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ABSTRACT

Recent research has suggested that the effects of the Holocaust have been transmitted to the third generation of Holocaust survivors. Research on second generation effects have established that survivor parents tend to instill a high need to achieve in their own offspring. The present study was designed to investigate whether this high achievement motivation has been passed on from the second to the third generation of Holocaust survivors. The hypothesis of this study is that grandchildren of Holocaust survivors would score significantly higher on both a measure of achievement motivation and of academic achievement motivation as compared to two control groups of children whose grandparents did not experience the Nazi concentration camps. The subject sample was drawn from children in the Montreal area who were attending Jewish elementary schools. One hundred and seventy-six children whose parents signed permission forms allowing them to participate in the study, were divided into three groups depending upon their grandparents' location during the Holocaust period (1939-1945): (a) Nazi concentration camps, (b) Europe, or (c) North America.

Two measures were selected to assess each child's
achievement motivation: The Achievement-Related Affect Scale created by Solomon and Yeager (1969) and The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale created by Weiner (1970). A third dependent measure, The Children's Academic Achievement Motivation Score which was aimed at assessing each child's academic achievement motivation, was calculated by the child's responses to thirteen specific items found on the two achievement motivation tests. A fourth measure used was the teachers' ratings of each child's academic effort.

A three-way analysis of variance (background * sex * grade) was performed on each of the three dependent measures. The results obtained indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the three subject groups.

A number of possible explanations to account for the experiment's failure to support the hypothesis were presented and discussed. It was suggested that future research in other areas of personality functioning might be able to differentiate between third generation children of Holocaust survivors and other groups of comparable children.
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Chapter I

Introduction

The Holocaust in Germany officially ended in 1945 with the termination of World War II and the liberation of the surviving inmates of the Nazi concentration camps. However, the massive psychological trauma experienced by these individuals was to have a profound effect not only upon their own lives, but their offspring as well. Thirty-six years after the fact, the psychological scars of the Holocaust are still evident. A number of researchers in this area have suggested that the effects of the Holocaust will perpetuate, passing on to future generations (Sigal, 1971; Newman, 1979; Kleinplatz, 1980). The intention of this paper is to investigate the possibility that these effects have already been transmitted and have manifested themselves in the children of the children of survivors, two generations removed from the original source.

Prior to the actual study, a brief historical summary of the effects of the Nazi concentration camps will be presented as well as reports of relevant research.

Following the war, an exceedingly large number of survivors sought clinical help. These survivors of the Nazi
persecutions manifested similar symptoms, such as "anxiety and apprehensiveness, psychosomatic manifestations, sleep disturbances and recurrent nightmares, obsessive ruminations over the past, depression and some unfavorable alterations in personality" (Chodoff, 1968; pg. 325). In response to the overlapping clinical symptomatology demonstrated by these survivors, the term "concentration camp survivor syndrome" was created.

One of the major problems of the survivor is his difficulty with relationships, more specifically family relationships. As a result of their feelings of despair and loneliness, survivors would often turn to other survivors for support. It was not uncommon for two survivors to marry and start their own families. It seemed as if these survivors believed that the only people who could truly understand what they were feeling were other survivors. Given the massive trauma experienced by these parents and the psychological symptomatology they generated, it should not have come as a surprise that many of the offspring reared by these survivors have become disproportionately representative in clinical populations (Trossman, 1968; Sigal et al., 1971, 1973; Russell, 1974; Barócas & Barócas, 1973; Newman, 1979).

Within the past fifteen years, much research has been conducted investigating the effects of the Holocaust on the children of survivors. A brief review of these findings will be presented.
Through his clinical observations of survivor children who sought treatment at the McGill Mental Health Clinic, Trossman (1968) delineated four commonly encountered parent-child interaction patterns and their consequences for the child. In the first pattern the parents tended to be excessively overprotective, continually warning their children of impending danger. Their children either became moderately phobic or battled their parents in hopes of attaining their independence. A second pattern involved the inculcation of guilt in the child as a result of the child's role as an audience for the parents' continuous ruminations of their terrifying experiences. These children tended to be depressed, feeling guilty over their relatively easy life as compared to what their parents had lived through. In another pattern, the parents tended to be suspicious and maintained a hostile attitude toward Gentiles. In response, the child either rebelled and actively associated with the forbidden world, or internalized his parents' values and became as paranoid and mistrustful as his parents. The final parent-child interaction pattern to emerge, which may have been communicated from parent to child either consciously or unconsciously, was that the child must attempt to fill a void in his parents' life. The child, through his own life, must vindicate all his parents' suffering. In response to this, these children either simply give up, realizing the futility of trying to replace all the family members lost by their parents in the camps or
openly rebelled against their source of anger, their parents. Trossman also noted that a majority of these families were dominated by one parent, usually the mother. This fact created identity problems for the child of the same sex as the recessive parent.

Sigal and Rakoff (1971) reported symptom manifestations that were similar to Trossman's findings. Through a quasi-experimental design, these researchers demonstrated that children of survivor parents, compared to a control group of children whose parents did not experience the Nazi concentration camps, differed on a number of measures such as: parent overevaluation of the child, sibling rivalry, and control of children's behavior. Sigal and Rakoff raised the possibility that given the research that indicated that disturbances in the parent-child relationship produces further personality problems for the child, it might be predicted that these survivor children will also rear disturbed children, perpetuating the psychological effects of the Holocaust.

Sigal et al. (1973) elaborated on the previous research that revealed a difference in survivor parents' control over their children's behavior compared to a control group. These authors suggested that children of survivors manifested problems in the area of impulse control and, more specifically, control of aggression. Sigal et al. discussed the parents' preoccupation with mourning the loss of their family members who had been killed during the Holocaust and their sense of
guilt over surviving. Because of this pre-occupation, they suggested that the parent is not emotionally available to the child. The child might respond aggressively to his parents' failure as parents. The child's aggressive display might be reinforced by the parents as these actions represent behaviors which the parents themselves cannot express and must repress because of their feelings of guilt.

Sigal's idea that the children of survivors lack control over aggression was further expounded upon through the work of Barocas (1971) and Barocas and Barocas (1973). They suggested that these children may serve as a source through which survivor parents can have their conscious or unconscious wishes and needs acted out and satisfied. Koenig (1964) proposed that survivor parents attempt to attain their own identification through their children. Barocas hypothesized that these children serve as transferential objects, being forced into becoming an extension of their survivor parents, acting out an aspect of their parents' neuroses, which the parents deny. All of these factors result in the child's inhibition of autonomous growth. Barocas and Barocas (1973) also mentioned that survivor children will not only have to cope with their own developmental problems, but also with their parents' unrealistic expectations of their future. The parents' expectations for the child serve as compensation for the parents' own sense of worthlessness.
Russell (1974) reported that second generation adolescents of survivor parents manifested problems ranging from failures in school to identity crises, behavior disorders and psychosomatic or sexual dysfunction. In his study the incidence of males manifesting problems outnumbered females by approximately two to one. Russell indicated that the results of therapy were not encouraging. He set forth a number of clinical impressions on the operating psychodynamics in survivor families. Russell found that the mothers felt incompetent and unable to properly nurture their children. They could not believe that a child born to them could be healthy and normal. These mothers feared that someone would come and take away and kill their babies. As a result, these mothers were overprotective, continually reminding their children of imminent danger. As reported by Trossman (1968), Russell discovered that a majority of the mothers were the dominating parental figure, thus producing identification problems for the male child. Russell also reported that fathers tended to be very withdrawn and passive as a parent and that these parents held unrealistic expectations concerning their children’s academic achievements. Russell found that the limits and rules imposed on the child were either too rigid or far too lenient and, finally, in the parents’ interactions with their children they presented their children with many double binds, skews, and dysfunctional communication patterns. Russell also noted that these
Families tended to be isolated, with very few interactions with the real world. Similar to the research cited earlier, Russell interpreted the parents' high expectations for their children as a replacement for all the family members that they had lost during the Holocaust.

The work of Trachtenberg and Davis (1977) further reinforced the findings of Trossman (1968) and Sigal et al. (1973). An important issue raised in this article, and which will prove to be highly relevant in this study, was the authors' discussion of the child's feelings of having to be successful in order to provide his parents with "nachas" (parental pride). This theme of "nachas" was expressed by the individual's insatiable need to achieve. Many of the children of survivors involved in the therapy reported in this article pointed out that because of this burden of having to satisfy their parents, they were highly motivated to achieve. These individuals were so ambitious that they were unable to stop even after attaining their desired goal. An example was provided of a man who worked most of his life to become a doctor and once this achievement was attained, was not satisfied and had to search for another goal. These children of survivors reported that their constant striving took the pleasure out of the attained achievement.

All of the research cited and most of the studies in this area have involved clinical populations. However, there are a number of studies employing non-clinical populations.
Aleksandrowicz (1973) identified two general parental styles among survivor parents. The first was referred to as "parental disequilibrium" which involved a survivor-parent marrying someone clearly inferior in strength, intelligence, and ambition to himself/herself. This produced a situation in which the superior parent would be respected, admired, and overidentified with, while the other would be rejected and despised. The second parental style, "the affective deficiency syndrome and hyper-repression", refers to a situation when the parents are no longer emotionally available to their children. This condition is associated with the parents' massive repression of their traumatic experiences. The parents' only coping mechanisms for the psychic pain they feel are avoidance and withdrawal. The child is discouraged against the direct expression of emotions and results in the child's acting out of aggression which the parent will simply avoid.

Fogelman and Savran's (1979) study of a non-clinical population served to reinforce and extend the validity of the findings on clinical populations. Through their encounter group, the children of survivors that were involved, indicated that they felt that they had been affected by their parents' experiences. These children of survivors referred to this effect as a feeling of being scarred, different or in some cases, special. These subjects disclosed that they had been struggling with conflicting
feelings about their parents and their cultural identity. They felt anger toward their parents and, as a result of this feeling, they also experienced a sense of guilt. These children mentioned that they had tried to protect their parents, realizing all that their parents had been through and not wanting to add to their parents' misery. They also reported the burden they felt over having to supply their parents with as much gratification as possible, so as to make up for all the people their parents had lost in the Holocaust. These individuals considered their parents overprotective and expecting them (the children) to bring happiness into their lives. These last findings in the non-clinical population—parental overprotectiveness and excessive parental expectations—are similar to the findings reported in clinical populations (Trossman, 1968; Rakoff et al., 1966A & B) and supported the assumption that these problems are not restricted to clinical populations.
Recurrent Themes

There appear to be a number of recurrent themes throughout the literature on second generation effects of the Holocaust. These include: parental overprotectiveness, the mother as the dominant parent, the child's identification problems and feelings of guilt and, finally, excessive parental expectations. These factors will be presented and briefly discussed with the appropriate references cited. It should be understood that even though these themes are recurrent, they do not imply that each child of survivor demonstrates each factor.

The first finding to emerge from the literature was that most survivor families are dominated by the mother and that the survivor parents tend to be overprotective (Trossman, 1968; Rakoff et al., 1966A & B; Newman, 1979; Russell, 1974; Fogelman & Savran, 1979).

A second discovery was that children of survivors experienced conflicts in the process of identification, whether related to personal, sex-role or Jewish identity formation (Trossman, 1968; Rakoff et al., 1966A & B; Newman, 1979).

A third product of this research was the observation of the sense of guilt experienced by the children of survivors. This guilt is a result of a number of factors, such as the simplicity and trouble-free lives these children are living in comparison to their parents' earlier lives and as
a response to the child's feelings of anger toward their parents (Trossman, 1968; Rakoff et al., 1966A & B; Newman, 1979).

A final theme to emerge and which serves as the basis of this study was the discovery of excessive parental expectations in survivor parents. This factor has been observed and interpreted by a number of researchers. For example, Barocas and Barocas (1973) reported that the parents' excessive expectations serve as a compensation for the parents' own sense of worthlessness. Russell (1974) indicated that the survivor parents' unrealistic expectations concerning their children's academic achievement serves as a replacement for the family members lost during the Holocaust. Trachtenberg and Davis (1977) concluded that the survivor child's insatiable need to achieve is a product of the child's wanting to provide satisfaction for his parents. This latter explanation was also proposed by Fogelman and Savran (1979).

In summary, from the child's perspective, this excessive parental expectation means that the child is forced to achieve and succeed in order to provide some meaning for his parents' empty lives. From the parents' perspective, the child is viewed as an extension of the parent, as a replacement of all the family members and dreams lost in the Holocaust. The parent tries to live through his children. Through the child's success, the parent vicariously feels successful as well. Therefore, the child's achievement and success are of utmost
importance for the survivor parents. This parental attitude explains the survivors motivation for instilling a high need to achieve in their children, to the extent of setting unrealistic goals. The child grows up knowing that he must be successful not only for himself, but more importantly for his parents.

The Present Study.

From the literature presented in this section, it is quite evident that children of survivors have been "scarred" by their parents' Holocaust experiences. As these individuals have grown up and are now parents themselves, it can be predicted that these new "scarred" parents will pass on their Holocaust-related problems to their own children. In fact, a number of researchers have raised this possibility. For example, Sigal (1971) wrote that "the effects of concentration camps may conceivably manifest themselves in psychologically disturbed functioning of future generations" (pg. 397).

This study is intended to explore the possibility that the psychological effects of the Holocaust have been transmitted to a third generation. A recent study by Rosenthal and Rosenthal (1980) supports this proposal. They presented the case of a seven year-old boy who manifested similar symptomology as his paternal grandmother, who was a survivor of the Holocaust. The symptoms reported included: anxiety, insomnia, nightmares and fatigue. The authors made the assumption that
the presenting symptoms were a direct result of the problems both the grandmother and father experienced as a by-product of the Holocaust. This case illustrated, as indicated by the authors, "of the need for a psychohistorical approach in the diagnosis and treatment of patients who are third generation of the Holocaust and the identification of the nature of the multigenerational processes within such a family" (pg. 572). Thus, these researchers have provided what they believe to be proof that the effects of the Holocaust have extended to a third generation.

The area selected to assess whether the effects of the Holocaust have been transmitted to a third generation is achievement motivation. As previously discussed, a number of studies have established the fact that children of survivor parents exhibited an extremely high need to achieve (for example, Trachtenberg & Davis, 1977). The present study will investigate whether children of survivors have passed on to their own children this high achievement motivation. The two achievement motivation instruments chosen to measure each child's achievement motivation are: The Achievement-Related Affect Scale (Solomon & Yeager, 1969) and The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale (Weiner, 1970). Russell's (1974) study of second generation effects of the Holocaust revealed that this high achievement motivation instilled by survivor parents in their children was more specifically related to academic achievement. In order to take this finding into
account, a third measure, academic achievement motivation, was created for this study.

The Hypothesis

In order to test whether there are third generation effects in the area of achievement motivation, this study will compare grandchildren of Holocaust survivors with other children whose grandparents did not experience the Nazi concentration camps.

The hypothesis of this thesis can be stated as follows: children of parents who are themselves children of survivors will score significantly higher on both a measure of achievement motivation and of academic achievement motivation as compared to groups of children whose parents are not children of survivors.

Achievement Motivation

Since achievement motivation has been selected as the dependent variable or as the measure of the transmission of Holocaust effects from the second to third generation survivors, a brief review of this construct and the associated research will be presented. As there is an extensive body of literature in this area, the research presented will be restricted to findings which are pertinent to the hypothesis of this study. As it has been demonstrated that children of survivors possess a high need to achieve (for example, Trachten-
berg & Davis, 1977), it would be predicted that the emerging characteristics of an achievement motivated person in the achievement motivation literature would be consistent with the characteristics of a child of a survivor.

The "need to achieve" (N-Ach) has been defined as "a learned motive to compete and strive for success" (Byrne, 1974, pg. 128). This construct was initially introduced by Murray (1938) who defined "N-Ach" as "the desire to do things as rapidly and/or well as possible" (pg. 164).

This concept has been refined largely through the work of Atkinson and McClelland. McClelland (1953) found that the more the sons felt loved and accepted by their fathers, the lower their achievement motivation. This discovery is consistent with the Holocaust literature that suggests that survivor fathers tend to be extremely passive and withdrawn (Russell, 1974).

McClelland (1961) discovered that children with high achievement motivation were less indulged by their parents than children with low achievement motivation. This finding is also consistent with the Holocaust research as many survivor parents were pre-occupied with their own problems and were unavailable either physically or emotionally to their children (Rakoff et al., 1966A & B).

Rosen and D'andrade (1959) reported that high achievement motivation scores are characteristic of individuals who have a domineering mother who controls her son's achieve-
ment efforts with both warmth and rejection. This finding supports the suggestion that children of survivors tend to possess a high need to achieve. The domineering mother and the presentation of double binds to survivor children has been frequently documented in the Holocaust literature (Trossman, 1968; Russell, 1974).

In summary, it would appear that a number of the relationships reported in the achievement motivation literature are consistent with the relationships discovered in the children of survivors literature. This fact serves to reinforce the proposed hypothesis of this study.
Chapter II
Method

Subjects

The subjects for this study were chosen from the students in grades one to six at four private Jewish elementary schools in the Montreal area. Each of the 600 students in the pool was provided with a brief questionnaire (See Appendix A). The return of the questionnaire enrolled the child in the study. The questionnaire provided the information needed to assign the children into the various groups and included a statement of permission for the child to participate in the study.

Out of the 600 distributed questionnaires, only 194 were returned (a return rate of 32.3%). Eighteen of these returnees did not provide permission for their children to participate. The children who were allowed to take part were assigned to one of three groups. The criteria used to classify these children was based on their grandparents' background, more specifically, where their grandparents were living during the Holocaust period (1939-1945).

The experimental group consisted of children who had at least one grandparent who was a survivor of the Holocaust.
The study also included two control groups. One of the control groups consisted of children whose grandparents did not experience the ordeals of European Jewry during the Holocaust period. The criterion for this group was children whose grandparents were living in North America during the Holocaust period. An attempt was made to include only children whose grandparents lived in Canada, specifically in the Montreal area. The purpose in minimizing the geographical region of this group was to maximize the homogeneity of the group. A second control group was made up of children whose grandparents were not incarcerated in the concentration camps but were in Europe for at least part of the Holocaust period.

Although both boys and girls were accepted into this study, the statistical analyses were conducted separately for each sex. The rationale for this sexual differentiation is that achievement motivation research has found differences between males and females (McClelland, 1953). In order not to confound this sex variable, each sex was considered separately.

It had been originally hoped that there would be at least 20 and preferably 30 children per group. This goal was not realized. For a breakdown of the subjects according to group and grade see Tables 1 and 2.

This study was designed to examine whether the Holocaust effect increased as the proportion of survivor grandparents became larger. Also, it was intended to determine if there was
TABLE 1
Total Number and Sex of Subjects
According to Group Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (Holocaust)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control I (European)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control II (North American)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Total Number and Sex of Subjects
According to Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 106 70 176
a difference in the Holocaust effect between children with survivor grandparents on the maternal versus paternal sides of the family. In both cases, the distribution of the subject population did not allow for such analyses.

Since all three subject groups were selected from private Jewish elementary schools, it can be assumed that these children are of similar socioeconomic backgrounds, middle to upper class. This homogeneity can be seen as both helpful and a hindrance. On the one hand, it allows the researcher to control both the socioeconomic and cultural variables involved. However, it also limits the generalizability of the findings reported. It is questionable if the results of this study can be applied to lower-class Jewish children who have grandparents that survived the Holocaust.

Instruments

A major problem with the achievement motivation construct was discussed in an article by Jackson et al. (1976). These authors pointed out that a vast majority of the measures employed to assess achievement motivation make an assumption that this construct represents a unitary dimension. Jackson et al. indicated the possibility that this construct is not unidimensional and consists of a number of distinct dimensions. This hypothesis would explain the failure of other researchers to correlate various achievement motivation tests. For example, Weinstein (1969) reported an average correlation of only .06 among various measures of achievement motivation; both pro-
jective and non-projective techniques were included. Jackson et al. postulated that the achievement construct could be subdivided into six separate areas: status with experts, acquisitiveness, achievement via independence, status with peers, competitiveness, and concern for excellence.

Given this postulate, two measures of achievement motivation were selected for this study: The Achievement-Related Affect Scale and The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale. A failure to produce a high correlation between these two achievement motivation measures would not necessarily reflect each test's inadequacy as a measure of the construct under study. It could simply be interpreted that each test is tapping a different area of the achievement motivation construct.

The first achievement motivation test, The Achievement-Related Affect Scale, was created by Solomon and Yeager (1969) for children aged eight to fifteen years (see Appendix B). The test construction was based on the assumption that "achievement motivation contains elements of behavioral striving for success and affect associated with both success and failure" (personal communication). In order to be better able to generalize across various situations, the researcher tapped different areas of the child's life, such as school, peer competition, and the child's own personal feelings of success.

The second achievement motivation test, The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale, was developed by Weiner (1970)
for children aged six to fourteen years (see Appendix C). This test is based on Weiner's theory of achievement motivation and is supported by empirical findings that have differentiated between individuals with high and low achievement needs (Mehrabian, 1968). The item construction taps three aspects of Weiner's theory: affect (hope or fear), direction of behavior (approach or avoidance), and preference for risk (intermediate versus easy or difficult). It has been demonstrated empirically that individuals high in achievement motivation needs are "hope" oriented, approach achievement tasks, and prefer intermediate risk, while individuals low in achievement motivation needs are "fear" oriented, avoid achievement activities, and prefer easy or difficult tasks (Weiner & Kukla, 1970).

In both cases, the reliability and validity measures are lacking. However, there are no other validated achievement motivation tests for this age group. It is hoped that this study will provide some empirical validity for these two achievement motivation instruments.

These two achievement motivation tests have been modified to make them more conducive for an oral, one to one presentation (see Appendices D & E). The modification also represents an attempt to simplify the questions, statements, and mode of response for the child. For example, question number six on The Achievement-Related Affect Scale is "if I have a good time making something, I don't care how well it turns out." The child must either respond "true" or "false". In the modi-
fied version, this same question is worded as follows, "if you have a good time making something, is it important that it turns out right?" The child can either respond "yes" or "no". Any references made to these instruments in the remainder of this thesis, unless otherwise stated, refer to the modified versions of these two achievement motivation tests.

In order to incorporate Jackson et al.'s (1976) proposal that achievement motivation is not unidimensional and the fact that many of the Holocaust-related studies cited referred to the survivor parents' high expectations regarding their children's academic achievement (for example, Russell, 1974), a third measure was created, The Academic Achievement Score. This measure consisted of thirteen items selected from the two achievement motivation tests employed in this study (eight items from The Achievement-Related Affect Scale and five from The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale). The items selected were intended to tap the child's sense of personal academic achievement striving. This measure can be considered similar to Jackson et al.'s "striving for excellence".

A fourth measure used in this study was the teacher's rating of each child. With the permission of the parents, the experimenter met with each child's English teacher to ascertain each child's general level of achievement motivation. These teachers were asked to rate each child on how hard the child "tries" in school and "how important is it for the child to succeed?" It was explained to the teachers that this was not
to be a measure of performance but rather one of effort. The teachers rated each child on a three point scale: above average, average, and below average. The teachers' ratings were included because of their (the teachers') knowledge of these children and their ability to provide additional insight into each child's achievement motivation needs.

Procedure

Once the questionnaires had been distributed to the students, there was a three week interval to allow the parents ample opportunity to respond to and return the questionnaires. Arrangements were made with the respective schools and acceptable dates and times were selected for the actual experimentation.

As the experiment was administered orally and on an individual basis, the experimenter was given permission to enter the classroom and remove the child to be tested. The subjects in grades one and two were escorted to and from the experimental room. The children in the higher grades (three to six) were simply given the name of the next subject and asked to inform his/her teacher. The children were very cooperative and there were no problems with this arrangement.

Once the child entered the experimental room, the experimenter welcomed the subject and asked him/her to be seated. To begin the testing session, the following instructions were provided,
Hi. My name is Reuben. I am going to ask you some questions which are not like the usual kind of questions that you are asked in school. There are no right or wrong answers. The only important thing is that you think carefully and answer as honestly as possible.

For the first group of questions (The Achievement-Related Affect Scale), I am going to read you a question and then I want you to answer "yes" or "no" depending upon how you feel. For example, if I asked you, do you like school? You could either answer "yes", which means that you like school or "no", which means that you don't like school. Remember, the important thing is that you think carefully about each question and answer as honestly as possible.

Do you understand? Do you have any questions before we begin?

Upon the completion of the first test, the following instructions were supplied for the second test, The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale:

This second group of questions are just a little bit different. I am going to read you a sentence and two choices. I want you to think carefully and tell me
which choice you think best suits you. For example, if I said to you, would you prefer to play outside or do your homework? If you like playing outside more than doing your homework, you would answer "playing outside". However, if you like doing your homework more than playing outside, you would answer "doing your homework". Remember, it's important that you think about each sentence carefully and answer as honestly as possible. Do you understand? Do you have any questions?

Once each child completed both tests, he/she was thanked for his/her cooperative and returned to his/her respective classroom.

In order to obtain the teachers' ratings of the children, one principal requested written permission from each parent before allowing the experimenter to speak to the individual teachers. This was accomplished by phoning and driving to the children's homes to collect the written permission slips. Although this was highly inconvenient, it proved to be a very rewarding experience as many parents expressed interest in the study and some time was spent explaining to them the purpose of the study. It should be noted that this phase followed the actual experimentation, so sensitizing the parents to the experiment was not an issue.
Chapter III

Results

In order to test the hypothesis that grandchildren of Holocaust survivors possess a higher need to achieve than a comparable group of children whose grandparents did not experience the Nazi concentration camps, a three-way analysis of variance (background * sex * grade) was performed for each of the three dependent measures. In total, there were 176 children involved. It was predicted that the children in the Holocaust group would score higher on both a general and an academic achievement measure as compared to a group of children whose grandparents were in Europe but not in the concentration camps and a group of children whose grandparents were in North America at the time of the Nazi persecutions.

Contrary to McClelland's (1953) prediction, it was not found that the boys' achievement motivation scores were significantly higher than the girls' group. In fact, as revealed in Table 3, the mean scores obtained were similar for both sexes. As a result, there was no need to analyze the data for each sex separately.

Means and standard deviations for the three subject groups on each of the three achievement motivation measures is summarized in Table 4. It should be recalled that the
### TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Boys and Girls on 3 N-Ach Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th></th>
<th>$T_3$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T_1 = \text{Df}=1, \overline{t} = 1.47, \, p \geq P = 0.09$

$T_2 = \text{Df}=1, \overline{t} = 1.19, \, p \geq P = 0.08$

$T_3 = \text{Df}=1, \overline{t} = 0.64, \, p \geq P = 0.97$
TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations on the 3 N-Ach Measures According to Group Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T1 M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T2 M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T3 M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (Holocaust)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control I (European)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control II (North American)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maximum score on both the Achievement-Related Affect Scale \( (T_1) \) and the Children's Achievement Motivation Scale \( (T_2) \) is twenty. The highest attainable score on the Academic Achievement Motivation Measure is thirteen.

The analysis of variance of the Achievement-Related Affect Scale (see Table 5) revealed a statistically significant difference \( (Df = 31, F = 2.12, P \gg F = 0.0017) \). However, upon closer examination of the independent variables it would appear that this statistical difference is a product of a "grade" effect \( (Df = 5, F = 4.79, P \gg F = 0.0004) \) and not of the predicted subjects' grandparents' background \( (Df = 2, F = 3.82, P \gg F = 0.40) \).

The analysis of variance of the Children's Achievement Motivation Scale failed to yield any significant differences \( (Df = 31, F = 1.42, P \gg F = 0.33) \). A further analysis of each classification variable and its interaction effects also failed to produce any statistically significant results (see Table 6).

The analysis of variance of the Children's Academic Achievement Motivation Score, a measure created by the experimenter for this study, failed to reveal any statistically significant results \( (Df = 31, F = 0.98, P \gg F = 0.504) \). Once again, a breakdown of the classification variables and their interaction effects failed to yield significant results (see Table 7).

As previously mentioned, the only independent variable to produce a statistically significant result was the subjects'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr&gt;F</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>241.26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>529.28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>770.54</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
The Analysis of Variance of
The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>184.99</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>770.51</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>955.50</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

The Analysis of Variance of
The Children's Academic Achievement Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Pr&gt;F</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>88.64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>420.38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>508.72</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"grade" and this effect was only found on the Achievement-Related Affect Scale. Table 8 provides the mean scores and standard deviations for the three dependent measures according to grade level.

As discussed earlier, it is not necessary for the two achievement motivation instruments to correlate with each other (see Table 9 for the correlation coefficients). It is important to keep in mind that the third dependent measure, The Children's Academic Achievement Motivation Score, was a measure derived from the other two achievement motivation tests. In other words, it was expected that this measure would at least correlate moderately with the other two measures as it is a derivative of each.

The fourth dependent measure, the teacher's rating of each child, failed to provide any support for the proposed hypothesis. In fact, the results obtained were contrary to expectations. It was predicted that children whose grandparents were Holocaust survivors and who are expected to display a high achievement motivation would be rated more often as "above average" by their teachers on a rating of academic achievement motivation than the other children. The results reported in Table 10 do not support this prediction.

In summary, a three-way analysis of variance (background * sex * grade) was performed on each of the three dependent measures. The results obtained indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among the three subject groups.
TABLE 8
Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Three Achievement Motivation Scores According to Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9

The Correlation Coefficients for the
Three Achievement Motivation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$T_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_1$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_2$</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_3$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10

Teachers' Ratings of Students According to Group Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Above Ave</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control I</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control II</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNo teachers' ratings obtained for 2 students.*
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Discussion

Recent research has suggested that the effects of the Holocaust have carried over to the second generation of children of Holocaust survivors (for example, Rosenthal & Rosenthal, 1980). The present study was designed to investigate this suggestion. It was hypothesized that grandchildren of Holocaust survivors would score significantly higher on both a measure of achievement motivation and of academic achievement motivation as compared to a comparable sample of children whose grandparents, however, did not experience Nazi concentration camps. The results reported in the previous chapter demonstrated that this study failed to support the hypothesis. A three-way analysis of variance (background x sex x grade) was performed for each of the three dependent measures and it was found that there were no statistically significant differences among the three subject groups.

The simple conclusion to be drawn from these results is that there are no apparent third generation effects. It is the opinion of this author that such a conclusion would be premature. Instead, some thought and consideration should be given to a number of methodological issues which might have
influenced the results. The purpose of this chapter will be to present a number of possible explanations to account for this study's failure to support the hypothesis and to suggest directions for future research.

The first area of concern is related to the subject population, i.e. recruitment and composition. The method of subject recruitment might have created a problem. The subjects who participated in this study were children whose parents were willing to allow their children to be involved in a Holocaust-related experiment. It may be that parents who are more involved with and experiencing Holocaust-related problems would not permit their children to participate. There were children of survivors who simply did not respond to the introductory letter. There were also a number of parents who returned the letter indicating that they are children of survivors, but would not allow their children to be tested. This issue of subject recruitment represents a sampling bias against the hypothesis of this study: the children who are possibly most vulnerable to the "Holocaust effect" might not have been tested.

The homogeneity of the subject population could also have been a problem. Since the subject pool for this study was drawn from four private Jewish schools in the Montreal area, it can be assumed that these children are from middle to upper class families. This fact suggests that these children come from families with a strong Jewish identity and have experi-
enced similar rearing patterns and socialization processes. Part of the Jewish socialization process is the instillation by the parents of a need to achieve. Although there is no empirical evidence to support this Jewish trait, Friedman (1974) has suggested that a majority of Jewish children possess a high achievement motivation. This proposed characteristic might have produced a "ceiling effect" limiting the possible range of scores. This would have meant that the results obtained reached a certain level beyond which the two achievement motivation tests were incapable of assessing. A measure of achievement motivation with a greater range might have revealed statistically significant differences among the three subject groups. Regrettably this instrument has yet to be constructed.

The second problem area involved the validity of the achievement motivation measures employed in this study. As the achievement motivation measures were designed to sample various content areas and primary attention was given to the content of each response, the reported results were dependent upon the accuracy and honesty of each child. Therefore, a factor such as social desirability could have influenced the child's answers, subsequently affecting the test scores. For example, question number three on The Achievement-Related Affect Scale is "when you play a game with a friend, is it important for you to try to win?" Most children responded "No", implying that having fun is more important than winning.
It is questionable whether this response validly depicts the average child's feelings.

This uncertainty is based on the Experimenter's personal experience with children and was further reinforced in conversations with various parents of children in this study. In one case, an interested mother asked about the types of questions that were presented to her child. This question was mentioned and she responded that she was certain that her child responded "No", because of her constant insistence that playing for fun is more important than winning. However, she also admitted that there was little doubt that her child is more interested in winning. This was based on her direct observations of her son in competitive situations. It would seem probable that many children would be prone to respond in the socially desirable manner, "No" in this instance, when in reality they are highly competitive and motivated to defeat their opposition. The effect this would have on the test scores would be to limit the range of achievement motivation measured by scale scores. In other words, the greater the number of questions vulnerable to this test bias, the more the achievement motivation tests lose their ability to differentiate between individuals who might actually have different levels of this trait.

The validity of the instruments used in this study may be related to their construction. As indicated in the previous chapter, only minimal correlations between the two achievement tests were reported. These findings raise the possibility that
one or both of these measures represent poor item sampling of the achievement motivation construct. However, it is also possible that this is not the case and that these two measures are merely tapping different aspects of the need-achievement construct. As was mentioned earlier, Jackson et al. (1976) proposed that achievement motivation is not a unidimensional construct as initially advanced by McClelland (1953). If this proposal is accepted, both instruments must be assessed independently. In a personal communication with Weimer, the creator of The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale revealed that in three earlier studies this test had proven successful in distinguishing between groups of high and low achievement motivated children. Limited success was also reported by Solomon, one of the creators of The Achievement-Related Affect Scale. The rationale for selecting these two tests was based on the fact that these measures have received some empirical support and also there were no other validated measures in this area.

Additional research on third generation effects of the Holocaust is needed. Although this study failed to distinguish between kin-related Holocaust survivors and two groups of comparable children, the possibility of third generation effects in other areas of personality functioning is not ruled out. What is needed is research using better designed and more sensitive dependent measures in order to eliminate some of the problems encountered in this study, i.e. social desirability.
It appears that a major flaw in this study was the assumption that all children of Holocaust survivor parents have been similarly affected. The results of this study suggest that such third generation effects may be either quite weak or unevenly distributed, or both. Therefore it might prove worthwhile in future research on third generation children of Holocaust survivors to assess the child's parents as well. It is reasonable to assume that the more the parents have been affected by the Holocaust, the more their children will demonstrate these problems as well.
Conclusions

In conclusion, the hypothesis that grandchildren of Holocaust survivors would score significantly higher on both a measure of achievement motivation and of academic achievement motivation as compared to two groups of children whose grandparents did not experience Nazi concentration camps was not supported. A three-way analysis of variance (background * sex * grade) failed to differentiate among the three subject groups. These findings could be used to support a proposal that the Holocaust effects have not been transmitted to a third generation. However, owing to certain limitations of this study, which have been presented and discussed in this chapter (i.e., homogeneity and recruitment of the subject population), it would seem much wiser to conclude that these results are not definitive. Further research in this area is required to substantiate or to refute these results.

It is suggested that additional research on third generation effects of the Holocaust is needed in other areas of personality functioning as well. It is further recommended that future research should include an assessment of the child's parents, as all children of Holocaust survivor parents may not have been similarly affected.
APPENDIX A

Introductory Letter to Parents

Dear Parents,

I am presently enrolled at the University of Windsor in a Child-Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program. For my thesis, I am investigating 3rd generation effects of the Holocaust and to accomplish this, I would like to administer a brief (approximately 30 minutes) pencil and paper test to a large group of children. The purpose of the test will be to assess the child's sense of achievement in school.

Since my interest is in comparing information concerning children of different backgrounds, I would appreciate your completion of the brief questionnaire provided. These answers will provide valuable information regarding your child's background.

I would like to emphasize that the results of this research are confidential and will not be used for any purpose other than this study.

Thank you for your cooperation and I would appreciate the return of these forms at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Reuben Schnayer

Reuben Schnayer, B.A.
Psychology Department
APPENDIX B

The Achievement-Related Affect Scale

1. If I had done my best, losing a game doesn't bother me. True False
2. If I can't learn something easily, I feel bad and want to try harder. True False
3. When I play a game with a friend, it doesn't matter to me if I win. True False
4. I get very disappointed when I don't get a high grade on a test. True False
5. I like trying to learn a new sport better than playing one I already know. True False
6. If I have a good time making something, I don't care how well it turns out. True False
7. When I play a game, I don't enjoy it much unless I am winning. True False
8. When I work on a puzzle, I don't mind much stopping even if I haven't figured it out. True False
9. When my friends and I are telling jokes, I'm happiest if mine are the funniest. True False
10. In school, I don't care much if my answer is better than someone else's. True False
11. When something I make turns out badly, I don't want to try it again. True False
12. I feel very unhappy when I hand in schoolwork that I know isn't very good. True False
13. When I can't understand something my teacher explains, I don't worry about it much. True False
14. When I draw a picture, I enjoy trying ways of improving it. True False
15. When I play a game and don't win, I sometimes get angry. True False
16. When a friend beats me at a game, I don't mind because he is a friend. True False
17. If I can't understand something in a book, True False
I want to keep working at it until I do.

18. I get pleased and excited when I get good True False
grades.

19. When I can do something as well as my True False
friends, I am satisfied.

20. If a gym teacher told me I wasn't very good True False
at a sport, I would want to give it up.
APPENDIX C

The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale

1. I prefer
   A. working with others.
   B. working by myself.

2. I prefer jobs
   A. that I might not be able to do.
   B. which I'm sure I can do.

3. I would rather take part in
   A. fun games.
   B. games where I would learn something.

4. I prefer a game
   A. where I'm better than anyone else.
   B. where everyone is about the same.

5. I would rather
   A. play a team game.
   B. play against one person.

6. I would rather
   A. wait one or two years and have my parents buy me one big present.
   B. Have them buy me several smaller presents over the same period of time.

7. When I am sick, I would rather
   A. rest and relax.
   B. try to do my homework.

8. I
   A. like giving reports before the class.
   B. don't like giving reports before the class.

9. Before class tests I am
   A. often nervous.
   B. hardly ever nervous.

10. When I am playing in a game or sport, I am
    A. more interested in having fun than winning.
    B. more interested in winning.

11. When I am sure I can do a job
    A. I enjoy it most.
    B. I become bored.
12. When I play a game
   A. I hate to lose.
   B. I love to win.

13. After summer vacation, I am
   A. glad to get back to school.
   B. not glad to get back to school.

14. I talk in class
   A. less than other students.
   B. more than other students.

15. I enjoy sports more when I play against
   A. one other player.
   B. several other players.

16. If I were getting better from a serious illness, I
    would like to
   A. spend my time learning how to do something.
   B. relax.

17. I like playing a game when I am
   A. as good as my playmate.
   B. much better than my playmate.

18. I would prefer classes in which
   A. the students were all as good as one another at
      the work.
   B. I was better than almost all the others.

19. When I do things to help at home, I prefer to
   A. do usual things I know I can do.
   B. do things that are hard and I'm not sure I can do.

20. I would choose as work partners
    A. other children who do well in school.
    B. other children who are friendly.
APPENDIX D

The Modified Form of

The Achievement-Related Affect Scale

1. If you had done your best, does losing a game Yes No bother you?

2. If you can't learn something right away, do you Yes No feel bad and want to try harder?

3. When you play a game with a friend, is it Yes No important for you to try to win?

4. Are you very disappointed when you don't get a Yes No high mark on a test?

5. Which would you rather do, try to learn a new Old New sport or play one you already know?

6. If you have a good time making something, is Yes No it important that it turns out right?

7. When you play a game, is it only fun if you are Yes No winning?

8. When you work on a puzzle, do you mind much if Yes No you have to stop, even if you haven't figured it out yet?

9. When you and your friends are telling jokes, is Yes No it important that yours are the funniest?

10. In school, do you care a lot if your answers Yes No are better than someone else's?

11. When something you make turns out badly, do you Yes No want to try again?

12. Do you feel very unhappy when you hand in Yes No schoolwork that you know isn't very good?

13. When you can't understand something your Yes No teacher explains, do you worry about it much?

14. When you draw a picture, do you enjoy trying Yes No ways to improve it?
15. When you play a game and don't win, do you sometimes get angry?  Yes  No

16. When a friend beats you at a game, is it okay because he is your friend?  Yes  No

17. If you can't understand something in a new book, do you want to keep working at it until you do?  Yes  No

18. Do you get pleased and excited when you get good grades?  Yes  No

19. Is it okay if you can't do something as well as your friends?  Yes  No

20. If your gym teacher told you, you weren't very good at a sport, would you want to give it up?  Yes  No
APPENDIX E

The Modified Form of
The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale

1. Would you rather
   A. work with others, or
   B. work by yourself?

2. Would you rather
   A. try to do something that you might not be able to do, or
   B. something which you are sure you can do?

3. Would you rather take part in:
   A. fun games, or
   B. games where you could learn something?

4. Would you rather play a game
   A. in which you were better than everyone else, or
   B. where everyone is about the same?

5. Would you rather play a game
   A. where you are on a team, or
   B. where you are against just one other person?

6. Would you rather
   A. wait one or two years and have your parents buy you one big present, or
   B. have them buy you one small present each year?

7. When you are sick and have to stay home, would you rather
   A. rest and relax, or
   B. try to do your homework?

8. Do you like telling an answer in front of the class?
   A. yes, or
   B. no.

9. When the teacher is going to give a test, are you
   A. often nervous, or
   B. hardly ever nervous?

10. When you are playing in a game or sport, are you more interested
    A. in having fun, or
    B. in winning?
11. When you are sure you can do something easily, do you
   A. enjoy it most, or
   B. become bored and tired of it?

12. When you play a game, do you
   A. hate to lose, or
   B. love to win?

13. After summer vacation, are you glad to get back to school?
   A. yes, or
   B. no.

14. Do you speak up in class
   A. less than other students, or
   B. more than other students?

15. Do you enjoy sports more when you are playing against
   A. one other player, or
   B. several other players?

16. If you were getting better from a serious illness and
    had to stay home, would you like to spend your time
    A. learning how to do something, or
    B. relaxing?

17. Do you like playing a game more
    A. when you are as good as your playmate, or
    B. much better than your playmate?

18. Would you rather be in a class in which
    A. all the students are the same, or
    B. you are better than most of the children?

19. When you do things to help at home, would you rather do
    A. usual things you know you can do, or
    B. things that are hard and you're not sure you can do?

20. Would you choose as a work partner
    A. other children who do well in school, or
    B. other children who are friendly?
APPENDIX F

The Academic Achievement Motivation Score

This measure consisted of the following items selected from the two achievement motivation tests—

The Achievement-Related Affect Scale

1. If you can't learn something right away, do you feel bad and want to try harder? Yes No
2. Are you very disappointed when you don't get a high mark on a test? Yes No
3. If you have a good time making something, is it important that it turns out right? Yes No
4. When something you make turns out badly, do you want to try again? Yes No
5. Do you feel very unhappy when you hand in schoolwork that you know isn't very good? Yes No
6. When you can't understand something your teacher explains, do you worry about it much? Yes No
7. If you can't understand something in a new book, do you want to keep working at it until you do? Yes No
8. Do you get pleased and excited when you get good grades? Yes No

The Children's Achievement Motivation Scale

9. When you are sick and have to stay home, would you rather A. rest and relax, or B. try to do your homework?

10. Do you like telling an answer in front of the class? A. yes, or B. no.

11. When the teacher is going to give a test, are you A. often nervous, or B. hardly ever nervous?
12. After summer vacation, are you glad to get back to school?
   A. yes, or
   B. no?

13. Would you choose as a work partner
   A. other children who do well in school, or
   B. other children who are friendly?
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