, an inability to directly assist people in one's career due to its nature, a lack of affiliation with one's co-workers due to the supervisory quality of the position or an incompatibility between career demands and parenting goals. When one considers the relation of intrapsychic variables to women's attitudes toward achievement (as representatives of a more communal mode), and their resultant behavior, the necessity of incorporating affiliative factors within the traditional achievement model becomes pre-eminent.

Finally, consideration of a communion model of achievement requires attention to much more specific definitions of success. While agentic success is defined, to some extent, in terms of one's distinctiveness from one's peers, communion-type success does not rely on the social comparison process. One can feel successful if one's group succeeds at a task they have defined as important or if one has contributed to harmony within one's social group. One can also feel successful if one is able to help someone succeed at his or her own goals, with minor regard to one's own welfare.

Thus, it can be seen that the consideration of people's communal needs is as essential as the consideration of their agentic needs in predicting their career aspirations and life goals. In addition to the predictive power it will lend the model with respect to women's achievement behavior and life choices, we expect that the inclusion of communion considerations in our achievement models will shed more light on intrapyschic factors (i.e., values) mediating men's achievement behavior. It cannot be assumed that men pursue goals without any regard to communion-type factors. However, in view of traditional societal demands upon men to adhere to an agentic-type path for career and life success, it is hardly surprising that internal values have not been considered as related to achievement. Perhaps a more realistic illustration of achievement behavior will aid in dispelling some of the more inhumane concepts and demands of "success" as we know it.

Measurement

As schemes for measuring agency and communion began to take shape, we perceived two distinct methodological approaches. The first approach engaged the use of the traditional Atkinsonian model with some major modifications. The second involved the development of a new scale which would reflect, more directly, agency and communion orientation in conjunction with the convergence of several other measures. What follows are our beginning attempts as conceptualizing measurement strategies within each of these approaches.

Modified motivational assessment. The reader will recall the many objections registered against the use of this model in attempting to predict long range achievement choices. In spite of its many deficiencies, however, we have constructed a formula using this paradigm which, by incorporating an additional motive structure, might provide a better estimate of the communion orientation to achievement.

Within a traditional motivational model, communal factors could be described as affiliative motives in that affiliation typifies the most distinct difference between agency and communion, that is, the attitude towards the importance of oneself apart from others versus the importance of others in conjunction with oneself. Take the need achievement motive: need affiliation can be divided into the motive to gain affiliative success (M_{as}) and the motive to avoid affiliative failure (M_{aaf}). These motives are assumed to be aroused whenever performance involves interpersonal interaction; and the degree of success or failure is measured against internal standards of the achievement of certain intimacy levels with a certain situation. M_{as} will be aroused at the prospect of gaining new friends, achieving deeper levels of intimacy, and maintaining that intimacy. M_{aaf} will be aroused by possible rejection or reduction of levels of intimacy with significant others, or of not gaining any new deep friendships. As in Atkinson's model, the strengths of the tendencies to approach affiliative success and avoid affiliative failure are multiplicative functions of their respective motives, incentive values and probability of success or failure ($T_{as} = M_{as} \times I_{as} \times P_{as}$; $T_{aaf} = $

$M_{aaf} = I_{aaf} = P_{aaf}$).

Combining the motive systems, the tendency to approach an achievement situation becomes the sum of the tendency to approach ,within task affiliative success minus the tendency to avoid within task affiliative failure ($T_{as} - T_{aaf} = T_a$ affiliation) and the tendency to approach goal oriented success minus the tendency to avoid goal oriented failure ($T_s - T_{af} = T_a$ achievement). To this function, the tendency to respond to extrinsic factors in an achievement situation could be added. The resulting formula appears as such:

$$T_A = (T_{as} - T_{aaf}) + (T_s - T_{af}) + T_{ext} \quad \text{or}$$
$$T_A = (T_a \text{ affiliation}) + (T_a \text{ achievement}) + T_{ext}.$$

Thus, one could calculate a single estimate of one's approach tendency in a given situation by considering both the achievement T_a and the affiliative T_a aroused by that situation. For individuals with high need achievement and high affiliation, the T_A for any given task would be high to the extent that the oportunity for both achievement and affiliative success were high; the T_A for any given task would be lowered to the extent that the probability of affiliative failure was high. In contrast, for individuals with low need for affiliation, the T_A for a given task would be high to the extent that T_a achievement was high; variations in the opportunity for affiliative success or failure would have little impact. Comparisons of the T_{AS} of a variety of individuals for a particular task would allow one to test hypotheses regarding individual differences in task selection. Comparisons of the T_{AS} of a variety of tasks for one individual would allow one to test hypotheses regarding within subject variations in task selection.

Alternatively, using a strategy similar to that used by Spence and Helmreich (1978) in scoring the PAQ for Androgyny, one could divide the population based on their scores on Mehrabian's need achievement and need affiliative scales into quadrants. This would yield four groups: high need affiliators and high need achievers (Type 1), high need affiliators and low need achievers (Type 2), low need affiliators and high need achievers (Type 3), and low need affiliators and low need achievers (Type 4). For our purposes the most interesting comparisons would be between Types 1, 2 and 3: Type 1 potentially reflecting the

integrated individual Bakan alludes to, Type 2 the communion individual, and Type 3 the agentic individual. Intuitively, it seems that Type 1 individuals are caught in the kind of double bind that is common to bright, competent women. While on one level these individuals could be characterized like Androgynous individuals as having the best of both worlds, on the other hand, they will often be caught between conflicting highly valued alternatives. In-depth analyses then of the differences in the resolution of conflicting choices between Type 1 and Type 3 individuals might illuminate the differences in the life choices and goals of academically competent men and women.

Values Assessment. The procedures discussed above rely upon traditional notions of the relation of motivation to behavior as a vehicle for describing the interaction of achievement orientations. The following procedure reflects our attempts to engage personal values more directly in the measurement of agency and communion. We have developed a scale based on our perception of the ways in which values might be articulated in attitudes concerning sensible and desirable philosophies and behaviors in work, leisure, and social aspect of life.

The original *Achievement Orientation Scale* consisted of 39 forced choice items. Each item described two attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors which were thought to reflect agency or communion-typed values. For instance, the item "Which, for you, defines "peace" more . . . 1) quiet, serenity, solitude . . . a mind at ease and cleared of the fog of daily, petty anxieties; or 2) warmth between people, acceptance because of and in spite of one's faults . . . no quarrelling, jealousy, or haughtiness," attempted to determine whether the individual desired to rise above, or get away from people rather than be together, as one. Several items measured these types of values in different ways. An extension of this differential orientation is seen in items discriminating the desire to "achieve" in one's career from the desire to develop friendships or help other's in one's career e.g., "Who would you rather be? 1) Someone who is a good friend . . . would do anything for you . . . one of my favorite people; or 2) Some who will go far in their field . . . has

gained a lot of people's respect . . . devotes a lot of time to work and loves it."

Based on several construct and content validity analyses,[1] the initial set of 39 items was reduced to 24 items divided into 3 subscales: (1) a group of items differentiating individuals with high agentic orientation from those with low agentic orientation (Subscale 1); (2) a group of items differentiating individuals with high communion orientation from those with low communion orientation (Subscale 2); (3) a group of items differentiating individuals with high agentic orientation from individuals with high communion orientation (Subscale 3). Scores on this last subscale reflect the resolution of the conflict between agentic and communion values. It is on this subscale that we have focused our validation research.

While we have just begun to test the strength and validity of this subscale, and have not assessed age and wider population appropriateness, our initial results are encouraging. In response to a question inquiring as to their probable career choice, our subjects (all college women) answered in ways that were easily categorized into either human service oriented, helping careers (doctor, nurse, social worker, and teacher) or self-oriented, non-helping careers (engineer, business executive, artist). Further the women within each career type were sorted into one of three groups according to their reasons for entering their career: (1) helping reasons (i.e., benefit others); (2) external, non-helping reasons (potential high salary, potential fame); (3) internal non-helping reasons (personal interest, intellectual challenge). A one-way analysis of variance disclosed no effects of career type per se on any of the AOS subscales. The reason for entering the career, however, was related to scores on Subscale 3. Women entering their career for helping or internal, non-helping reason scored significantly higher (more communion orientation) than women entering for non-helping reasons. In addition, low scores (agency orientation) on Subscale 3 were related to higher educational aspirations, plans to make more money and plans to work a larger percentage of working years.

---

[1] Details can be obtained from the authors.