

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1988

Conflict and the achievement/affiliation relationship analysis of elite male and female long distance runners.

Janice Ellen. Dean
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Dean, Janice Ellen., "Conflict and the achievement/affiliation relationship analysis of elite male and female long distance runners." (1988). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1541.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/1541>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité intérieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

**CONFLICT AND THE ACHIEVEMENT/AFFILIATION RELATIONSHIP:
AN ANALYSIS OF ELITE MALE AND FEMALE LONG DISTANCE RUNNERS**

by

**JANICE ELLEN DEAN
B.A., WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, 1985**

**A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
THROUGH THE FACULTY OF HUMAN KINETIC
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF HUMAN KINETICS AT
THE UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR**

WINDSOR, ONTARIO, CANADA

JULY 14, 1988

(c) JANICE ELLEN DEAN, 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN . 0-315-48148-X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter I: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
Achievement and Affiliation	1
Models of Achievement Motivation	2
Traditional Approach	2
Attribution Approach	6
Expectancy-Value Approach	11
Maehr's Approach	14
Summary	21
Role Identity, Role Conflict and the Female Athlete	21
Summary	31
Conclusion	31
Chapter II: Statement of the Problem	36
Research Questions	37
Hypotheses	37
Chapter III: Methodology	38
Subjects	38
Procedures	39
Instruments	40
Demographic Information	40
Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale (HSBAS)	40
Affiliative Conflict Scale	41
Follow-Up Interview	41
Data Analysis	41
Chapter IV: Results and Discussion	43
Subject Attrition	43
Demographic Information	43
Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale (HSBAS)	44
Affiliative Conflict Scale	46

Conflict Question	48
Interview Data	50
Conclusion	53
 Appendix A: Letter	 56
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire	57
Appendix C: Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale	58
Appendix D: Likert-Scale and Conflict Question	59
Appendix E: Open-ended Interview Questions	60
References	63

LIST OF TABLES

1. Age distribution of subjects (n=125)	43
2. Marital status of subjects	43
3. Data from HSBAS	44
4. Themes, in order of frequency	49

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine quantitative and qualitative gender differences in the relationship between achievement and affiliation in elite male and female runners. The basis of the study was theoretical work that suggests that female achievers have a higher need for affiliation than male achievers and that this fusion of achievement and affiliation in females results in interpersonal, affiliative conflict for females in competitive achievement situations.

Two hundred subjects, elite Michigan long distance runners, were asked to respond to a questionnaire which included, 1) the Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale (HSBAS), measuring need for achievement and need for affiliation, 2) eight Likert scale questions measuring affiliative conflict and 3) one short answer question directly asking whether the athlete experiences conflict between meeting athletic goals and maintaining interpersonal relationships. In a second part of the study, 15 males and 15 females were selected on the basis of the short answer question for open-ended interviews. Interviews focused on questions related to achievement, affiliation and conflict related to the running experience.

Data analysis indicated that, although male and female runners did not differ on HSBAS Achievement and Affiliation scores, they did differ significantly in terms of affiliative conflict as demonstrated on several of the Likert scale questions. Response differences were also noted on the short answer question and in the interviews. Affiliative/emotional issues were shown to be the basis for conflict in some female elite runners. This was not found to be the case for males.

These results suggest the need for a reassessment of the utility of the Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale in understanding the reasons underlying athletic participation and the meaning athletes bring to the athletic context. This is particularly relevant in any attempt to gain information that is appropriate for females as well as males.

DEDICATION

**IN LOVING MEMORY OF ALEXA KRAFT, A PIONEER MICHIGAN RUNNER AND
AN INSPIRATIONAL ROLE MODEL TO MANY MALE AND FEMALE RUNNERS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THANKS TO MY SUPPORTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chapter I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.1 *Achievement and Affiliation*

There is evidence from studies (Veroff et al., 1975; Hoffman, 1974) and from popular literature (Porter & Foster, 1986) that females have greater affiliative needs than males and therefore, when affiliative needs are coupled with high achievement needs, a conflict between affiliation and achievement may occur in competitive kinds of achievement situations. Since it is maintained that the high achievement oriented female places added importance on fulfilling both affiliative and achievement needs, a different kind of meaning is brought to the competitive achievement situation by the female, producing a conflict of interests and a unique set of problems for her. This is a significant assertion in one particular achievement situation where the competitive edge is an essential one -- the athletic situation. It seems that, apart from direct concerns with whether or not their behavior is sufficiently "feminine" (Felshin, 1974; Del Rey, 1977), competitive female athletes frequently allow concern with affective relationships to interfere with the full use of their capabilities. While the need for social approval has been found to increase persistence behavior in females (Atkinson & O'Connor, 1966; Harter, 1974), it has also been hypothesized that this need has a debilitating effect on the level of performance (Sutherland & Veroff, 1985). For the purpose of this study, the relationship between affiliation and achievement (ie., athletic excellence) will be explored in elite long distance runners to determine if this relationship differentially affects the athletic experience of male and female athletes.

1.2 **Models of Achievement Motivation**

Achievement behavior consists of three component parts; persistence, choice of activity and intensity of performance. Achievement motivation or the motivation to display such behavior has been the focus of much theoretical and empirical work. The answer to one question, however, still eludes researchers. How is achievement behavior best explained and understood? Research results disclose gender differences, differences which have been explained in a variety of ways depending on the theoretical framework used by the researcher to understand achievement. Making explicit which of the various ways or frameworks used to conceptualize achievement motivation, then, is an essential first step in an attempt to understand how the female or any athlete is driven or operates.

The first approaches or theoretical frameworks to be examined are fragmentary in nature. They contribute to pieces of the achievement puzzle, but as each new piece is provided, the shape of the puzzle changes. Research based on 1) motives, 2) expectancies and 3) values or incentives has provided insight into the understanding of achievement behavior, but as will be seen, there has been a tendency in such research to look at achievement from an ethnocentric standard -- a white, Western-culture, male point of view -- that precludes other points of view - women, blacks, ethnic groups -- and often precludes non-standard behavior patterns as achievement-related. A new framework will be outlined that provides a broader perspective of achievement which includes a greater variety of behaviors that are recognized as achievement-oriented. This new framework attempts to regard unique cultures, groups and individuals as different from one another but not inferior or superior to each other based on such differences.

1.2.1 **Traditional Approach**

McClelland, often called the father of achievement motivation, first defined this motivation as a concern with excellence (McClelland et al., 1953). In McClelland's conception, this concern is learned in early childhood in the form of motive states. These states he calls the "mainsprings of action". One motive, the need to achieve, was the first motive to be identified. This motive was

thought to be an internalized, dispositional aspect of the personality -- a stable, enduring trait that exists but needs to be aroused by appropriate environmental cues. Hence, motivation, according to McClelland's view, is determined by the interaction between personal and environmental cues.

From this theoretical framework, McClelland et al. (1953) derived a measurement scheme to assess motivation and detail its impact on behavior. The theory of achievement based on Murray's system of needs (Murray, 1938), implemented by McClelland, specified that motives are unconscious: hence, projective tests, relying on the subject's own reconstruction of an ambiguous scene, were held to be the best means of assessment. Early validation studies used a projective technique based on the Thematic Apperception Test. The typical procedure was to test under two conditions -- a neutral and an aroused -- using a picture cue about which a story was to be written. The arousal procedure consisted of instructions highlighting the competitive nature of the task in order to arouse the latent achievement propensity (Veroff et al., 1974). Imagery that reflected the differences between the two conditions became the basis of a scoring system used to derive a need-for-achievement (nAchievement) score. Male nAchievement scores consistently increased from the neutral to the aroused condition. Female nAchievement scores did not. These findings (Veroff et al., 1953; McClelland et al., 1953) provoked the next empirical investigations.

The achievement construct was speculated to be more complex than originally conceived. Atkinson and Feather (1966) reconceptualized it to include two motives rather than one -- a positive and a negative one. These two motives are thought to be separate and perhaps, interacting dispositions, rather than polar ones, each of which has a bearing on resultant achievement behavior. The positive component, the motive to approach success, interacts in some cases with a negative component, the motive to avoid failure and considering both in the measurement scheme gives the best predictions of achievement behaviors (Atkinson & Feather, 1966). The motive to avoid failure, often referred to in the literature as the fear of failure, is defined as the threat of the possibility of failure in an achievement situation. This motive affects behavior in different ways. In avoiding failure, an individual (1) may avoid participation in a given achievement situation, (2)

may attempt to restructure the situation as a noncompetitive one so that success or failure cannot be directly assessed, or (3) in many instances, may strive for success (Birrell, 1978). An example of the latter effect can be understood by reflecting on an incident that Billy Rogers, a U.S. Olympic marathon participant, relates (Lynch, 1987). In a Boston victory over Jeff Wells, during the race Rogers saw in his mind the headlines in the paper of his second place finish. This picture was so devastating to Rogers that it was sufficiently motivating to produce a final surge that won him first place by a narrow margin. From this example, it is clear that the motive to avoid failure does not necessarily accompany low achievement behavior. People who fear failure are often successful. Hence, the wide range of behavioral latitude this motive can elicit, might, in fact, demonstrate one reason why the motive approach might be an inadequate or at least narrow one to examine and understand the full spectrum of achievement behavior.

Another reason is that the patterns of data that have emerged in reference to the motives outlined thus far support the construct validity and reliability of the basic theory and measurement system for males only. In some cases, women were simply omitted as subjects from the experiments (Birrell, 1978). Some investigators, however, inspired by gender discrepancies, took an interest in the possibility that women make a different kind of sense out of achievement situations (Gilligan, 1982), and results for females are inconsistent with motive theory.

Using the same theoretical framework, various researchers (Veroff, Wilcox & Atkinson, 1953; Field, 1951; Lesser, Krawitz & Packard, 1963; French & Lesser, 1953) reconsidered the imagery data from studies measuring nAchievement; the imagery scores from the neutral and the aroused conditions were independently examined. Females were found to have high scores in the neutral condition, in fact, higher than their male counterparts in the aroused conditions. The females' achievement imagery did not change from the neutral to the aroused condition, implying very low achievement propensity from difference scores. Rather than accepting such conclusions at face value, experimental findings suggest that there are different conditions or "cues" that elicit motivation in the female. One explanation has been that females are at their peak level of

achievement motivation in the neutral condition, so experimental procedures cannot possibly heighten that level (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980).

One group of studies, however, did heighten that level. Experimental procedures that guaranteed social approval for excellence in the arousal condition were found to bring an increase in nAchievement scores in the female (Field, 1951). In fact, the only increase in nAchievement scores in women has been under conditions that link affiliation and achievement concerns (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980). Although some males measure high on the need-for-affiliation (nAffiliation), high nAffiliation scores are more characteristic of the female (Romer, 1974). It is thought to be the one critical variable responsible for discrepant gender findings in achievement research (Hoffman, 1972). Affiliation has been defined broadly -- it is related to social concerns: the need to excel in social skills, the striving for social acceptance, the importance placed on interpersonal relationships, and, in general, the desire to maintain gender-role-appropriate behavior. Females, primarily concerned with such social concerns, are thought to construe achievement in terms of its effects on affiliative success. While achievement efforts might not be primarily instigated by affiliative motives or social approval per se, social skills are a central area of achievement concern (Stein & Bailey, 1973). The two concerns then -- affiliation and achievement -- are both central to and "fused" in the female, presumably bringing competition and achievement behavior within the female role in a way that is different from what occurs with males. Based on such findings, the affiliative motive is an essential area to consider when determining the meaning and operation of achievement in women.

Whether affiliation affects a female's choice of activity (or entry into an achievement domain) or affects her persistence at a given achievement behavior, it has been hypothesized that affiliation affects the intensity of performance. If women are highly affiliation-oriented, the additional need for affiliation might obstruct their achievement behavior. If affiliation and achievement are fused, as suspected, achievement entails multiple incentives. It has been hypothetically stated, because of this, that women's psychological resolution could be to make their achievement

desires subservient to those of affiliation (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980). Perhaps the two central needs are more balanced than this statement implies. Even so, having more than one focus could minimize concentration and the accomplishment of peak levels of excellence. In one empirical study using males, those males with high levels of nAffiliation and high nAchievement demonstrated lower levels of performance than those with a lower nAffiliation (Atkinson & Reitman, 1958). In an area such as athletic participation where concentration is crucial to high performance, this might be an important determinant to consider.

It is thought that social concerns lead to conformity in the female (Horner, 1968). Perhaps women receive the message either that they risk jeopardizing social approval for outstanding performance or that they are guaranteed social approval for more moderate performance levels. This is the premise underlying another motive postulated by Horner (1968) as an explanation for the gender differences found in the research. The motive to avoid success or "the fear of success" is conceptualized as a psychological barrier to achievement in the female. It is thought to occur in situations that are perceived as role-inappropriate for the female and that incur negative consequences for high level accomplishments. At this point, it is important to note that Horner makes a distinction between two types of achievement situations -- one that entails competition against a standard of excellence and another that entails competition against other people. It is with the latter that people with fear of success have a problem. Since evidence supports the idea that social comparison is less desirable for females than for males and, even aversive (Deci & Ryan, 1985), it would seem reasonable to expect that this motive is more characteristic of females than of males. The studies on fear of success confirm this expectation (Horner, 1968; Hoffman, 1974).

1.2.2 Attribution Approach

Another framework used to explain achievement behavior is attribution theory (Weiner, 1972). Attributions are causal explanations or the reasons given by individuals to explain success and failure outcomes in achievement situations. Weiner (1974) demonstrated the importance of studying attributions to further the understanding of achievement-oriented behavior. In this

approach, it is thought that causal attributions affect expectancies for the future, an individual's choice of future performance, the pride or shame one experiences and one's subsequent performance levels (Weiner, 1974). Gender differences have emerged in this body of research as well and the differences have been explained in a number of conflicting ways.

For any achievement outcome, there are a number of possible reasons why a particular success or failure might occur: therefore, many causal attributions are possible. Traditional attribution research, having its foundation in academic settings, discovered four prevalent causes used to explain achievement outcomes -- ability, effort, task difficulty, luck -- and these have been the ones utilized in most subsequent research areas. These attributions are two dimensional in nature -- there is an internal/external component and a stable/unstable one. Based on this analysis, one perceives and assesses causes for one's behavior based on internal (ability, effort) or external (task difficulty, luck) characteristics and stable (ability, task difficulty) or unstable (effort, luck) characteristics. It is assumed that people are more likely to seek out tasks where there is an increased probability of doing well and will strive to maximize positive feelings about success and minimize negative feelings about failure. This has been called self-enhancement (Frieze et al., 1974). Hence, people will generally attempt to attribute positive success to internal causes and negative failure to external ones (Weiner, 1974).

The assessment of causes to outcomes, however, is not an objective process but a subjective psychological one mediated by an individual's interaction with his or her environment (e.g., socialization patterns, past experiences, significant others). Patterns of attributions develop over time and an individual perceives himself in a certain light. The attribution process creates enduring beliefs about one's success and failure record and these beliefs form expectancies with regard to future performance (Weiner, 1974).

These basic principles and concepts have been explored in many achievement contexts, including sport. Wins and losses are an integral part of the inherently competitive sport situation and thus, it is thought to be a perfect environment for measuring attributions of success and fail-

ure (Roberts, 1982). Such clear cut attributions as luck, effort, task difficulty and ability are not the only or even primary basis for perceptions of success and failure in sport (Spink & Roberts, 1980). Other influences also play a role -- for example, opponents' ability, team members, environmental factors (e.g., weather conditions, type of court), past performance and others' expectations. Hence, the attribution process in the sport context is more complex than in the laboratory.

Within the existing attribution literature, certain gender differences in attributions have been predicted and investigated. In general, it is thought that women utilize self-derogatory attribution patterns. They are thought to have low beliefs in their own ability and lower expectations for success than males (Frieze & Weiner, 1971). According to the model, a female who expects to do poorly but succeeds would attribute her success to an unstable cause such as luck. This type of attribution will not increase expectancies and will not occasion pride for success. In the event that the female fails, she tends to attribute the outcome to a lack of ability. This occasions feelings of shame and low expectancies for future success. Studies have supported this pattern in female subjects (Deaux, 1976; McMahan, 1973).

A more frequently predicted pattern for women is one of externality. This pattern is characterized by attributions to task difficulty or luck regardless of the outcome. For example, some studies found that females rate task easier than males in both success and failure situations (Bartol & Frieze, 1976; McMahan, 1973). By doing this, females reduce the value of success (or the positive affect -- pride -- associated with it) and increase the negative implications of failure.

Similar predictions of gender differences have been made in the sport setting. Such self-derogatory attributions are predicted to have an effect on persistence behavior in women. Women athletic participants, who routinely attribute success to luck and failure to low ability, might be more likely to discontinue sport altogether or, at least, will not achieve the higher levels of sport accomplishment which necessitate some degree of confidence and a correlation between output and outcome (McHugh, Duquin & Frieze, 1978).

More serious female athletes are predicted to reflect the attributional patterns of high achievement-oriented women in general. Studies have suggested that highly motivated women employ more effort attributions for both success and failure than low achievement-oriented women (Bar-Tal & Frieze, 1976). High achievement motivation was related to higher estimates of ability for both male and female subjects, but the finding was stronger for men. Success attributed to effort is a more prevalent pattern in high achievement females, contrary to high achievement males who attribute success to ability. Success attributed to effort, an unstable quality, has been associated with certain deficits in both affect and expectancies for future success.

Research (Nicholls, 1976) has explored how the use of ability rather than effort attributions to explain success might differentially affect performance expectancies toward performance, causing such deficits. While perceived effort was once thought to increase feelings of pride, competence and self-esteem in the face of success, this is found to be true only for the isolated event (Nicholls, 1976). Effort attributions have little effect on future expectancies. It is thought, rather, that those who attribute success to ability come to expect and achieve success more consistently, for perceived ability will occasion positive affect and will lead to anticipation of future pleasurable successes. Hence, attributing success to effort, as is common procedure for the female high achiever (e.g., athlete) implies a full use of ability, therefore, one will not anticipate much, if any, improvement.

Another disadvantage associated with the use of effort over ability attributions is that effort is under volitional control (Nicholls, 1976). Individuals who attribute success to effort might not perceive themselves as having the capabilities to gain the larger rewards contingent on outstanding performance and will act only to gain the smaller rewards rendered from external sources. As an example of this, Joan Benoit, Olympic gold medalist, mentioned that she has to be constantly on guard to keep praise (external) in perspective. By accepting the external rewards or other's praise for her outstanding accomplishments as enough, she may reduce her achievement goals and be satisfied with mediocrity (Benoit, 1987). "Self-reward for effort may be seen as an expres-

sion of basic conformity in an achievement-related society" (Nicholls, 1976). Consistent with this argument, it has been speculated that high effort-oriented females perceive sport and other "inappropriate, masculine" achievement domains as conforming. The female may act to conform to social norms that do not sanction high ability for the female.

Greater effort attributions in athletic females in particular, have been explained in other ways as well. The additional barriers to participation that females must hurdle in addition to the standard demands of athletic endeavors may, in fact, mandate greater effort on their part for success. Female athletes do not readily receive positive reinforcement by way of social approval and encouragement in the pursuit of physical excellence, receive inferior training and coaching, and receive less financial aid and backing (Neal & Tutko, 1975).

Also, psychological barriers, such as beliefs about physical unsuitability might act to inhibit physical performance. Many female athletes have been indoctrinated with a view of themselves as having limited potential. Having no concept of their own abilities requires them to use effort as an explanation for success and failure (Neal & Tutko, 1975).

In a study by Frieze et al. (1976), female athletes were found to attribute their outcomes differently than males. In fact, they attributed success more often to effort than ability as predicted. However, there was little evidence to support the prediction that such attributions affect performance (undermine affective responses such as praise for success) or mediate low expectations (reduce anticipation for future success). Frieze et al. (1976) suggested that while effort is the most important causal factor for high achievement-oriented women, perhaps the negative implications are unfounded.

As this study suggests, there are unresolved issues within the attribution theory model. These issues are particularly evident in sport research. First, the four traditional elements found to be commonly assigned in success and failure situations -- ability, effort, task difficulty, luck -- accounted for only 45% of the reported attributions in the sport context (compared to 79-83% in academic settings). In other words, the attributions assigned in sport research which utilizes the

traditional model might not be producing the same attribute results that would occur if subjects were allowed to respond freely. Hence, the traditional model could be inappropriate for the sport situation (Roberts, 1982).

Second, the attributional elements of ability, effort, task difficulty and luck often assume different shades of meaning in sport environments. For example, in nonsport environments, task difficulty typically refers to the complexity or age-appropriateness of a given task for the subject. In some sports, the difficulty or ease of the task will depend, in part, on the competence or performance ability of an opponent. This competence can be unstable if it varies from game to game. Hence, what is traditionally conceived of as an external, stable dimension can take on an unstable property in certain sport settings. Therefore, careful analysis of the dimensional properties of responses within specific environments is mandatory (Roberts, 1982).

Based on this general overview, it has been suggested that attribution theory and its associated sex-determined attributions offer only a "kernel of truth" (Hansen & O'Leary, 1985). While gender differences have emerged, they have been explained in a variety of ways that make the female appear disadvantaged or deficient in achievement situations. Another perspective offers the idea that males and females might, in fact, achieve similar performance levels but through different means and for different reasons. Therefore, incentive or the value associated with success for achievement offers another avenue to the understanding of achievement behavior.

1.2.3 Expectancy-Value Approach

A third framework that deals with the incentives associated with behavior is called the expectancy-value theory of motivation. This theory is two-facted. First, it takes into account the expectations or beliefs individuals have about the nature and likelihood of the consequences of their actions. Second, the value of these consequences to individuals in light of their motives is considered and has a bearing on behavior (choice of activity, persistence and intensity) (Horner, 1968).

Fear of success (Horner, 1968) is one theoretical construct based on this framework. According to Horner, anxiety is aroused when one expects the consequences of one's actions to be negative. Fear of success (or the motive to avoid success) is particularly prevalent among high achievement-oriented, high ability women who aspire to and/or are capable of achieving success. Their success is believed to be met with negative consequences such as fear of social rejection and/or feelings of being unfeminine. Fear of success is thought to occur or be aroused in competitive achievement situations that emphasize a standard of excellence and evaluation against others (Horner, 1968).

Horner (1968) investigated this motive by using a projective technique based on the Thematic Apperception Test emphasizing verbal leads rather than picture cues. Subjects were 178 freshmen and sophomore university undergraduates who were asked to write stories based on a sentence cue: ninety females wrote to the lead "After first term finals, Anne finds herself at the top of her medical school class," while 88 males wrote to the cue "After first term finals, John finds himself at the top of his medical school class."

Imagery was content analyzed and the fear of success motive was scored as present in individuals who "made statements in their stories showing conflict about success, denial of effort or responsibility for attaining success, denial of the cue itself or some other bizarre or inappropriate response to the cue" (Horner, 1972). As hypothesized, fear of success imagery dominated the female responses and was relatively absent in the male responses. Ninety percent of male responses displayed imagery that suggested strong positive feelings, confidence and optimism about the future, while 65% of the female imagery revealed negative or conflictual messages about the cue.

Replications of Horner's study have produced similar findings (Hoffman, 1974) in a series of female samples. Sixty to 88% of evaluations in a variety of study samples revealed fear of success imagery. The female subjects in the studies reflect a variety of ages, occupations and educational backgrounds.

One new trend, however, emerged in the replication studies. An increase in fear of success imagery was found for male subjects. While in the original study, only 8% revealed fear of success, in later studies, as many as 77% of male subjects responded with fear of success imagery (Horner, 1972). The initial explanation was that fear of success, contrary to the original hypothesis, is not sex-linked. However, upon evaluating male versus female imagery, it was found that the themes of their anxiety differed.

In females, the predominant theme was affiliative loss -- the fear of losing the affection of friends, lovers or husbands; in males, the common theme involved questioning the value of the accomplishment -- "writing stories that depict the uselessness and folly of achievement pursuits" (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980). For example, some male study themes included ideas such as "John is unhappy with his accomplishment", "John questions what he worked for" and "John's accomplishment was for his parents and not for himself." Some female themes related to Anne's loneliness for being so smart and achievement-oriented; for example, the loss of friends that took place when Anne climbed to the top of her medical school class (Hoffman, 1974). While fear of success associated with affiliation is not totally foreign to males, the findings suggest that it is more prevalent among females. This differential prevalence is based on the fact that females tend to be more attentive to interpersonal/affiliative concerns within a situation (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980).

The fact that a disillusionment with the idea and reality of success due to the pressures to succeed (male "fear of success" imagery) and a conflict between achievement and affiliative needs (female "fear of success" imagery) both score as "fear of success" has brought about the recognition that coding such imagery is problematic and dispels the original conception of fear of success as unidimensional. Rather, these findings suggest that fear of success is more accurately considered a multi-dimensional construct. For example, in discussing fear of success in sport situations, Jerry Lynch, a sport psychologist, delineates fear of success into categories -- "fear of self-knowledge," "fear of unacceptance," "fear of disaster," "fear of parental demands" (Horner's

studies were discussed under the category "fear of unacceptance") (Lynch, 1987). Perhaps the use of such conceptual categories to help differentiate types of fear of success imagery could help to clarify the construct.

Homer (1968) went on to propose ways in which female socialization engenders fear of success. She claims that fear of success is a result of sex-role training through which females come to acknowledge societal restrictions in their achievement and the consequences of violating these restrictions. This explanation takes into account the societal impact on personality development and also implies that societal standards are internalized and thus come to have motivational significance (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980). As Hoffman (1974) said, if the motivation for equality between the sexes has progressed to the point where women need not fear rejection for top level success, the female subjects do not know it yet.

As the fear of success literature suggests, women's sex-role expectations can be incompatible with achieving. This is particularly evident in situations that are perceived as sex-role inappropriate for the female -- situations that demand competition against others. It is thought that in order to be successful, the female must succeed in both achievement and affiliation, a dual task causing conflict or anxiety at times (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980). Nevertheless, fear of success shows great promise as a predictor of real life behavior in women (Sutherland & Veroff, 1980).

1.2.4 Maehr's Approach

A new framework that is broader in scope has been put forth by Maehr (1974). This framework assumes that achievement behavior is determined by a variety of "idiosyncratic situational and contextual factors, by social expectations, norms, task definitions and social cues" (Maehr, 1974, 1979) and not simply by traits or motives, attributions and incentives.

Maehr criticizes the personality trait or motive approach for its inherent biases. First, he suggests that this approach assumes a preconceived definition of achievement -- one scale of motivation against which all measure regardless of social and cultural variables. Second, the approach assumes that achievement motivation is a static dimension -- it is relatively stable across time and

situations. Third, it ignores diverse modes of achievement in different cultures and groups. Its approach is limited by its mainstream, ethnocentric view of achievement and, in this light, emphasizes a tendency to seek personal or individual success (i.e., competition) (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980). Maehr maintains that this limited perspective prevents a full understanding of groups, such as Japanese and women, that stress cooperation in achievement pursuits (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980).

Maehr's reconceptualization was first introduced as a means of understanding cross-cultural achievement motivation. The narrow, Western cultural view inherent in the McClelland approach has since been thought inappropriate for studying within culture variation as well, for example, variations between males and females (Ewing, 1981). This is at least partly due to the fact that the measurement procedures used, as already discussed, embody a conception of achievement that is role-inappropriate for females (Horner, 1972). Therefore, Maehr's redefinition of achievement is thought to provide a more useful and unbiased perspective for studying females (Ewing, 1981).

In redefining achievement, Maehr held that it consists of three conditions: "achievement motivations refers first of all to behavior that occurs in reference to a standard of excellence and thus can be evaluated in terms of success and failure. A second defining condition is that the individual must in some sense be responsible for the outcome. Third, there is some level of challenge and therewith, some sense of uncertainty involved" (Maehr, 1974).

Within this definition, Maehr maintains that two approaches can be used to investigate achievement behavior. The first approach is biased toward exploring diversity in achievement striving. This would involve identification of the meaning of achievement and achievement behavior for any given group or any individuals within a group. A second approach tests the hypothesis of universality or explores similarities between groups of individuals. This would involve defining a class or classes of achievement behavior in terms of the meaning or goals of behavior. This would necessitate using certain theoretical assumptions and concepts of achievement which are, in the present case, derived from attribution theory. As will be seen, this

approach employs categorizing achievement into achievement orientations. This two-fold theoretical framework is designed to promote and guide questioning while at the same time allowing a place for answers to be classified (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980).

Before exploring each approach, the sport context can be used as an example of how the Maehr framework offers a different perspective of a situation. His definition of achievement dispels two assumptions that underly most of sport research and has a bearing on the way the females are perceived in this context.

The first assumption is that sport provides a fairly universal training ground for the development of achievement behavior. It has recently been suggested, contrary to this assumption, that achievement behavior might not be generalizable or transferable. If an individual is highly motivated to achieve in one domain (academics), it cannot be assumed that he or she will display achievement behavior in a second domain (sport) (Maehr, 1974). Maehr contends that to examine motivation accurately, it is essential to view it in specific contexts as the complex and multidimensional process that it is.

The second assumption is that sport provides an ideal opportunity for competence-testing, an opportunity to fulfill the innate need to feel self-determined or in control of one's environment (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This assumption, however, is probably more true for mainstream American males than for other groups. Sport in American society emphasizes a competitive structure and direct competition entails social comparison (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Social comparison is more congruent with the male orientation than the female one (Deaux, 1977). In fact, females have described this type of competition as aversive and strive to avoid situations of this nature (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It has been speculated that the typical female, contrary to the male, does not desire or find meaning in achievement situations that emphasize socially comparative ways and finds sport to be a less salient arena for displaying achievement than her typical male counterpart.

It is necessary to take the function and meaning of behavior into account and this requires understanding people in their own terms. It is assumed, within the Maehr conception, that people

do not seek to achieve goals because goals are there, but because goal attainment implies something desirable about themselves. It follows that if there is cultural variation in the personal qualities that are seen as desirable, success and failure will be viewed differently by different members.

Therefore, according to Maehr, the meaning of success and failure among members of specific groups is an essential first step to understanding achievement motivation. Without such an understanding, researchers run the risk of comparing behavior patterns which on the surface seem similar but which in fact hold quite different meanings because of the varying purposes they serve.

The results of earlier cross-cultural empirical studies and more recent work comparing males and females show that differences in meaning do exist. The primary methodology used in these studies is based on a strategy developed by Triandis et al. (1973) called an antecedent-consequence method. An antecedent is a perceived cause associated with success or failure. This strategy consists of asking four questions: "If there is ____, there is success," "If there is success, there is ____,", "If there is ____, there is failure," and "If there is failure, there is ____." Diversity in meaning was disclosed across cultures. One example of such diversity can be seen in regards to antecedents to success. Ability and effort were found to be important antecedents in the United States, Greece and Japan but not India. Success in Indian culture appears to be closely related to what may be considered political success or power motivation (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980).

Ewing (1981) has since used the Maehr approach and the antecedent-consequence strategy to discern whether differences in the meanings of success and failure exist in males and females in American culture. The conceptions of success and failure of 224 high school students (126 males, 98 females) were examined in both general achievement situations and also in the sport context. Ewing (1981) tested two hypotheses: males and females within American culture will define success and failure differently in general achievement situations, and males and females in American culture will define success and failure similarly in sports.

Contrary to one of these hypotheses, Ewing (1981) found that males and females defined success and failure differentially in both general achievement situations and in the sport context.

In the sport context, the primary male antecedent to success was "ability," for the female, it was "playing her best." The perceived consequences of success also differed. Males were more specific than females, associating success with gaining materialistic commodities such as money, fame and girls, while females were vague regarding consequences. In general, male subjects were found to follow traditional views of success being caused by "ability" and "money" which result in the "good life" and "pride"; female subjects generally perceived the antecedents of success to be "doing your best," "understanding and "fun" which result in "achieving a goal" and "a good attitude."

In the failure condition, the consequences of failure were more clear cut for males -- consequences were primarily external and depressing, while females were almost optimistic -- "other things to do," "need to try again", "not doing your best" and other statements that suggest that opportunities exist in failure (Ewing, 1981).

It is important to remember in doing this kind of study that life cycle stage as well as cultural group membership affect the perception and meaning of success and failure (Maehr & Kleiber, 1980). Since Ewing's (1981) study was comprised of high school students, this factor is important to recognize when examining results.

As well as a need to establish what goals are important in different cultures and groups, there is a need to define achievement behavior so that it can be distinguished from other forms of behavior across cultures and groups. In order to achieve these ends, Maehr formulated achievement typologies or orientations (based on attribution theory). These typologies, he suggests, can serve as a structure to recognize similarities across cultures and groups. A second essential part of this aim, however, is explore the personal-situational complex antecedent to these behaviors to see if the meaning associated with the achievement orientation is the same across groups and cultures. The aim, then, is an active search for universals, although there is a chance that universals cannot be defined (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980).

Maehr, in redefining achievement motivation, assumes a universal will to achieve. The goals associated with achievement, however, are more diverse than traditionally thought. Rather than define one form of achievement behavior, Maehr defines three and calls them achievement orientations. These orientations can serve to assist in the identification of achievement behavior in contexts and cultures where it might not be recognized by its overt nature. These orientations, based on attribution theory, depend on the assumption that behavior is governed by its expected consequences (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980). These consequences or qualities are the distinguishing characteristics of each form or orientation. Maehr suggests that all three forms exist and perhaps, can account for any achievement behavior yet all cultures might not display each form with the same degree of emphasis.

The first achievement orientation, ability-oriented motivation, is described as the motivation "to maximize the subjective probability of attributing high ability and to minimize the probability of attributing low ability to oneself" (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980). This definition, basically congruent with the traditional definition of achievement behavior within the attribution literature (and consistent with McClelland's ethnocentric view of achievement), would account for approach-avoidance behavior.

A second achievement orientation is called task-oriented motivation. It can be distinguished from the ability orientation in that it is not concerned with the demonstration of ability, but rather, concerned with producing an adequate product or solving a problem for its own sake. In other words, the product or outcome is not important, the process is. The task-orientation is mastery based. With this type of motivation, no negative or active avoidance behavior is seen. The perceived quality desired from behavior is 1) to understand, 2) to produce an inherently good product and/or 3) to solve a problem.

A third motivation type is the social approval orientation. The behavior associated with this motivational form seeks to maximize the chances of attributing high effort and minimize the chances of attributing low effort to oneself. This type has been described as indicating conformity

to norms or virtuous intent rather than superior talent, based on an explanation associated with attribution theory.

In the second part of her study, Ewing (1981) examined achievement orientations. Using 452 high school students (254 males, 198 females), she found evidence that all three achievement forms exist. However, in this study, the majority of male and female athletes were found to be social approval oriented. In other words, while male and female athletes differed in their definitions of success and failure, they appeared very similar in achievement orientation (Ewing, 1981).

It is important to remember that the first step in the Maehr approach, defining the goals of male and female individuals in a given achievement situation is necessary to the understanding of the achievement orientation each appears to utilize. The orientation is essentially meaningless without attempting to capture the meaning of the goals of behavior, or what the person considers success to be. Ewing (1981) asked these same subjects next to define the single best predictor of social approval: in this task, males and females generally differed. For males, "trying hard" (effort) was the single best predictor, while for females the best predictor was "special skills." According to Ewing (1981), females appear to define social approval in terms of ability rather than effort, contrary to males. Perhaps, as Ewing suggests, females seek social approval as a means of verifying favorable ability attributions.

In any event, the case can be made that traditional attribution literature and research is flawed for not addressing the issue of individual perceptions and meaning associated with success and failure in relation to causal explanations. Only subjective analysis of the meaning underlying achievement and associated variables is useful in such situations.

It is apparent from these research findings that males and females have different goals associated with behavior. They have different conceptions of what success and failure are, therefore they are explaining different "things" (Ewing, 1981).

1.2.5 Summary

The redefinition of achievement behavior offers a broader perspective of what constitutes achievement behavior. The two-faceted approach outlined in this last section provides a different viewpoint and new avenues to explore in the quest for understanding human behavior. One important insight Maehr's conceptualization provides is the apparent meaninglessness of comparative studies when exploring behavior in relation to culture, race or gender. The basic foundation -- values, beliefs, meaning, perceptions -- are often different across such populations and to assume homogeneity across groups is erroneous. As Maehr contends, while behavior appears similar, the function and meaning of this behavior differs. Hence, when investigating female athletes, for example, a thorough understanding of the subjective meaning females bring to the achievement situation is of vital significance.

1.3 *Role Identity, Role Conflict and the Female Athlete*

One predominant theme in gender-related sport research is role conflict. The role conflict construct in sport implies that the role of athlete and the role of female are incongruent. The personality characteristics or traits associated with the athlete role are not the same as those associated with the female role. In fact, the expectations associated with each role are thought to be bipolar. Hence, the emergent picture of the female athlete is one of a "troubled creature" (Allison & Butler, 1984) suffering from a role dilemma.

The issue of role conflict in sport tends to be discussed within the framework of traditional views of both sport and sex roles. The role conflict construct did not originate in sport research but has been transposed to this area utilizing the same methodology and gender distinctions assumed in general psychology. While the idea of role conflict has received much theoretical support, actual empirical evidence is less definitive. Before examining the research investigations of role conflict, it is necessary to look at traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity, the backbone of the problem.

The constructs, masculinity and femininity, are made up of constellations of characteristics that are commonly identified with the male and female identities. The ideal male is characterized as aggressive, competent, independent, rational, active and competitive; the ideal female is nurturing, dependent, cooperative, intuitive and passive (Broverman, 1972). The traits associated with masculinity are often referred to as instrumental; those associated with femininity are referred to as expressive. These gender-linked traits are considered bipolar in nature. For example, an individual who is highly competitive would not be expected to be cooperative. Interestingly, it is those instrumental traits associated with masculinity that are regarded as appropriate for the athletic world. To be successful in sport, it is believed that certain masculine traits are necessary. Hence, the successful female athlete who displays masculine qualities in the sport world would be viewed as displaying gender-inappropriate behavior. Traits, then, are linked to social roles and values, and are deemed socially desirable or undesirable depending on who displays them. It is important to realize that these characteristics are not entirely biologically determined but socially produced. They are the product of the historical, social, political and cultural system in which they exist.

In spite of a number of incidents over the last twenty-five years to augment changes in attitudes towards women and attempts to broaden the female role to include opportunities to work, play and behave in ways that historically have been inhibited or disapproved of (for example, the Women's movement), stereotypes still exist. In a series of studies conducted by Broverman et al. (1972), the traits traditionally associated with each gender are still viewed in bipolar terms. Broverman et al. measured current sex-role perceptions without using a standard masculinity-femininity scale such as the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). They used a list of 122 items to be put in bipolar form by the subjects. Over a series of studies, 599 males and 383 females were tested, both married and single, 17 to 60 years old, and from varying educational levels. There was high consensus about the differing characteristics of men and women on a considerable number of items, consistent with traditional standards.

The problem extends beyond the traits themselves to the value associated with such traits. Masculine, instrumental qualities are generally regarded as more valuable than feminine, expressive ones (Broverman et al., 1972). For example, Broverman et al. (1970) asked mental health clinicians to construct images of a psychologically healthy male, a psychologically healthy female and a psychologically healthy adult. The clinicians considered a healthy male to be virtually identical to a healthy adult, but a healthy female and a healthy adult were described differently. In essence, being a psychologically healthy female precludes the possession of certain characteristics, excluding her from the category of "psychologically healthy adult", and is based on stereotypes.

Such stereotypical standards form the basis of many standardized personality inventories and mental health scales that are used to assess adjustment, mental health standards and for use in psychological research (Oglesby, 1978). The inherent bias in such measurement instruments has been the concern of many feminist-oriented researchers. Bem (1974) questioned the use of the bipolar construct and came up with a new conceptualization. She maintained that an individual could have both masculine and feminine qualities (instrumental and expressive traits) and a third dimension, androgyny, was possible and even superior. An androgyny score can be attained by measuring each dimension separately -- masculinity and femininity -- and those scoring high in both dimensions are considered androgynous. Androgynous individuals are thought to exhibit behavioral flexibility, performing effectively in both instrumental and expressive domains.

Since the inception of the "androgyny advantage" (Duquin, 1978), this too has come under fire. Bem herself (1981) suggested that gender schemata (masculinity, femininity and androgyny) be abolished altogether, with all that it implies for behavior. Under such a design, men and women can retain their sense of gender identity -- "a quiet pride in their bodies and their part in the reproductive process" (Unger, 1985). This evolutionary position -- the emergence of true individualism -- is unfortunately a bit optimistic. While individualism to this extent is appealing, stereotypical mindsets still pervade society about what is appropriate behavior and cannot be ignored.

However, as will be forthcoming, the idea of gender identity, in which each individual takes on characteristics of each gender might be, in fact, what is occurring in the female athlete and her conception of self. While empirical evidence suggests that the social perceptions concerning competent and athletic women are often negative, self-perceptions report that there is little experienced role conflict in athletic women in spite of an awareness by them that external forces still operate against serious female sport participation.

In order to look clearly at existing literature, it must be approached from two separate directions -- the outsider's view or social perspective and the insider's view or female's perspective of self. In this way, role conflict in the female athlete has been defined in two entirely different ways. The social perspective definition maintains that the role of female and the role of athlete have contradictory expectations (Hoferek, 1982). The self-perspective definition suggests that in order for a female to experience conflict, "she" must perceive the role expectations of athlete and of female as having incompatible obligations.

The societal picture of the psychologically healthy female and the psychologically healthy adult as contradictory has been supported (Broverman et al., 1972). This kind of paradox carries over into sport as well. The image of the female and that of healthy athlete are also portrayed as contradictory. This is based on the assumption that masculine traits and athletic traits are consistent, while feminine traits and athletic traits are inconsistent.

The societal picture of a healthy athletic character is one that is rough, ambitious, strong, self-confident, independent and competitive, whereas, the societal picture of femininity is opposite -- passive, non-competitive, weak, gentle and nurturing (Bem, 1974; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968).

Because sport involvement has been regarded traditionally as a departure from socially acceptable definitions of female behavior, other social situations also demand characteristics such as assertiveness, self-confidence and competence. Negative reactions to women in sport are merely exemplary of reactions to women in any less traditional situation; hence, considering reactions

to competent women in general is useful to the discussion of female athletic participation (Birrell, 1983).

One major theme in the literature addresses the issue that perceived differences between males and females on competence exist. Males are often perceived as more competent than females, even by females. Goldberg (1968) gave female college students articles to evaluate in which the author's gender was manipulated. Those articles allegedly written by males were rated as superior to those allegedly written by females although the articles were identical. Replications of Goldberg's study (Levenson et al., 1975; Peck, 1978) have shown an encouraging reversal in this finding, however.

Another study found that females can be accepted as competent as long as they have the added qualification of being feminine. Reactions to competent and incompetent males and females were assessed by college males and females (Spence et al., 1975). The findings showed that subjects generally valued competence more than incompetence, regardless of gender. However, when gender was added, subjects preferred competent-feminine women over competent-masculine ones. An exception to this rule was found in a sample of women who held liberal attitudes toward women; these women preferred competent-masculine women.

Societal reactions to female athletes are thought to vary according to the sport the female is involved in. Metheny (1972) explored the criteria which serve to determine the relative social desirability/undesirability of various sports for women. Metheny says that "the greatest likelihood of role conflict occurs in physical activities of body contact, application of force to a heavy object, projecting the body through time and space over long distances and face to face competition." Hence, the female gymnast is more socially acceptable than the female basketball player and would hypothetically experience less conflict. Under the principles governing the socially sanctioned image of feminine sports, competition is not appropriate; aesthetic, non-competitive sport is.

Snyder and Kivlin (1977) found support for a dichotomy between masculine sports and feminine sports, and their relation to stigma. Asking college women competing in national tournaments, "Do you feel a stigma?", 56% of basketball players responded "yes", followed by track and field (50%) swimming and diving (40%) and gymnastics (31%). Sixty-five percent of non-athletic college students said that a fairly high percentage of women athletes feel a stigma attached to participation, but the type of sport is a factor.

The perceptions of different "types" of female athletes are insightful in terms of stigma. Kenrick (1972) divided female athletes into two groups -- those in creative, socially acceptable sports (i.e., dance, synchronized swimming) and those in more structured, competitive and unacceptable sports (i.e., hockey, basketball, softball). Each group was asked how they view themselves and how they perceive members of the other group. Although they did not perceive themselves as being different from one another in a social or athletic situation, they perceived the members of the other group as quite different. The socially acceptable sport members perceived the less acceptable athletes as being less feminine and more negative than the reverse pattern. Even female athletes carry such stereotypical stigmata.

While type of sport is one criterion used to judge female social acceptance in sport, a second is the involvement style or level of ambition. Kingsley et al. (1977) studied reactions to ambitious female athletes. Subjects responded to autobiographical sketches of women athletes who described themselves as having high or low ambition. No differences were found in reactions. A second study (Birrell, 1978), however, tested reactions to extremely ambitious female athletes (e.g., those competing successfully against males). Such athletes were judged negatively.

In general, female athletes are not found to be perceived positively. One study examined how female athletes measure up to the image of the ideal or "typical" woman. Griffin (1973) found that female athletes and female professors are furthest from college undergraduates' image of an ideal woman; closer are girlfriend and mother.

This kind of empirical evidence has set the stage for the belief that there exists a contradiction between traditional feminine values and those associated with competency and athletic behavior. It is assumed, based on this premise, that the female who does participate, especially in socially less acceptable sports, experiences role conflict. This assumption might not be warranted (Allison & Butler, 1984). First, such an assumption is based on a belief about an existing contradiction that is not validated in these studies by the individuals in question -- female athletes. Society's views, therefore, are imposed upon the female. Second, the majority of studies are dated in the seventies. The increasing number of female athletic participants, the increasing number of potential role models and an increase in opportunities (sponsorships, prize money) for the female athlete could be having an impact. Hence, it makes the area of role conflict particularly difficult to keep current and these study findings may be suspect. Regardless, role conflict as conceived as a "contradiction" between the female role and the athletic role should not be the dominant issue today. As a contemporary concern, role conflict must be examined as a role identity issue. What aspects of the female identity are incongruous with what aspects of the athletic identity? Also, this concern must be examined from the insider's view -- through the eyes of female athletes themselves.

A second stream of empirical work looks at role conflict in terms of the female athlete's perception of self. Harris (1973) compared an athlete's perception of her social self with her competitive self. The athletic role was seen as separate from and to some degree inconsistent with the general social role. Tyler (1973) also found this. The competitive athletic self emphasized achievement, dominance, aggression and endurance and was less affiliative, change-oriented, deferrent and feminine in contrast to the social self.

Another study, however, found that while the female athlete's self-concept did not measure up to her ideal self, female athletes generally saw themselves more favorably than did non-athletes (Sullivan, 1973). Shifting the emphasis to a more thorough examination of how the female perceives and experiences her athletic role in relation to her feminine role, Sage and Loud-

ermilk (1979) devised a questionnaire to measure role conflict. Using it to question college athletes, the findings suggest that there is more perceived than experienced role conflict in female athletes. Forty-four percent of respondents reported that they perceived little or no role conflict, while 56% reported experiencing little or no role conflict. On the other hand, 26% perceived role conflict to be a great problem while only 19% reported that they experienced role conflict to a great degree. Examining the types of sport activity respondents were involved in, those in less socially approved sports such as softball, volleyball, field hockey and track and field reported greater perceived and experienced role conflict than those in more socially appropriate sports (i.e., tennis, swimming). The conclusion was made that while type of sport has a bearing on the results, perceived and experienced role conflict among female athletes is not as crucial a dilemma as popularized in the literature (Sage & Loudermilk, 1979).

Anthrop and Allison (1983) expanded on this research. Based on previous thinking, they speculated that stereotypes exist in three forms: a negative stigma is attached to all female athletes, but more to those in masculine sport; a loss of femininity is a possible outcome of sport competition; and sport in general is believed to masculinize the female participant not only physically but psychologically and behaviorally. Their study sought to examine variable interrelationships rather than parameter estimates.

The study (Anthrop & Allison, 1983) examined 133 high school female varsity athletes in four schools in a variety of sports. Using the role conflict questionnaire (Sage & Loudermilk, 1979) and open-ended questions, the findings suggested very little role conflict.

The suggestion was made that the methods utilized to this point to assess role conflict in the female athlete are insensitive to the multidimensional nature of such conflict. Anthrop and Allison (1983) item analyzed the questionnaire and distinguished between two types of conflict that may be operating -- internal (or intra) role conflict and external (or inter) role conflict. The internal conflict relates to the physical and psychological self concept and the external conflict deals with the perceived pressures imposed on the female from outside sources; lack of support, lack of recognition from significant others and sporting establishments (i.e., media).

Since it is a known fact that there is less support and recognition for female athletes (Neal & Tutko, 1976), it would be expected that females are more likely to perceive and experience external role conflict. This was, in fact, the case (Anthrop & Allison, 1983). Thus, the notion that females struggle with feminine self-conflict is not supported and what conflict that does exist resides more as a function of the athlete's status inconsistency in the public domain rather than a personal struggle with her own psychological femininity.

Another study conducted by Allison and Butler (1984) replicated such findings. In this study, also, relatively little role conflict was found among subjects, more perceived role conflict was reported than actually experienced and the greatest perceived and experienced role conflict appeared to be on external items.

The findings of this particular study proved interesting in view of the subjects used. Based on Metheny's classification system (1965), female subjects were chosen who engaged in a socially inappropriate sport -- powerlifting -- an activity "where the resistance of a heavy object is overcome by the direct application of bodily force". Allison and Butler (1984) used 44 athletes competing at the 1981 National Powerlifting Championship, representing all nine weight classes (44 kg. to 82.5 kg.). The majority had a history of competitive experience. The researchers hypothesized that because these subjects participated at a highly competitive level, in a socially inappropriate sport and had larger body types, they would perceive and/or experience greater role conflict. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings. The issue of why there is a discrepancy between what the female athlete says she perceives and/or experiences and the gender-related literature that portrays an image of psychological struggle, identity crisis and role conflict, is explored. Two potential explanations are given.

First, Ann Hall (1981) suggests that researchers/scholars may be guilty of reification. Role conflict was created as a conceptual category and has been adopted and fostered as fact without testing its existence or persistence over time. Second, sport scientists have failed to distinguish conceptually and empirically between what society thinks of the female athlete and what the

female athlete thinks of herself. There is enough evidence to indicate that society does stereotype the female athlete but it cannot be assumed that the female internalizes all these images and messages as a part of her psycho-social identity. In so assuming, "we have fallen into the conceptual trap of overemphasizing the role of significant others and socializing agents in the process of socialization and have oversimplified the interactive process involved in sex-role identification and formation" (Allison & Butler, 1984, p. 161)

Also, in the discussion section, Allison and Butler (1984) suggest that the role conflict construct is multidimensional in nature rather than unitary. They delineate four different components or factors that are examined within the role conflict questionnaire -- emotion, attraction, sport-performance, significant others -- and state that "at least" these four components make up the construct.

Allison and Butler briefly defined each: 1) emotion - those items dealing with perceived and experienced conflict in dating behavior and the emotional response of the female, 2) attraction - items related to feminine image of the female athlete, 3) sport-performance - items of skill, recognition and winning, and 4) significant others - items about the degree to which others encourage the female athlete to participate in a variety of athletic events.

An attempt to clarify the constructs utilized must be done more systematically (Allison & Butler, 1984). A start in this direction would be to look at group identification and its impact on behavioral opportunities. In an attempt to understand how female athletic status facilitates and/or inhibits movement into various social and organizational structures in society, female identification with athletic peer groups and other significant support systems would be a worthwhile first step (Allison & Butler, 1984).

1.3.1 Summary

Certain ideas have emerged in the investigations pertaining to role conflict. First, female athletes perceive more role conflict than they experience. Second, female athletes have more external conflict (perceived pressures from outside sources) than internal conflict (self-concept problems). Third, role conflict is best conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. This multidimensional view of role conflict opens up many new possibilities for future research in this area.

As stated earlier, the emphasis must be shifted from role conflict as a unidimensional idea (the role of female and the role of athlete as incongruent) to role identity conflict, that is, specific characteristics of the female identity as inconsistent or incompatible with characteristics central to the athletic identity. It has been suggested that in competitive situations, the need for affiliation may conflict with a high need for achievement. Interpersonal relationships, shown to be particularly important to the female, and competition, suggested to be less desirable and even at times, aversive, to the female, may set the stage for this identity incompatibility in the athletic situation.

1.4 Conclusion

Rainer Martens (1987), a noted sport psychologist, recently addressed the issue of the emergence of two sport psychologies -- an academic sport psychology and a practical sport psychology. These two psychologies, Marten contends, are on two very different, divergent courses. Martens attributes the divergence to be based on sport psychologists' perceptions of what constitutes legitimate knowledge.

From his own experiences as an academic sport psychologist, he upheld the necessary commitment to the orthodox scientific process with its aim for objectivity. On the other hand, as a practicing sport psychologist, working with the U.S. Ski Team, his aim as to help coaches and athletes and with this objective, it was necessary to focus on the whole person to do so. Martens feels he gained more knowledge from his practical experiences where "the emphasis was not on

knowledge gained from the experimental method, but on knowledge gained from any method that helps to understand the person" (Martens, 1987, p. 31). Most often, Martens suggests, these are experiential methods. These experiential methods, however, may also be scientific including case histories, clinical experiences, introspectionism and observation.

Martens criticizes the divergence in sport psychology. "Academic psychology subscribes and is governed by orthodox science. Practicing sport psychology relies mostly upon experiential knowledge, although it does integrate experimental knowledge into its practice when such is available and applicable" (Martens, 1987, p. 51). If academic sport psychology had more leeway in terms of what is legitimate knowledge and utilize experiential methods to understand human behavior, a convergence could take place. The experiential knowledge gained in practical settings could provide a new academic body of knowledge which could more adequately be applied to real sport situations, and an interactive process between the practical and the academic could take place (Martens, 1987).

Unger (1981) also values personal experience as a way of making scientific progress. "Experience is a good source of questions. It may provide the best insights and most creative ideas". Koch (1981) suggests that a distrust of one's own experience is a part of our current pathology of knowledge.

In the area of gender and psychology, however, women's issues may instigate a move to experiential methods. Traditional orthodox methods have been criticized as ethnocentrically biased and unable to account for gender differences. The lack of success with traditional approaches has led researchers to take new approaches to examine gender relevant issues. It has been suggested that there are stages of knowledge where qualitative and observational techniques are particularly appropriate, especially when investigating a new area and there is need to develop appropriate questions. One such area is gender.

Personal experience can lead to questioning assumptions that others take as evident (Unger, 1981). As more women break into the psychology profession, ethnocentric biases are being rec-

ognized and research tools that originally measured such biased results are being abandoned for exploratory methods.

In short, the area of human behavior is a complex one and the methods of orthodox science, according to Martens, are too limited to study behavior generally and athletic behavior specifically. It has been unsuccessful particularly for studying behavior in women.

In a field such as sport where consultation services are being sought to a greater degree than ever before, in order to provide adequate, practical services, a thorough understanding of the parameters of behavior is necessary. Any methods that promote such understanding should be recognized as a positive step towards developing a convergent sport psychology -- where the practical can benefit from the academic and vice versa.

In the early 70's, very few women were running (Ullyot, 1986). Today, it is estimated that as many as 63% of "new athletes" are women (Runner's World, 1987). Evidence suggests that generally women do not relate to the athletic situation in the same way as men. Therefore, it is essential that the female athlete is examined on her own terms in order to understand this growing population group to provide adequate services for her.

The experiences of women athletes and those working with women athletes can be used as a method of gaining subjective insight into the objective information already provided. These subjective cases are provided in an attempt to bridge the academic with the practical -- to bridge the achievement literature with affiliation as a central factor in women with role conflict, clarifying the position taken in the research to be conducted that affiliation in competitive sport situations may be a potential source of role conflict.

One noted participant in women's sport is Gayle Barron, 1978 women's winner of the Boston Marathon. Barron has spoken publicly on "fear of success". She suggests that the need to be accepted by friends and acquaintances can contribute to the development of fear of success. "Many people still believed during the early 70's that women should be home with a family" (Lynch, 1987, p. 141). Barron felt she got little support for her vocation and she and other female

athletes were viewed as second class citizens. Even her close friends, she felt, were threatened by her success for it forced them to look inward and examine themselves.

Carol Mann, Hall of Fame golfer, suggests that along with being a highly competitive athlete (i.e., one who is committed to excellence at any level) goes embarrassment about success, loneliness, a feeling of being different from other women and a feeling of unpopularity among men. Yet, on the other hand, the benefits of physical mastery, the development of mental and emotional skills associated with golf gave her an enormous pride. She was forced to make a conscious decision whether the positive outweighed the negative. During this time, she sought counseling to deal with her concept of femininity and masculinity (skills in sport). Her interpersonal relationships were strained due to the unresolved nature of her self-concept. Counseling was able to help her resolve many of the emotional issues she struggled with. As a final statement in a public address, Mann said "commitment to excellence means sacrifice for many women and certainly for women athletes. It has meant up to now, an isolation from social norms" (Mann, 1984).

Joan Ulliyot, master's runner, doctor and author of several books on women's running, feels that women runners are at a great disadvantage compared to men. Given their upbringing and traditions, women struggle to be as selfish as they should. Women are accustomed to be the supportive partner, the homemaker and caretaker. Women take great pride in domestic accomplishments. "Top level athletes freely admit that a certain degree of selfishness -- of putting their own needs first -- is essential to top-level racing" (Ulliyot, 1987, p. 27). Ulliyot says women must become somewhat selfish if they wish to achieve their goals, but it takes a while to learn this and some women never learn.

With the growing number of female athletic clients seeking help for sport related problems, these issues can be examined here as well. An example, Alice, sought psychological help in spite of her success in training and racing. She often felt terrible when she beat other runners, especially friends and members of her racing team. Alice adopted a new outlook with the help of a sport psychology team -- competition could be viewed as a cooperative aim to get the most out of one-

self and others. Many women have this type of problem. According to Porter and Foster, a sport consultant team, women show hesitancy to enter races because competition summons up a host of negative connotations (Porter & Foster, 1986).

These few anecdotal cases point out that emotional issues remain central to the exercise efforts of many women and sometimes prevent them from becoming liberated athletes (Porter & Foster, 1985). Emotional issues such as affiliative concerns can create conflict or produce anxiety in the athletic situation, limiting athletic excellence. Hence, the link between achievement and affiliation as a source of role conflict can be seen in the theoretical review and in the practical and anecdotal experiences of athletic women.

Chapter II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

From the literature, it has been shown that two psychological dispositions are especially salient in the athletic context. These are achievement and affiliation. "Achievement refers to an athlete's predisposition to have standards of excellence applied to his or her performance, while affiliation refers to an athlete's predisposition to seek, attain and maintain social bonds" (Zachery, 1987, p. 2). In general, different kinds of athletic populations (high school and college students) have been used for study purposes and gender distinct patterns emerge on these variables. Males measure significantly higher on achievement than females, while females measure significantly higher on affiliation than males. It is not known, however, if these patterns persist when athletes who have demonstrated a more clear cut interest in athletic excellence are sampled.

Also, the basis for achievement motivation is different for males and females. Evidence supports the idea that affiliation is a central component in achievement motivation for females. It is not clear, however, how affiliation needs effect the competitive athletic experience of the female. Success in the academic setting and the maintenance of interpersonal relationships pose unique problems for many women (Keller & Moglen, 1987). The types of conflict reported by women in the academic setting parallel the anecdotal reports of the female athletes in the conclusion section of the review of literature.

2.1 Research Questions

1. Is need for achievement higher in elite male runners than elite female runners?
2. Is need for affiliation higher in elite female runners than elite male runners?
3. Are there gender differences in the conflicts that occur between nAchievement and nAffiliation in elite distance runners?

2.2 Hypotheses

- H0:** There is no difference in nAchievement between males and females.
- H1:** Males will exhibit greater nAchievement than females.
- H0:** There is no difference in nAffiliation between males and females.
- H2:** Females will exhibit greater nAffiliation than males.
- H0:** There are no differences in the conflicts that occur between nAchievement and nAffiliation between males and females.
- H3:** There are differences in the conflicts that occur between nAchievement and nAffiliation between males and females.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 *Subjects*

The subjects used for this study were selected from the Michigan Elite Runner List compiled by Media Consultation Services, a Michigan based consulting firm that compiles demographic information on the elite runners for the state. The consultants responsible for the list are organizers of the Bay Area Runners Club, an active Michigan based club, and active members of the Michigan TAC (The Athletic Congress of Michigan). This list comprises the best male and female long distance runners racing in Michigan. All the male and female long distance runners on this list has raced at a competitive level that has gained them local, and in some cases, national recognition in at least one distance ranging from the 5K (3.2 miles) to the marathon (26.2 miles). Any potentially new candidate to be considered for the list (at the instigation of the race director or another word of mouth method informing committee members that an athlete has been competing at a high level) must go through a committee process which decides whether inclusion will be granted. This list is annually updated. While this list is not published or available to the general public, a copy of the list (a computer printout with names, ages and addresses of athletes) is made available for purchasing to race directors/organizers for mailing purposes and for purposes such as notifying athletes of an upcoming race or occasionally sending free entries to this locally recognized "elite" population. This list was requested for research purposes and was received August, 1987.

For the first part of this study, 100 males and 100 females were selected to receive the mailed questionnaire. From the responses obtained (and those respondents who stated they were willing to be interviewed), 15 males and 15 females were chosen on the basis of their apparent

sensitivity to the area of concern as determined by the content analysis of the short answer question about conflict on the mailed questionnaire. Any statements about conflict between meeting athletic goals and maintaining interpersonal relationships, "affiliative themes" (i.e., marital difficulties, difficulty maintaining friendships with other runners), were considered for use in the interviews.

The subjects used for the study ranged in age from 19 to 80; the males ranged from 20 to 80, the females ranged from 19 to 64. The mean age for male subjects was 37; females, 33.

The majority of subjects were from the Michigan area (this includes the entire state): however, some of the athletes live out of state either due to relocation or because they come to the state of Michigan to run major races and are recognized in the state (for example, Joan Benoit Samuelson, Olympic gold medalist from Maine, has won the Old Kent Riverbank Run in Grand Rapids, Michigan several consecutive years and hence, is regarded as a Michigan Elite Runner).

3.2 Procedures

There were two parts to this study. Part One consisted of mailed questionnaires. All 200 subjects received a four-page questionnaire sent with a stamped self-addressed envelope. The cover page of the questionnaire included a form letter (Appendix A) that served as a letter of introduction, giving a brief account of the researcher's background, interests, academic status and a general description of the purpose of the study. Subjects were asked to fill out and return the questionnaire which sought to provide:

1. demographic information (Appendix B)
2. a Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale score: two subscales measure achievement and affiliation dispositions (Appendix C)
3. a) Affiliative Conflict Scale as determined by 8-likert scale questions (Appendix D)
4. b) short answer information on conflict between achievement in sport and maintaining interpersonal relationships (Appendix D)
5. c) a statement of willingness on the part of the subject to participate in a follow-up interview (Appendix D)

Part Two of the study consisted of thirty interviews (15 males, 15 females) in an open-ended format at a time and place of subjects' convenience (Appendix E).

3.3 Instruments

3.3.1 Demographic Information

All subjects on the questionnaire were asked for information regarding gender, age and marital status for the purpose of assessing equivalency between males and females on these factors.

3.3.2 Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale (HSBAS)

Personality research in sport has relied primarily on general psychological inventories to assess certain personality characteristics or dispositions of behavior in sport. The practice of using general instruments, originally designed for business and industry, in sport research has been criticized as being the major cause of discouraging results in athletic personality research, for such inventories may be inappropriate for the athletic context (Carron, 1980).

Two behavioral dispositions that have been deemed particularly salient in the athletic context are achievement and affiliation. While many general psychological instruments measure these characteristics, Howe (1976) saw a clear need for the development and validation of a sport specific scale to measure these two characteristics in athletes. He developed the HSBAS with its conceptual basis on the behavioral model of motivation designed by Birch and Veroff (1966). "As a sport specific instrument, it sought to measure an athlete's behavioral propensities to perceive and act in accordance with stimuli revolving around achievement and affiliation" (Zachary, 1982). The scale has been found to be both reliable and valid (Zachary, 1982).

3.3.3 Affiliative Conflict Scale

Eight questions in likert-format were asked subjects on the questionnaire for the purpose of tapping affiliative conflict and to discern gender differences.

3.3.4 Follow-Up Interview

Open-ended interviews were designed to tap attitudes and experiences related to the athletes' personal lives. Questions covered the topic areas of achievement, affiliation and, conflict between achievement and affiliation.

3.4 Data Analysis

For Part One of the study, a quantitative method of analysis was used. The variables tested were as follows:

- IV - gender (2 levels, male and female)
- DV(1) - HSBAS score for achievement
- DV(2) - HSBAS score for affiliation
- DV(3) - Likert scale scores for each of 8 questions
- :
- :
- DV(10)

Ten separate one way ANOVAs were employed to discern any statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level. Also, three Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients were calculated: a correlation for males between achievement and affiliation scores, a correlation for females between achievement and affiliation scores and a correlation for males and females together between achievement and affiliation scores.

For Part Two of the study, a qualitative approach was taken to interpret data. Specifically, a descriptive method examining similarities and differences in regard to males and females on the questions related to achievement and affiliation was used. The basis for this method was proposed by Maehr (1974). He maintained that exploring universality and uniqueness in cross-cultural research is a valuable tool to understanding. This method has since been used for gender research by Ewing (1981). Other methods have not been successful in discerning differences in the under-

lying meaning brought to a given context in terms of culture, race and gender (Maehr, 1974). Similarities and differences, explored here in the athletic context, will be examined within the scope of the review of literature.

It is important here to note that the data are both quantitative and qualitative. The researcher is aware that the information represents the perception of the informant "filtered and modified by his/her cognitive and emotional reactions and reported through his/her verbal usages" (Dean & Whyte, 1958). Hence, the process ascertains the informant's picture of the world as he or she sees it.

Chapter IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Subject Attrition

Two hundred subjects (100 male, 100 female) were sent questionnaires to be filled out and returned. The final response total for purposes of data analysis was 65 males and 60 females (n=125).

4.2 Demographic Information

Subjects were asked to indicate their gender, age and marital status. As indicated in Tables 1 and 2, male and female subjects were equivalent in terms of age and marital status distribution.

Table 1: Age distribution of subjects (n=125)

Age of Subjects	Males (65)	Females (60)
18-29	20	28
30-39	22	20
40-49	10	9
50+	13	3

Table 2: Marital status of subjects

Marital Status	Males	Females
Married	39	36
Single	23	18
Divorced/ Separated	3	6

4.3 *Howe Sport Behavior Assessment Scale (HSBAS)*

Means and standard deviations for the two groups on the variables achievement and affiliation are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Data from HSBAS		
Descriptive statistics for achievement and affiliation (mean scores and standard deviations)		
	Male ----	Female -----
Achievement -----	51.72 ± 6.9	52.72 ± 6.2
Affiliation	60.23 ± 5.5	60.44 ± 4.4

Twenty-six subjects were not included in the data analysis for this portion of the questionnaire. Each of these subjects failed to answer one of the questions and an inclusion of their scores was thought to be a potential source of response skewing.

The first two experimental hypotheses were tested using this scale: male distance runners would have a significantly higher need for achievement than female distance runners and, female distance runners would have a significantly higher need for affiliation than male distance runners. Neither of these hypotheses was confirmed; no significant differences were found between males and females on either of these dependent variables ($p < .05$).

Correlations were computed for males and females, correlating the two dependent variables achievement and affiliation. No significant relationships for either males ($r = -0.01$), females ($r = -0.21$) or for all subjects together ($r = -0.13$).

These findings contrast with previous studies using the HSBAS. Using high school and undergraduate physical education students, Zachary (1987) reported a consistent trend of gender difference results. Male subjects measured consistently and significantly higher on need for

achievement scores than females while female subjects measured consistently and significantly higher on need for affiliation than males. Interestingly, both male and female elite runners in the present study scored higher on both need for achievement and need for affiliation than the physical education students in Zachary's (1987) report. So, while male and female elite runners tend to differ from the general population of non-elite athletes, they appear to be very similar to each other.

But, are male and female elite runners really as alike as the scores suggest? The possibility exists that the need for achievement and the need for affiliation scores are not representing the same thing for males and females. It will be recalled that Ewing (1981) discovered that the underlying meaning of success and failure for males and females in the sport context differed. Success and failure had different antecedents and consequences for males and females. Also, she examined achievement orientations. Males and females in the sport context were both social approval oriented; however, upon further examination the basis for social approval -- the underlying meaning associated with it -- differed according to gender. So, in interpreting results from standardized scales such as the HSBAS, any conclusions that are drawn must be approached carefully and perhaps viewed as incomplete.

The consistency of the measuring instrument for males and females can be called into question when the results of another study using the HSBAS are examined (Howe, 1977). Two way analysis of variance was used to examine the effects on achievement and affiliation scores of success (determined by whether or not an athlete's team made the local play-offs) and gender. The significant interaction between gender and success on affiliation scores reflected the fact that successful males, successful females and unsuccessful females had statistically identical affiliation scores while unsuccessful males had significantly lower affiliation scores. So, affiliation scores discriminate between successful and unsuccessful males, but not successful and unsuccessful females. While success in sport was not a variable in the present study (all athletes were considered successful by virtue of being Elite Michigan runners) these findings suggest that affiliation is

a component part of the reality of all female athletes whereas only successful athletic males score highly for this variable.

The Ewing results and the results of this study exploring successful/ unsuccessful athletes on achievement and affiliation suggest that the underlying meaning associated with affiliation, in particular, within the sport context may be different for males and females. Therefore, it can be assumed that these scores alone tell us only that elite runners differ from less elite athletic populations on these behavioral dispositions. Without more subjective insight into how the athlete relates to these dispositions (or of what importance these characteristics are) the elucidation of an accurate or more illuminating picture is not possible.

Upon examining the importance of affiliation (which appears to be central to both successful and unsuccessful female athletes), evidence suggests that in competitive situations (situations that emphasize social comparison/competition against others) this affiliation produces anxiety or conflict. Therefore, the third hypothesis was that females would experience significantly greater achievement-affiliative conflict (conflict between achieving athletic goals and maintaining social bonds) than would males. This was examined in three ways: through 1) eight Likert response questions, 2) a short answer question directly asking whether the athlete experienced any conflicts, and 3) open-ended interviews. Results on these measures confirmed the hypothesis.

4.4 *Affiliative Conflict Scale*

On this portion of the questionnaire, the results of analyses of variance based on each of eight Affiliative Conflict Scale questions by gender showed significant differences on five of the eight questions. Examination of the means indicates that in each case, males were significantly less affected by the achievement-affiliation conflict described than were females, as follows: (8=strongly agree-1=strongly disagree): (mean scores and standard deviations)

1. When I race against friends or others I know well and beat them, I feel bad.
Males (5.2 ± 1.5) < Females (5.9 ± 1.8), (p < .05)
2. When I race against friends or others I know well and they beat me, I feel bad.

NS ($p > .05$)

3. Beating a competitor can jeopardize or threaten a friendship.

Males (4.2 ± 1.3) < Females (6.2 ± 1.8), ($p < .05$)

4. I am threatened when running partners dramatically improve.

Males (4.0 ± 1.8) < Females (5.3 ± 1.8), ($p < .05$)

5. I threaten others when I improve my running ability.

Males (3.2 ± 1.9) < Females (4.3 ± 1.9), ($p < .05$)

6. I will alter my run (i.e., time, length) so that I can run with others rather than alone.

NS, ($p > .05$)

7. Friendships/relationships can get in the way of achieving my running potential.

NS, ($p > .05$)

8. I prefer training with partners (same gender) who are better than me.

Males (3.3 ± 1.4) > Females (2.7 ± 1.8), ($p < .05$)

These results confirmed the hypothesis, with females agreeing significantly more than males with five of the eight statements describing achievement-affiliative conflict. Females agreed more with the statement that they feel bad when their friends or others that they know well beat them and also, with the statement that beating a competitor can jeopardize or threaten a friendship. In the case of the third statement, females agreed less with the idea of training with partners (same gender) who are better than themselves. While these three statements were statistically significant in the direction anticipated, they did not show this as strongly as anticipated (for example, agreed versus disagreed). The last two statements that showed statistical differences did; however. Females agreed with the statements suggesting that 1) they are threatened when running partners dramatically improve and 2) they threaten others when they improve their running ability whereas males disagreed with these statements.

4.5 Conflict Question

Subjects were asked on the questionnaire: What conflict, if any, do you experience trying to meet your running goals and trying to maintain interpersonal relationships? Results are in Table 4:

Subjects' responses to the short answer conflict question also supported the hypothesis that males and females differ in their perceptions of what conflicts exist between meeting athletic goals and maintaining interpersonal relationships. While two common themes emerged for males and females -- males and females both perceived no conflict and those expressing conflicts shared a "time" theme, males emphasized these two themes more frequently than females. When citing specific types of conflict created by time, problems appeared slightly different for males and females. Male runners reported that family commitments posed a problem. For females, the conflict was more a product of juggling roles -- as wife, mother, career women, athlete. For some men, family commitment problems led to marital difficulties and family friction. For women, the attempt to juggle roles led to other difficulties such as social isolation, difficulty maintaining friendships and training, and fatigue. The distinction between the "time" conflicts reported by men and women runners may be related to security of roles. Perhaps male runners are secure in their role as an athlete and have conflict external to this role -- with family members. In other words, males may experience conflict with others who infringe on their time and dedication to running. Female athletes, on the other hand may not be secure with the integration of their role as athlete and other roles they choose to take on. Therefore, the juggling of roles may be a problem internal to her -- the conflict arises within.

Beyond "time", "family commitment" and "role" kinds of conflict, female reports suggested another type of theme -- an "emotional" one with factors such as jealousy, competition, and conflict with others. Issues such as beating another and no longer maintaining the friendship, making the Olympic trials and feeling tension with friends that did not and perceiving others to be threatened by their dedication to running emerged in female but not male responses. Such emotional

Table 4: Themes, in order of frequency

responses to short answer question on conflict between running and interpersonal relationships

Males -----	Females -----
1. none (27)	1. none (13)
2. time (18)	2. balancing running/ professional goals (8)
3. sacrifices (others don't understand) (7)	3. juggling schedule as wife/mother/runner (7)
4. maintaining family commitments	4. time (6)
a) family friction (4)	5. males intimidated/ threatened by dedication (4)
b) marital problems (2)	6. running reduces social contact (4)
5. imbalance between training partners (2) (partners less ability)	7. other's don't understand (3)
	8. competition (3)
	9. jealousy (2)
	10. maintaining friendships and training (2)
	11. friends who worry about keeping up with me (1)
	12. fatigue (1)
	13. having qualified for Olympic Trials, conflict with those who didn't (1)
	14. in beating friend, she hasn't spoken to me since (1)
	15. put on pedestal, choose to associate with non- runners or those not impressed with talent (1)
	16. satisfy husband's goals for me (husband is coach) (1)

themes are consistent with both the anecdotal accounts of female athletes and the literature on women and achievement suggesting that competitive anxiety is a critical factor.

Conflict for male-elite runners appears to be perceived as a function of external factors (outside the realm of their athletic involvement) -- i.e., family, job (hours at work don't allow much time to train). Little conflict was perceived within the affiliative circle of athletic associates. With the elite female runners, internal conflict (inside the realm of their athletic involvement) was more evident - that is, conflict is perceived to exist with their affiliative circle of running associates.

4.6 Interview Data

This is interesting when the interview data is examined. Two of the questions asked were "How did you get involved in running/racing?" and "What significant others were instrumental in your involvement?". Ten of the fifteen female runners responded with boyfriend, husband or father (three of the fathers were coaches). Of the remaining females, all became involved by their own volition: one was a spectator at a marathon and decided she wanted to compete, another took up running to develop endurance for tennis, and the others started running to control weight. No mention of female significant others was made in relation to their initial introduction into running.

Elite male runners, on the other hand, often got involved through other males: male friends already participating in competition, a coach who recognized talent or because, wanting to be active in a sport, their size was most suitable for running. Males, also, were primarily inspired by male figures.

It appears that the basic support system for females develops initially with male figures who are not part of her immediate competitive network (technically, in races males and females do not compete against each other) whereas most males exhibit associations with male peer groups from the start. Perhaps, this can begin to explain the different kind of perceived conflict that exists.

More similarities existed in the answers related to the questions pertaining to "What are the costs/benefits of being an elite caliber runner?". The male and female elite runners suggested that

self-esteem benefits, recognition and respect, health and fitness (physical and mental), prizes, money, trips and other opportunities, were benefits derived from their involvement. While the runners suggested that sacrifices exist in the way of costs -- lack of free time, increased chances for injury -- the benefits far outweighed them and the costs were not a real factor. Males and females did not exhibit differences on these factors.

When asked about their feeling towards competing, the males unanimously said they loved it. In fact, several males in the interviews said their sole reason for running is for competing, not for health reasons. The females had varying responses. While some said they loved it, others said they love and hate it. One female with this reply said that she feels somewhat uncomfortable with competing. She is trying to cultivate a "killer instinct" for she had no competitive experience growing up. Another female said she hates competition. This female chooses to race only in marathon distance races since this distance she views as a race against oneself and the clock (whereas she views the shorter races as more competitive against others). Two other females said they view themselves as runners and not as competitors (although both race well in competition throughout the summer).

The next three questions in the interviews pertained to issues of conflict: 1) "Do you experience conflict with friends/acquaintances when you beat them?", "Do you experience conflict when these others beat you?" and 3) "Is conflict an issue personally or for others you know between meeting two needs -- the need to achieve in running and the need for social or interpersonal relationships?". These questions generated a variety of responses.

There were differences between males and females, but also many differences among female group members. Males did not perceive any problems with competition (that is, beating others and others beating them). In their view, competition is the nature of sport, and therefore, not a personal thing. They would hope friends understood. Several females shared this perspective. However, some females did perceive conflict to exist. On a general level, one female stated that she feels bad when she beats others, but on the other hand, wants to win. A few females said that

they perceive tension to exist among competitors that is hard to ignore. It is not possible, for this reason, to be friends with those close in ability level. A couple of females said that this is why they separate friendships with racing. In fact, one female said that she views her female training partners strictly as colleagues.

On a more specific note, emotional/affiliative conflict was cited by some of the women. Several women could cite a personal case where running threatened a friendship. One woman resolved the issue by discussing the problem with her friend. They jointly decided no longer to train together. Another woman, the one who made the Olympic trials, said she felt bad for her friend who did not qualify. She said she was aware of her friend's problem with her -- envy, jealousy -- and she perceived a strain on their friendship. Hence, she now avoid the same races with friends. Two other women cited cases of fellow competitors whose relationship was fine when she was racing inferior to the other. When the situation became reversed, the friendship was strained. In one final case cited secondhand, a friend of the woman reported that this woman began to improve her running, gaining the potential to beat her female friends. This woman became aware of animosity that existed towards her by these others and curtailed her competitive spirit to ensure the maintenance of friendships.

The last interview question asked whether the elite runners thought that there were male/female differences in this area. A few of the athletes said they didn't know, but most said yes. Male and female elite runners who also had experience coaching females noted differences. Male coaches described female runners as more competitive, unwilling to cooperate and display team-ship to the same extent as males he coached. In fact, at times the females he coached would not train together. Another male coach said that he perceived no conflict to exist at track meets: however, between meets the female runners had trouble getting along.

Other males and females had different perceptions. A female perceived elite females as being unwilling to share ideas; males, she said, are more cooperative and willing to help each other reach their potential. Another female perceived females as more emotional -- she said they

don't communicate effectively with each other. One male runner perceived that males have the ability to beat others and not worry about others' feelings. A female perceived this as a weakness in males, that, in fact, females are capable of closer interpersonal relationships. It is clear to her that the relationship should always be more important than beating someone.

4.7 Conclusion

It is necessary to mention that the interview data, based on fifteen male and fifteen female interviews, are from a limited sample. Since subjects were selected based on the analysis of the content of the short answer question providing evidence that they experienced some type of conflict, it could be argued that this constitutes biased information. However, the intent of this study was to explore whether the perception of conflict of an affiliative nature in the competitive situation occurred in female subjects to any degree and whether it differed from the perceptions surrounding conflict for males. The purpose was not to examine to what extent conflict occurred.

It has been reported in other high achievement, competitive contexts such as academics that some women experience "success anxiety". Keller and Moglen (1987) set out to analyze some of the ambiguities and ambivalences that define competitive relationships among academic women. In the academic world, females have ambivalent feelings about accepting higher positions. Keller and Moglen cited two examples. One female accepted a tenure position that a friend had also applied for, and in so doing, severed all ties with this friend, leaving her friend hurt and bitter, and herself, guilty and feeling like a traitor. A second female refused a promotion on the grounds that she wanted to remain at the same level as her peers and friends. In fact, relationships were the single differentiating factor between the behavior of men and women in the corporation (Kanter, 1974). Women chose not to be promoted if this meant losing close relationships. In the sport world, ambivalent feelings emerged as well. For example, some female runners cited that they separate friendships from running. Such is the case of the female who perceives her running partners as colleagues. On the other hand, another female minimized her competitive drive when she

perceived ambiguity and tension from others as a result of improvement and the possibility that she could beat her friends.

Such conflict or anxiety has been labeled "fear of success" by Horner. Horner (1965) maintains that this fear exists in competitive situations. Fear of success is aroused because competitive situations are perceived to be role-inappropriate for the female and incur negative consequences for high level accomplishment. Success is thought to bring about consequences such as fear of social rejection and/or feelings of being unfeminine.

This fear or anxiety has also been called "success anxiety". From a constructivist viewpoint, however, this anxiety has been thought to have less to do with anxiety over success but more to do with the competitive nature of the situation; competition produces anxiety.

This alternative viewpoint of "success anxiety" may be a reflection of the female's essentially female way of constructing reality. In this view, it is maintained that the female's "structure of knowing" is more oriented toward preserving and fostering relationships than toward winning" (Sassen, 1980, p. 19). Females are thought to be more aware of a different view of competition - that there are emotional costs for success. For example, with winning there are losers. In effect, there are only so many tenure track positions, only so many trophies.

It appears that the message constitutes a dilemma. Achieving in competitive environments and maintaining interpersonal relationships may be viewed as mutually exclusive by the female. In an example related to the corporate situation, women are thought to face a choice between competitive success as defined by the corporate structure and the emotional roots and sense of meaning that "successful gamesmen" leave behind (Sassen, 1980). "If they (women) choose the meaning their structures of knowing find in relationships, they cannot work up to their capacity and therefore experience frustration and anxiety" (Kegan, 1977). Whatever course she charts, it appears the female dilemma consists of her navigating between the Scylla of relationships and the Charybdis of success.

However, within the constructivist-developmental framework, "success anxiety" has more positive implications. As suggested before, this anxiety results from seeing the other side of the competitive situation. The recognition of an alternate perspective is thought to allow the potential for "re-cognizing" or reformulating her experience (Kegan, 1977). A reassessment of events is a positive force in psychological growth, and thus, anxiety in competitive situations may serve as the impetus for developmental growth. For example, a female may bring her values to the question of competition versus relationships and reconstruct institutions according to what she knows (Sassen, 1980).

It is the assumption of Keller and Moglen (1987), constructivist-developmental theorists and the researcher that there is a "transformative potential in self-understanding". Uncovering some of the psychological dimensions of affiliative/emotional problems or conflict may provide the basis for awareness and such transformation in any competitive achievement context.

Appendix A

LETTER

Dear

I am a graduate student in the faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor studying sport psychology and consider myself a serious runner. I am presently doing research on the area of motivation, particularly, attitudes toward achievement in long distance runners. You have been selected to participate based on the fact that you rank among top competitors racing in Michigan. Research in the area of motivation and sport has been minimal and has neglected to look at unique population groups such as yourselves - "elite runners" - so, this research project, I feel, will be a valuable contribution to the field of sport psychology.

In order to help make this study a successful one, you need only fill in the enclosed forms and return them to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. I have requested your name on the first (and separate) sheet for the purpose of a second part of this study. For a follow-up, I would like to briefly interview some of the runners responding by mail. I have asked on one of pages whether or not you would be willing to be interviewed. I assure you, however, all the information I receive will be kept in complete confidence and reported findings will include no names. At the completion of this study, I will provide a copy of my research findings to anyone who is interested.

Thank-you and have a good race season!

Janice Dean

Appendix B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Age _____ Male _____ Female _____
Marital Status S _____ M _____ Divorced/Separated _____
Ethnic Background _____

Appendix C

HOWE SPORT BEHAVIOR ASSESSMENT SCALE

Instructions: The scale is a self-rating instrument. You should check each item with reference to your likely behaviour as a sport participant. When rating yourself consider the middle category as representing an average of those who compete in your sport.

		Never	Occasionally	An Average Amount	Often	Always
1.	I am willing to work hard to correct my weaknesses.					
2.	I am single-minded in my approach to winning.					
3.	I have the respect of my opponents for my skill.					
4.	I accept criticism easily from my sporting peers.					
5.	I am a fair competitor.					
6.	I am selfish in my desire to succeed.					
7.	I share my knowledge with my rivals.					
8.	I am loyal to my team members.					
9.	I accept easily not being the best in my sport.					
10.	I am one of the hardest workers in my sport.					
11.	I am prepared to sacrifice a great deal to achieve my goals.					
12.	I consider friendships made through sport are a major reason for my participation.					
13.	I hate to lose.					
14.	I make friends easily with others in my sport.					
15.	I gain pleasure from the success of others in my sport.					
16.	I believe that new situations will affect my performance negatively.					
17.	I accept defeat in games without being distressed.					
18.	I enjoy the recognition from other athletes.					
19.	I argue with officials.					
20.	I enjoy being a leader in my sport.					
21.	I find it difficult to accept advice from other athletes.					
22.	I believe I owe more to others than to my own efforts.					
23.	I love the praise of my coach.					
24.	I give of my best in sport.					
25.	I recognize my lack of skill will always prevent me from being the best.					
26.	I enjoy participating against new opponents.					
27.	I believe friendships in sport detract from my performance.					
28.	I am prepared to break the laws to win a game.					
29.	I believe that I show more potential than my opponents.					
30.	I am upset when my friends do not succeed.					

Appendix D

LIKERT-SCALE AND CONFLICT QUESTION

Instructions: The following are statements about running. Please circle the answer below each statement that best describes how true it is for you.

1. When I race against friends or others I know well and beat them, I feel bad.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

2. When I race against friends or others I know well and they beat me, I feel bad.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

3. Beating a competitor can jeopardize or threaten a friendship.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

4. I am threatened when running partners dramatically improve.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

5. I threaten others when I improve my running ability.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

6. I will alter my run (i.e., time, length) so that I can run with others rather than alone.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

7. Friendships / relationships can get in the way of achieving my running potential.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

8. I prefer training with partners (same gender) who are better than me.

Strongly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly	Moderately	Strongly
Agree	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree	Disagree

What conflict, if any, do you experience trying to meet your running goals and trying to maintain interpersonal relationships? _____

Would you be willing to participate in a brief follow-up interview scheduled at your convenience? Yes ____ No ____

Appendix E

OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How did you get into running? _____

2. How did you get into racing? _____

3. Were other people instrumental in your running/racing? _____

4. When you have a particularly satisfying work-out or race, is there a particular person or group of people you like to share this with?

5. When you race and fall short of your proposed goal, is there anyone you feel you disappoint?

6. Do you train alone or with others? _____ What is your preference and why?

7. Are you flexible to alter your training plans if someone offers to run with you or are you unchangeable in terms of your schedule?

1. Do you have a running schedule you follow day-by-day or do you run as you feel?

2. Do you plan races ahead or time of do you enter races spontaneously?

3. Approximately how often do you race in a season? _____

Do you attempt to compete at the same intensity in all races? _____

4. Would you define yourself as a consistent performer? _____

5. Could you tell me about one of your really satisfying running experiences?

What made this a satisfying experience? _____

6. Could you tell me about one of your really disappointing/unsatisfactory running experiences?

What made this a disappointing/unsatisfactory experience? _____

7. How do you feel about competing? _____

8. Have your attitudes toward competition changed over the course of your athletic experiences?

1. Overall, what would you describe as the benefits of being an elite caliber runner?

2. What would you describe as the costs of being an elite calibre runner?

3. Have you ever raced against women/men friends or acquaintances? _____

How do you feel (do you experience any conflict) when these friends beat you?

How do you feel (do you experience any conflict) when you beat them?

4. As you've probably gathered by now, I'm interested in the area of conflict - it's been suggested that people may have two needs - the need to achieve and the need to have social and interpersonal relationships; in competitive situations such as racings, this may cause conflict or contradictory aims or the juggling of the two may be difficult for some people to handle. Are you conscious of this being an issue personally or for other people you know (inside or outside the sport world)? Any examples?

5. Do you think there are male/female differences? _____

6. Other comments? _____

REFERENCES

- Allison, M. & Butler, B. (1984). Role conflict and the elite athlete: Empirical findings and conceptual dilemmas. *International Review of Sociology of Sport*, 19, 157-165.
- Anthrop, J. & Allison, M. (1983). Role conflict and the high school female. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 54, 104-111.
- Atkinson, J.W. & Feather, N.T. (1966). *A theory of achievement motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Atkinson, J. & O'Connor, P. (1966). Neglected factors in studies of achievement-oriented performance: Social approval as an incentive and performance decrement. In J. Atkinson & N. Feather (Eds.), *A theory of achievement motivation*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Atkinson, J. & Reitman, W. (1958). Performance as a function of motive strength and expectancy of goal attainment. In J. Atkinson (Ed.), *Motives in fantasy, action and society*. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.
- Bar Tal & Frieze (1976). Achievement motivation and gender as determinants of attributions for success and failure. *Learning Research and Development Publications*
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. (1981). The BSRI and gender schema: A reply to Spence and Helmreich. *Psychological Review*, 88, 369-371.
- Benoit, J. (1987). *Running tide*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Birrell, S. (1978). Achievement related motives and the woman athlete. In C.A. Oglesby (Ed.), *Women and sport: From myth to reality*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkston, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S. and Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, 34, 1-10.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkston, F. & Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 59-78.
- Carron, A.V. (1980). *Social psychology of sport*. Ithaca, New York: Movement.
- Deaux, K. (1976). Sex: A perspective on the attribution process. In J.H. Harvey, W.J. Ickes & R.F. Kidd (Eds.), *New directions in attribution research*, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Deci, L.E. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Del Rey, P. (1978). The apologetic and women in sport. In C. A. Oglesby (Ed.), *Women and sport: from myth to reality*. Pennsylvania: Lea & Rebinger.
- Depner, C. (1981). Toward the further development of feminist psychology. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the association for women in psychology, Boston, March.
- Duquin, M. (1978). The androgynous advantage. In C.A. Oglesby (Ed.), *Women as sport: From myth to reality*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Ewing, M.E. (1981). Achievement orientations and sport behavior of males and females. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Felshin, J. (1974). The triple option... for women in sport. *Quest*, 21, 36-39.
- Field, W. (1951). The effects of thematic apperception upon certain experimentally aroused needs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- French, E. & Lesser, G. (1964). Some characteristics of achievement motivation in women. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68, 119-128.
- Frieze, I.H. & Weiner, B. (1971). Cue utilization and attributional judgements for success and failure. *Journal of Personality*, 39, 59.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Griffin, P.S. (1973). What is a nice girl like you doing in a profession like this? *Quest*, 19, 96-101.
- Hall, M.A. (1981). Sport, sex roles and sex identity. Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, Ottawa.
- Hansen, R.D. & O'Leary, V.E. (1985). In O'Leary, V.E., Unger, R.K., & Wallston, B.S. (Eds.). *Women, gender and social psychology*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Harris, D.V. (1973). *Involvement in sport*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Harter, S. (1975). Mastery motivation and need for approval in older children and their relationship to social desirability response tendencies. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 186-196.
- Hoferek, M.J. (1982). Sex roles and physical activities: evolving trends. *Quest*, 34, 72-81.
- Hoffman, L. (1974). Fear of success in males and females: 1965-1972. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 353-358.
- Horner, M. (1968). Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Horner, M. (1972). Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 157-175.

- Kanter, R. (1975). Women and the structure of organizations. In M. Millman (Ed.), *Another voice*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Kegan, R. (1977). Ego and truth: Personality and the Piaget paradigm. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Keller, E.F. & Moglen, H. (1987). Competition and feminism: Conflicts for academic women. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12, 492-511. Kennickles, L. (1972). Masks of identity. In D.V. Harris (Ed.), *Women and sport: A national research conference*, University Park, Penn., College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
- Lesser, G., Krawitz, R. & Packard, R. (1963). Experimental arousal of achievement motivation in adolescent girls. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 59-66.
- Lynch, J. (1987). *The total runner: a complete mind-body guide to optimal performance*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Maehr, M.L. (1974). Culture and achievement motivation. *American Psychologist*, 29, 887-896.
- Maehr, M.L. (1979). Social culture origins of achievement motivation. In Bar-Tal, D. & Saxe, L. (Eds.), *Social psychology of education: Theory and research*. New York: Hemisphere Corporation.
- Maehr, M.L. & Kleiber, D.A. (1980). The graying of america: Implications for achievement motivation theory and research. In L.J. Fryans, Jr. (Ed.), *Recent trends in achievement motivation theory and research*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Maehr, M.L. & Nicholls, J.G. (1980). Culture and achievement motivation: A second look. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in cross-cultural psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Martens, R. (1987). Science, knowledge and sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 1, 29-55.
- McClelland, D., Atkinson, J., Clark, R. & Lowell, E. (1953). *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc.
- McHugh, M.C., Duquin, M.E. & Frieze, I.H. (1978). Beliefs about success and failure: Attribution and the female athlete. In C.A. Oglesby (Ed.), *Women and sport: From myth to reality*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- McMahan, I.D. (1973). Relationships between causal attributions and expectancy of success. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 108.
- Metheny, E. (1965). Symbolic forms of movement: The feminine image in sports. In *Connotations of movement in sport and dance*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neal, P. & Tutko, J. (1975). *Coaching girls and women: Psychological perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nicholls, J.G. (1976). Effort is virtuous, but it's better to have ability: Evaluative responses to perceptions of effort and ability. *Journal of Research on Personality*, 71, 306-315.

- Oglesby, C.A. (1978). The masculinity/femininity game: Called on account of. In C.A. Oglesby (Ed.), *Women and sport: From myth to reality*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Porter, K. & Foster, J. (1987). Feeling free: women are learning to knock down psychological barriers. *Runner's World*, March, 58-60.
- Roberts, G.C. & Pascuzzi, D.L. (1979). Causal attributions to explain winning and losing in sports environments: theoretical implications. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1, 203-211.
- Roberts, G.C. (1982). Achievement motivation in sport. *Exercise and Sport Science Reviews*, 10, 236-269.
- Romer, N. (1974). Sex differences in the development of achievement-related motives, sex-role identity and performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Sage, H. & Loudermilk, S. (1979). The female athlete and role conflict. *Research Quarterly*, 50, 88-96.
- Sassen, G. (1980). Success anxiety in women: a constructivist interpretation of its sources and its significance. *Harvard Educational Review*, 50, 13-25.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. & Strapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39.
- Spink, K.A. & Roberts, G.C. (1980). Ambiguity of outcome and causal attributions. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 23, 237-244.
- Synder, E.E. & Kivlin, J.E. (1977). The female athlete: An analysis of objective and subjective role conflict.
- Stein, A. & Bailey, M. (1973). The socialization of achievement orientation in females. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 343-366.
- Sutherland, E. & Veroff, J. (1985). Achievement motivation and sex roles. In V. O'Leary, R.K. Unger & B.S. Wallston (Eds.), *Women, Gender and Social Psychology*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Triandis, H.C., McGuire, H., Saral, T.G., Yang, K., Loh, W., & Vasso, V. (1972). A cross-cultural study of role perceptions. In H.C. Triandis (Ed.), *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tyler, S. (1973). Adolescent crisis: Sport participation for the female. In D. Harris (Ed.), *DGWS research reports: Women in sports*. Washington D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
- Ulliot, J. (1986). *Running free*. New York: Perigee Books.
- Ulliot, J. (1987). Women's running. *Runner's World*, October, 26-27.
- Unger, R.K. (1985). Epilogue: Toward a synthesis of women, gender and social psychology. In O'Leary, V.E., Unger, R.K. & Wallston, B.S. (Eds.), *Women, gender and social psychology*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Veroff, J., Wilcox, S. & Atkinson, J.W. (1953). The achievement motive in high school and college age women. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 48, 108-119.

Weiner, B. (1972). *Theories of motivation*. Chicago: Markham Press.

Weiner, B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. New York: General Learning Press.

Zachary, P. (1987). A validation study of the Howe sport behavior assessment scale. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Victoria.