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Striving for success is an almost universal way of life for most Americans. Success and failure are emphasized constantly. Successful people are admired, envied, emulated, and extolled as models of virtue. Parents begin to worry about the potential for success of their children as soon as the children are born. By the time the children are in school, they are themselves imbued with the success ethic and begin to do their own worrying about success.

A well understood belief among Americans is that success is the product of a combination of virtues—ability, hard work, perseverance, and perhaps a bit of luck. Americans tend to assume that success is an almost universal commodity. Thus, most of us cannot conceive of a person being fearful of success (Canavan-Gumpert, Garner, and Gumpert, 1978).

Even though the idea that some people fear or avoid success has not until recently become popular, the fear of success has been identified as a neurotic problem by psychotherapists since Sigmund Freud (1915). Historically, Freud was the first to record his observations of "those wrecked by success."

Other clinical writers have followed Freud's lead and have published descriptions and analyses of people whose neurotic problems appear to worsen at the moment success seems imminent (Horney, 1937; Sullivan, 1953; Maslow, 1954).
Of the early work on fear of success, there are many points on which the various theorists are in agreement and several points of differences among their positions.

A major difference among the theorists lies in whether they see fear of success as originating primarily in the child or primarily in environmental events which then affect the child. The Freudian and Horneyian positions sees the child as active in creating the fear of success, while the child is seen as being passive in the Sullivanian position.

Related to the notion of whether the child is active or passive in creating his fear of success is the question of the definition of success and what it means to a person who fears success. In all three positions, regardless of the definition, success is seen as destructive and has negative consequences. In the Freudian version, the child's forbidden Oedipal desires are repressed. The feared success is the attainment of whatever goal or event has come to symbolize the successful destruction of the same-sex parent. In Horney's view, social validation of the importance and attractiveness of the task and the presence of competitors are important in the notion of success. In the Sullivanian position, the definition of success is broader than the other two positions. Successes ranged from any event that demonstrates the child's competence or independence to success at those tasks about which the mother
herself feels inadequate or insecure.

Another point of difference among the three theorists is the way fear of success is manifested over time. Freud and Sullivan state that the success fearing person strives toward his goal until he begins to near success. Upon approaching success, he engages in self-sabotage or another defense mechanism to prevent the success. Horney describes a process involving various performances used by the individual.

The last point, with which all the theorists agree, is that people who develop fear of success occupy a low power and low status position in relation to the people who initially induce their fear of success.

Further development of the theory on fear of success was provided by David McClelland and John Atkinson (1958). Atkinson's basic premise concerns the various determinants of a person's "tendency to approach success" \( T_s \). This tendency is influenced by three factors. The first is the person's motive to achieve success \( M_s \). The remaining two factors represent the effect of the immediate environment: the probability that performance will yield success \( P_s \) and the incentive value of the success \( I_s \). The three factors combine multiplicatively to determine the tendency to approach the task: \( T_s = M_s \times P_s \times I_s \).

The attractiveness of a success tends to increase with greater task difficulty and is defined by Atkinson in
terms of the subjective probability of success: $I_s = 1 - P_s$. Similarly, the negative incentive value of failure at a task ($I_f$) is greater the easier the task. Atkinson expressed the negative incentive of failure as $I_f = -P_s$. Thus, both the strength of the tendency to approach success and the strength of the tendency to avoid failure are determined by the following factors: the motive to approach success, the motive to avoid failure, and the subjective probability of success.

Atkinson assumes that all people have acquired some motive to achieve success ($M_s$) and some motive to avoid failure ($M_{af}$). These conflicting motives combine additively and yield a tendency either to approach or to avoid achievement tasks. Predictions about whether people will approach or avoid achievement tasks are determined by the premeasured personality difference represented by $M_s$ and $M_{af}$. Since measurement of need achievement and fear of failure allows one to determine only whether an individual is dominated by the motive to approach or the motive to avoid achievement tasks, the strength of an individual's tendency to approach or avoid an achievement task at a particular level of difficulty is determined entirely by the subjective probability of success or failure at that level.

Most studies on these motives have been done with male subjects. It has been shown that among males: 1) individuals who are primarily oriented to avoid failure are
strongly repelled by the risk levels that attract people who are primarily oriented to achievement; and 2) achievement motivation scores are related to various behavioral measures such as intelligence, and leadership (Atkinson & Feather, 1966).

Achievement motivation research among the female population has been ambiguous and contradictory. Horner (1972) attempted to explain the discrepancies by suggesting that most women have a motive to avoid success. Horner proposed that the typical woman, as a result of sex-role socialization, has developed the belief that achievement strivings are incompatible with feminity. Strivings for success are generally believed to require the personal characteristics of aggressiveness and competitiveness, which are considered to be masculine qualities. As a result, successful achievement is said to be associated with negative consequences for women, such as being disliked or rejected by men or being seen as unfeminine.

Horner was originally concerned with attempting to understand why research results on achievement motivation could not successfully be obtained with women. Atkinson's model of achievement motivation was favorably supported from studies using male subjects, while findings from studies using female subjects were inconsistent. Need achievement imagery produced by women in their Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) stories was not demonstrated to be predictably
elicited by the same conditions as it was for men or that predictable performance differences were associated with women's results in achievement motivation. Horner suggested that in order for the Atkinson-McClelland achievement motivation model to be applicable to women, a third factor must be incorporated: a motive to avoid success (or fear of success). Women's motive to avoid success was thought to lead to anxiety that interfered with the production of need achievement imagery in TAT stories, as well as interfering with their performance levels in achievement situations.

In order to test her ideas, Horner developed a projective test based on the TAT that paralleled measurement of the achievement motive. The procedure involved giving subjects a verbal cue that described a woman competing in a mixed-sex situation. The implications of the research spurred by Horner's original study have generally been accepted as indicating: 1) that fear of success is a personality disposition that is characteristic of women and not men, and 2) that it adversely affects the performance and achievement strivings of women, especially when they are competing against men.

While such ideas may be consistent with cultural beliefs, the empirical evidence in support of them is weak. The results of studies on fear of success using a projective instrument have raised problems on the following issues: 1) reliability of the projective measure;
2) predictive validity; 3) sex differences; 4) relationship to achievement motivation; and 5) relationship to sex role conflict.

Fear of success (FOS) is typically measured by analyzing imagery in a story written to a verbal cue. There is practically no consistency across studies in the proportion of women who include FOS imagery in their stories. A review by Moreland and Liss-Levinson (1977) found that 8 of 13 fear of success studies published or accepted for publication in APA journals (by October, 1974) scored stories written to a particular verbal lead for FOS imagery. The average percent interrater agreement beyond that expected by chance was only .50, suggesting that the FOS construct is not being reliably measured across all studies. The percentages of FOS stories of females ranged from 89% (Alper, 1974) to a low of 16% (Winchel, Fenner, & Shaver, 1974). Other investigators have found the percentage of FOS imagery in stories of male subjects ranged from a low of 9% (Horner, 1968) to a high of 76% (Hoffman, 1974).

These variations may reflect differences among the various samples or differences between the different scoring systems used in the studies. Tresemer (1974) suggested that a common coding mistake has been the labeling of all negative themes in the story as fear of success imagery and that the correct procedure is to score only negative consequences of success as fear of success. Zuckerman and
Wheeler (1975) suggest that coding mistakes may be due to the judges' ideas about the "correct" scoring system, sex of judges, and the judges expectations may determine to some extent the fear of success scores.

Overall, it would appear that the reliability of the projective measure used to identify persons who fear success is quite low. This in turn places the validity of the projective measure of fear of success in a questionable position. The reviews by Zuckerman and Wheeler (1975) and Tresemer (1977) have both concluded that in those studies in which measures of task performance were obtained, the relationship between fear of success imagery and those performances have been inconsistent.

Several other studies examined the relationship between fear of success and performance and produced conflicting results. The problem with these studies according to Zuckerman and Wheeler is that "the situation in which the motive to avoid success is supposed to be aroused has never been defined." The performance situations examined varied from performance of females in male-female pairs, masculinity/femininity of the task, goal setting behavior, and the effect of past success on present performance.

In a study by Sorrentino and Short (1974) females in general, particularly high fear of success females, performed better when the task was defined as masculine rather than feminine. These results were inconsistent with an
inhibitory anxiety explanation of the motive to avoid success. Sorrentino and Short suggested that the motive to avoid success score might be tapping other factors which lead the females who score high on this measure to be more sensitive to the demand characteristics of the situation. In addition, the females who score high perceive the sex-role cues as more prominent than those who score low on the motive to avoid success. The results of the study lend support to the idea that there are more positive extrinsic incentives of a self-esteem nature for success at male-oriented activities than at female-oriented activities, and these additional incentives available in male-oriented activities are pursued more by women scoring high in the motive to avoid success than by those scoring low in the motive.

A study by Stake (1976) investigated the usefulness of the fear of success hypothesis as an explanation for sex differences in goal setting behavior. Two predictions were made based on the fear of success hypothesis: 1) an interaction was predicted between sex and level of subjective probability of outstanding performance, and 2) the description of a task as sex inappropriate was expected to produce lower discrepancy scores (the difference between past performance and goal level) among female subjects. The results indicate that females set lower goals relative to past performance than did males. However, this sex difference did not occur when subjects were given feedback
indicating they were likely to perform in an outstanding manner on succeeding trials. A sex difference did occur when subjects were given information suggesting their performance would be more average. The latter two outcomes contradict the fear of success hypothesis as an explanation for sex differences in goal setting behavior.

Three studies examined the effect of past success on present performance. In a study by Karabenick and Marshall (1974), female subjects worked on a task opposite a male, female, or no opponent, after being informed that they had performed better, worse, or the same as their competitors on a similar task. All subjects were administered a fear of success (FOS) measure and a fear of failure (FF) measure. The three main findings indicated: 1) among low FF subjects, low FOS females improved more with a competitor present than absent, while high FOS subjects showed the reverse; 2) among low FF subjects, low FOS females improved more when competing against a male than when competing against a female, while high FOS females improved more when competing against a female than when competing against a male; and 3) there was no interaction between type of feedback and fear of success.

A second study by Zaro (1972) reported results inconsistent with the theory on fear of success. Zaro examined the effects of previous success/failure on cooperation versus competition in a game and found that: 1) sex of the
competitor did not interact with fear of success, and 2) high fear of success females who lost in the first task exhibited the highest rate of competitiveness in the game.

A third study by Canavan-Gumpert et al. (1978) reanalyzed the data from Horner's original dissertation in order to demonstrate that inappropriate comparisons and inappropriate statistical analyses were used by Horner. Canavan-Gumpert et al. (1978) contend that "all that was really compared were the performances of women while working alone and while working in a group setting that happened to include men on the other side of the room." Although the appropriate analysis to assess the relative effects of competitive situations on the performance of women who fear success is to compare the performances of FOS-present and FOS-absent women in the three experimental conditions, this analysis was not reported. A 2 x 3 analysis of variance was computed on the performance data for the FOS-present and FOS-absent women in the three experimental conditions of the second session. The analysis revealed only one significant effect--the main effect for the FOS category. This indicated that FOS-present women, regardless of the experimental conditions, constructed more words from the letters of the master word than did FOS-absent women.

In a recent review, Tresemer (1976) concluded that overall no major differences exist between males and females in the incidence of fear of success imagery. He compared
data from 56 studies that had assessed fear of success imagery for both males and females and found that although women told slightly more fear of success stories than men, the variability among the studies was very large.

The relationship between fear of success and achievement motivation as predicted by a projective measure have not been consistently correlated. Data reported by Horner (1968) show that high fear of success females tended to score lower on achievement motivation but the difference was not significant. In other studies, no correlations between fear of success and need for achievement were found. A study by Beldner (1976) examined fear of success in women and its effect on women's performance in different types of achievement situations. In addition, Horner's theory and Pappo's theory of fear of success and their prediction to performance were examined. Three achievement situations were studied: competition with the same sex, competition with the opposite sex, and a noncompetitive situation. The results indicated that fear of success was not significantly related to performance in the experimental situations. Supplementary analyses were conducted to determine the relationship of fear of success to performance in a real-life achievement situation and also to educational and occupational choice variables. Fear of success was correlated with grade point average (GPA), SAT verbal and math scores, traditionality of educational choice and occupational goal,
and decisiveness about occupational goals. Additionally, fear of success was correlated with race. Using Horner's scale, fear of success was found to be significantly related to GPA, traditionality of occupational goal, and race. Fear of success as measured by Pappo's questionnaire, was significantly related to traditionality and level of occupational goal. Beldner concluded that fear of success is significantly related to women's behavior in certain achievement related situations.

Brown (1978) designed a study to help clarify the nature of FOS with particular reference to the question of whether FOS reflects a motive that can be distinguished from other motives and that bears a predicted relationship to achievement behavior. The subjects were full time homemakers who had been clients of a community vocational guidance center for women. The evidence did not support FOS as a motive to avoid success since it was not associated with the inhibition of achievement behavior as predicted by the theory. Analysis of the themes of stories exhibiting FOS suggested that FOS may be a measure of achievement related conflict.

Canavan-Gumpert et al. (1978) suggest the theory of achievement motivation of Atkinson and his coworkers is limited in two major ways. First, it restricts itself to studying a personality characteristic and thus neglects the influence of situational and environmental factors. Finally,
it almost exclusively focuses on sources of task motivation that have to do with competitive achievement while neglecting situations in which people do productive work for other reasons.

Recently it has become popular to explain the difficulties women experience in traditionally male-dominated professions by alluding to a tendency for women to fear success. Fear of success is presumed to result from the sex-role socialization experienced in the American culture. However, studies of the relationship between fear of success and various measures of sex role orientation have not produced consistent results.

Among a group of Southern college women, Heillbrun, Piccola, and Kleemeir (1974) isolated a pattern of achievement orientation characterized on the one hand by a father identification and feminist attitudes, but on the other by role inconsistency and high fear of success. Patty and Shelley (1974) found that FOS women tend to be more career oriented but also reflected achievement ambivalence in a lack of career dedication and traditionality of occupational choice. Paradoxically, in two studies in which no relationship to sex role ideology was found, the behavioral impact of fear of success was greater in combination with a traditional sex-role orientation (Moore, 1974; Peplau, 1973). This apparent discrepancy in research findings suggests two interpretations according to Fleming (1977). She states
that "although much of the research does show that able/achievement-oriented/nontraditional women are more likely to show evidence of heightened conflict arousal, this does not preclude the possibility that traditional women in some instances may also undergo a set of experiences that arouse the motive." Fleming also contends that there is a difference between conflict arousal (observed among achievement-oriented women) and functional debilitation (among traditionalists).

A major difficulty in doing research from a clinical perspective is that the fantasy based interpretations of the meanings and consequences of ordinary behaviors that indicate competence, success, and competition are usually not directly observable or reportable. Most of the studies conducted using the projective FOS measure have been concerned primarily with measuring FOS imagery in different groups of people. On the basis of the above studies, it can be concluded that the projective measure of FOS is ambiguous, has low reliability, and lacks predictive validity. While a new scoring system was developed by Horner and her colleagues to score stories for fear of success imagery, the new system does not solve the problems of the approach.

Within the past few years three studies have made attempts to construct new tests of fear of success (Pappo, 1972; Cohen, 1974; Zuckerman & Allison, 1976). These tests can be classified as objective measures. The questionnaire
that Pappo developed was intended specifically to identify persons who fear success in academic situations. Pappo inferred that fear of success individuals have certain general characteristics: a preoccupation with evaluation and competitions, a tendency to repudiate their competence, self-doubt and negative self-evaluation, and self-sabotage behavior when success is imminent. The results of an experiment supported the hypothesis that high FOS individuals who received success feedback on the first task were expected to become anxious and consequently sabotage their performance and do less well on the second part. The remaining three groups—success-fears who received average feedback, the non-success-fearers who received success feedback, and the non-success-fearers who received average feedback—performed better on the second part than they had on the first part.

Pappo's analysis emphasized that only when a person nears success of mastery of a task will fear of success defenses be engaged and lead to self-sabotage behavior. Canavan-Gumpert et al. (1978) conducted an experiment similar to Pappo's in which they removed the surprise element accompanying success. Instead of performing the task twice and receiving feedback only after the first time, subjects performed the task four different times and received feedback after each performance. The results confirmed their predictions: 1) Success-fearers in the
nonimprovement condition performed better on the last set of passages while the success-fearers in the improvement condition markedly decreased their performance on the last task. Subjects in the improvement condition were led to believe that initially their performance was about average and that gradually their skill at the task increased. Subjects in the nonimprovement condition were told that they initially performed at the same average level as those in the improvement condition, but their performance appeared to remain average; 2) Non-success-fearers in the improvement condition began at an initially high level of performance and maintained that level of performance, while the non-success-fearers in the nonimprovement condition also maintained or bettered their actual performance during the first three tasks. However, when they were confronted with their apparent inability to improve their performance, their performance decreased on the final task. Studies by Beldner (1975) and Curtis, Zanna, and Campbell (1975) found the Pappo measure of FOS to be uncorrelated with responses to Horner's story cues.

Cohen (1974) constructed a measure of fear of success that was not just restricted to academic situations but contained items about a wide range of activities, including intellectual, competitive, interpersonal, sexual, and so on. The questionnaire items were constructed to reflect success anxiety that is independent of specific
achievement contexts and avoid questions that involve stereotypic behaviors associated with male or female sex roles. Cohen identified nine factors that were regarded as meaningful in describing success-fearing individuals: anxiety over expressions of needs and preferences, reluctance to acknowledge personal competence, impaired concentration and distractability, indecisiveness, fear of loss of control, illegitimacy of self-promotive behavior, anxiety over being the focus of attention, preoccupation with the underplaying of effectiveness, and preoccupation with competition and evaluation. Eleven items in the Cohen scale were taken from Pappo's scale. Prior to calculating a correlation between the two measures, these 11 items were eliminated from the Cohen scale. The correlation between the remaining 53 items of the Cohen questionnaire and the entire Pappo questionnaire was .74 (p<.01).

To validate her scale and test her ideas about fear of success behavior in men and women in competition with each other, a contest was staged with a qualifying phase and a subsequent runoff phase. The results of the experiment indicate that the proximity of success is what activates immobilizing anxiety for success-fearing individuals. After feedback, high scorers on the fear of success scale showed a decrement in performance relative to low scorers on the fear of success scale. Among the success-fearing individuals, those who performed the second task in
competition with a same sex person improved less than those who competed against an opposite sex person. The behavioral data suggest that men and women performed similarly in the two experimental conditions. However, significant sex differences did emerge in subjects' reports of their thoughts and feelings during competition. Cohen's results lend support to the assumption that the FOS problem afflicts both men and women and that FOS is a general personality characteristic rather than one that is restricted to particular idiosyncratic spheres of activity as was assumed by Pappo.

Zuckerman and Allison (1976) developed a 27-item fear of success scale (FOSS) to assess individual differences in the motive to avoid success. Like the other two instruments, the FOSS was designed for both males and females. Females scored significantly higher on the FOSS than did males. Both males and females with high scores on the FOSS: 1) performed less well on an anagram task; 2) attributed success more to external factors, and 3) attributed failure more to internal factors than subjects with low scores on the FOSS.

A study by Griffore (1977) found no evidence to indicate positive correlations between Horner's measure of fear of success, Pappo's fear of success questionnaire (FOS), and Zuckerman and Allison's fear of success scale (FOSS). Correlations were also calculated between these three
instruments and the Alpert-Haber Debilitating Anxiety Scale (DAS). The results showed that only the FOS and FOSS fear of success instruments were correlated positively and significantly. However, all three fear of success instruments were correlated positively at a significant level with the DAS.

There appear to be two weak areas in studies concerning the fear of success. First, there are the issues regarding measurement. The research cited earlier substantiates more recent theories concerning the usefulness of the projective measure of fear of success. Other instruments used to measure fear of success have proven themselves to be more reliable, valid, and useful in relating performance to fear of success than the projective measure. The questionnaires identify people who are low in self-esteem, high in general anxiety, generally neurotic, fearful of being different or fearful of failing. Many of these variables are related to fear of success in some way. The items across groups as well as within groups are reasonably intercorrelated and are also reasonably correlated with the total score of the scale (Beldner, 1975; Canavan-Gumpert, et al., 1978; Griffore, 1977).

Finally, most of the research up to this point on fear of success has been studied almost exclusively in universities and concentrated mostly on responses to performance on intellectual tasks such as college courses and
reading comprehension tests. Conceivably, fear of success problems are strongest during periods in which the individual is undergoing socialization, as in the case of universities. Another possibility is that fear of success is most common among upwardly mobile members of the middle and professional classes. There is a need to expand the research into applied settings to determine under what conditions such consequences are likely to occur. The research needs to address the following questions: Does fear of success always happen or are some situations more likely to intensify it, diminish it or alleviate it? How do success-fearers respond to different situations in which they perform? What other traits and characteristics are most likely to be associated with fear of success?

The present study was designed to further investigate the relationship between fear of success and the prediction of performance in an applied industrial setting. It involved presenting individuals, who are in management positions, an objective fear of success questionnaire (Cohen, 1974) and comparing their fear of success scores with their performance appraisal scores. In addition, the individuals rated their performance on a self-report questionnaire in order to determine any rating errors in the rating scales used for the purpose of performance appraisal. Sex differences were also examined.
The hypotheses examined in this study were:

1. High success fearing individuals will have significantly lower scores than low success fearing individuals as measured by the dependent variables (performance appraisal scores and self report performance scores).

2. There will be no significant differences between the scores of males and females on the Cohen FOS Questionnaire.
Method

Subjects

Twenty female and twenty-three male managers (ranging from entering to senior levels), who were employed at a small state agency located in the southeastern United States, participated in the study.

Procedure

Subjects were told that they were participating in a study designed to investigate what people feel, experience, and think about various situations.

Subjects were presented two questionnaires (see Appendix A). They were asked first to respond to Cohen's Fear of Success Scale. The respondents either agreed ("true") with an item as characteristic of their behavior or disagreed ("false") with the item, thereby indicating that it was not characteristic of their behavior or beliefs.

The Cohen FOS Scale was chosen because the various thoughts and feelings that compromise fear of success as measured by the Cohen FOS Scale form a coherent whole. The intercorrelation among the various factors in Cohen's original study were relatively high, with a mean intercorrelation of .42.

The procedure for measuring FOS was the same as that used by Cohen (1974). High FOS for this sample was
defined as a score one standard deviation (seven points in this case) or more above the established test mean of 29; low FOS as a score one standard deviation or more below it. Thus, scores of 36 or more were regarded as reflecting high success anxiety and those of 22 or less as low anxiety. The samples used for the analysis were selected on the basis of the scores obtained on this scale.

The second questionnaire contained statements concerning the subject's perceived performance on the job. All of the statements were related to the following dimensions of performance: organizing and planning, perception, judgment/decision-making, decisiveness, leadership, adaptability/flexibility, sensitivity/interpersonal characteristics, oral communication, and written communication. The subjects were asked to rate themselves on the nine performance variables using a five point partially benchmarked scale, with high scores indicating that subjects considered their performance to be outstanding. An overall rating was found by calculating the mean of the nine ratings.

Performance appraisal scores for each subject were obtained from the agency's personnel files. The performance appraisal consisted of 12 performance variables which were rated on a five-point scale and an overall rating which was the average of the 12 performance variables (see Appendix B).
Results

The experimental design consisted of two 2 x 2 factorial designs with the following dimensions: fear of success (high scores vs. low scores) and sex (female vs. male). The dependent variables were the performance appraisals scores and the self report performance scores.

As presented in Table 1, the analysis yielded no significant effects on the dependent variable of performance appraisal scores. First, the main effect for fear of success was not significant, indicating that performance on the job is not related to fear of success, $F(1,39)=.13$, $p>.05$. Second, the main effect for sex of the subject showed that sex is not significantly related to job performance, $F(1,39)=.07$, $p>.05$. Third, the interaction effects were not significant $F(1,39)=.47$, $p>.05$, supporting the hypothesis that fear of success is not related to the sex of the subject.

The same two-way analysis of variance was then performed for the self report performance ratings. Generally the results, as presented in Table 2, show that fear of success was not significantly related to self perceived performance on the job, $F(1,39)=1.62$, $p>.05$, or the sex of the subject, $F(1,39)=.44$, $p>.05$. Also, self perceived performance on the job was not significantly related to the
Table 1
Summary of Analysis of Variance of Performance Appraisal Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at p<.05.

Table 2
Summary of Analysis of Variance of Self-Report Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at p<.05.
The performance rating data were analyzed separately for high and low FOS groups and for the males and females in each group. For each group, the mean and standard deviation were calculated and are presented in Table 3. Pearson product-moment correlations (Bruning & Kintz, 1968) were used to determine the relationships among FOS scores, performance appraisal scores, and self report performance scores. While the relationship between performance appraisal scores and self report performance scores was not strong, the correlation was significant, \( r = .49, p < .05 \) (see Table 4). The correlations of FOS with performance appraisal scores and self report performance scores were \( r = .05 \) and \( r = -.24 \), respectively. Neither of the two correlation coefficients attained significance at the .05 confidence level.
Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations of Subjects' Performance Appraisal Scores and Self Report Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Self Report Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High FOS</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low FOS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High FOS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low FOS</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each factor, on both performance measures, was rated on a five-point partially benchmarked scale, with high scores indicating outstanding performance and low scores indicating unsatisfactory performance.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1 FOS</th>
<th>2 PA</th>
<th>3 SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 FOS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.0482</td>
<td>-.2421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PA</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.4873*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SR</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Discussion

Although the small sample size of the study prohibits major conclusions, the results do suggest some important findings in the area of fear of success. If fear of success inhibits achievement and performance, it would be expected that success fearing individuals would show greater variability in their overall performance than those who do not fear success. Their performance records would indicate a lack of consistent performance; hence the individuals would have both good and bad ratings (Cohen, 1974; Canavan-Gumpert et al., 1978). Contrary to the study's hypothesis, no significant relationship was found between job performance and fear of success. This may have been partially due to the skewed distribution of performance appraisal scores. The high performance appraisal scores may be reflective of the problems encountered with many performance appraisal systems. Some of the problems include: the reluctance of the supervisors to give subordinates low ratings, the lack of training for supervisors on how to properly use performance appraisal systems, the rating errors made when assessing performance, and the ambiguity and subjectiveness in the actual performance appraisal scales.

The findings with respect to the correlation between FOS and self perceived job performance approached
statistical significance and were in the direction expected \( r = -0.24 \). In order to further investigate the magnitude of the correlation as a function of the degree of heterogeneity, a procedure outlined by McNemar (1965, p. 144) was applied. The correlation which was adjusted for the difference in range was significant \( r = 0.26, p < 0.10 \). Thus, there was some support for the notion that high FOS individuals become anxious when failure is imminent and this anxiety interferes with their perceived performance on the job.

A related aspect that deserves attention is that the measure of fear of success might conceivably be measuring another personality characteristic or a combination of characteristics. The situation in which the motive to avoid success is supposed to be aroused has never been defined (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975). Most studies of fear of success merely measure fear of success, taking it as an already proven measure of a unitary personality trait and correlating its presence with other variables of interest. Furthermore, the range of behaviors that are measured in the experimental studies is very great, preventing meaningful comparisons.

An additional consideration is that the subjects represented only the public sector of business where employment is relatively secure. In the private sector, survival is a higher risk. In the former, promotions are
achieved through competitive testing, but perhaps many benefits given civil servants may attract employees who have a greater need for security than those who choose careers in the private sector. Further research is needed to determine how these differences in needs relate to fear of success.

While performance predictions were not supported when FOS scores were compared with performance appraisal scores, the hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between sexes in fear of success was supported. This is consistent with more recent FOS studies (Hoffman, 1974; Pappo, 1972; Cohen, 1974). The findings also suggest that sex of the subject is not significantly related to job performance. It is possible the phenomenon of a motive to avoid success does exist but it is also possible that the fear directing that motive is diminishing. Traditional double standards that may have caused ambivalence in qualified women regarding success may be disappearing (Wood & Greenfield, 1976). Women who have had any success find it is more pleasant than failing; those who may have once feared taking a job with authority will find that people will listen to them and that they can be effective executives (Epstein, 1973). This study may reflect changes resulting from gains women have made in terms of modification of men's and women's behavior and attitudes in a work environment. There are increasing governmental pressures
for enforcement of legislation, social consciousness is more widespread, and women are proving themselves when given opportunities in traditional fields.

The findings also suggest that use of subjects from populations other than university students challenges the generalization of former FOS studies. Conclusions based on testing university students cannot be generalized to mature men and women succeeding in a highly competitive environment.

Finally, methodology, and in particular scoring of FOS scales, needs further clarification. The difficulties arise from the lack of a standardized scoring method for FOS which forces researchers to rely on their own judgment about what constitutes FOS (Moreland & Liss-Levinson, 1977).

Clearly, a great deal of research must be conducted before FOS can be either identified conclusively or rejected as a stable and enduring personality characteristic for females or males. The potential for future research would be useful in the following areas:

1. Extend the inquiry beyond university samples to other groups and obtain background information on the subjects;

2. Investigate other levels of management (i.e. entry level positions vs. higher status within the same organization);
3. Carefully define the constructs involved in the meaning of success; and
4. Further investigate the environmental and social factors as they relate to fear of success.
APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION AND DIRECTIONS

The first part of this questionnaire is about people—what they feel, experience, and think. It is being distributed to a number of people, varying in ages and backgrounds. I would like to learn more about people and will need your help in doing that. Obviously, I will learn most if you can be as "straight" as possible in your answers to this questionnaire. There are no "right" answers, just honest feelings.

The questionnaire contains a series of statements. Please read each one and then mark either "T" (true) or "F" (false) on the answer sheet. If you feel that a statement is true or mostly true about you, mark the "T" on the answer sheet. If you feel it is not true or mostly not true about you, mark the "F" on the answer sheet. Please use only the first answer sheet and try to answer all the questions. Use a #2 pencil. Please indicate your sex in the space provided on the answer sheet.

The second part of the questionnaire is about people in their jobs—what duties and tasks they perform and what responsibilities they have. As with the first part of the questionnaire, there are no "right" answers, just honest feelings.

The questionnaire contains a series of statements. Please read each one and then rate yourself using the following key:

A = Outstanding Performance - Outstanding accomplishments and effectiveness. Little room for improvement.
B = More than Satisfactory Performance - Demonstrated awareness and knowledge of the job is above average.
C = Satisfactory Performance - Knowledge and demonstrated skills meet the standards for the job.
D = Less than Satisfactory Performance - Accomplishments and effectiveness are below the standards for the job but acceptable.
E = Poor Performance - Knowledge and demonstrated skills need improvements to meet the standards for the job.

Some examples of outstanding, satisfactory, and poor performance have been provided to assist you in rating each category. Although examples have been outlined only for three of the scale points, feel free to use all five of the scale points. Please use only the second answer sheet. Please indicate your sex on the answer sheet in the space provided.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
1. When I think I've made a particularly "strong" statement to someone I get a bit worried that I might have made them feel bad.
2. I generally feel guilty about my own happiness if a friend tells me that (s)he's depressed.
3. I sometimes get uncomfortable because I've pretended to be more committed to a cause than I really feel.
4. It makes me feel self-conscious to perform a stunt at a party, even if other people are doing the same sort of thing.
5. As a child, I sometimes played sick to get out of something.
6. I must admit that I'm quite nice looking.
7. I've sometimes gone without something rather than to have to ask others for it.
8. I dread the idea of walking into a party by myself when most of the others have been there for some time.
9. Often, when I sit down to solve a problem, my thoughts drift off to a bunch of other things.
10. It's pretty difficult to turn down a gesture of friendship without hurting the other person's feelings.
11. I feel uneasy being the center of attention in a group.
12. I frequently find myself not telling others about my good luck so they won't have to feel envious.
13. I often have trouble saying no to people.
14. I frequently find myself making a date or appointment and then dread having to go through with it.
15. I'm very rarely worried that I'll look clumsy or awkward at a social gathering.
16. I'm reluctant to make a large purchase without consulting someone else first.
17. Before getting down to work on a project, I suddenly find a whole bunch of other things to take care of first.
18. I sometimes find myself apologizing for my behavior even though an apology isn't really called for.
I must say that I’m pretty confident when it comes to my sexual ability.
I hate having a fuss made over me.
I’m quite comfortable in the role of group spokesman.
Most people are secretly pleased when someone else gets into trouble.
I often brood about something I’ve said which may have been taken in the wrong way by another person.
I tend to believe that people who look out for themselves first are selfish.
As a child, when I was called on by a teacher, I often felt my stomach sink, even when I knew the right answer.
I sometimes cross the street to avoid meeting someone I know.
When someone I know well succeeds at something, I usually feel that I’ve lost out in comparison.
I rarely have trouble concentrating on something for a long period of time.
It makes me feel uneasy to have to ask other people for things.
When I notice that things have been going particularly well for me, I get the feeling it just can’t last.
I feel uneasy about breaking a date or an appointment.
I’m pretty competent at most things that I try.
Often, before I act, I consider how others would regard my action.
I’d rather give in on most issues than get into heavy debates with people.
I’m not one for organizing group activities, though I usually enjoy them once they’re under way.
I generally feel uptight about telling a boss or professor that I think I’m entitled to a better deal.
When I have to ask others for their help, I often feel that I’m being bothersome.
I often compromise in situations in order to avoid conflict.
On the whole, I’m quite satisfied with the way I look.
I have often “woken-up” during a lecture or meeting and realized that I haven’t heard a word of what was said.
I sometimes “play down” my competence in front of others so they won’t think I’m bragging.
Before I make a final decision about something, I like to check with others about their views and ideas.
I sometimes have trouble acting like myself when I’m with people I don’t know well.
I’ve often felt a little ashamed of the way my house (apartment) looks.
When I’ve made a decision, I usually stick to it.
Before going to some type of social gathering, I’m often uptight that I just won’t look good enough.
Although I usually begin projects with lots of get up and go, I tend to get bored after a while.
Secretly, I think I’m pretty special, but I try not to “let on” to others about that.
49. I often feel self-conscious when someone who "counts" compliments me.
50. I used to fantasize about doing something that no one else had ever done before.
51. When I'm involved in a competitive activity (sports, a game, work) I'm often so concerned with how well I'm doing that I don't enjoy the activity as much as I could.
52. When people are watching me while I'm doing something, I have difficulty not being aware that they're watching me.
53. If it's easy for me to learn to do something, I have trouble imagining anyone else having difficulty with it.
54. If someone calls attention to me when I'm doing well, I feel awkward or embarrassed.
55. Even though I feel I have a lot of potential, I sometimes feel like a phony or a fraud.
56. It pays to check out your ideas with other people before making a final decision.
57. It's important not to get too excited about things one really desires.
58. A sure-fire way to end up disappointed is to want something too much.
59. Instead of celebrating, I often feel let down after completing an important task or project.
60. Mostly, I find that I measure up to the standards that I set for myself.
61. When I'm praised for something, I sometimes wonder if I will be able to do as well the next time.
62. When things seem to be going really well for me, I get uneasy that I'll do something to ruin it.
63. In the lower grades in school, if I got a good grade on a work assignment I often felt that I had fooled the teacher.
64. When I have to meet an important deadline, I get so nervous that it's hard to keep my mind on the work I'm doing.
PART II

I. Organizing and Planning

This factor refers to the ability to effectively establish an appropriate course of action for oneself and/or others and arrange information into a logical and systematic scheme.

Outstanding Performance:
1. Automatically plans ahead and for emergencies
2. Anticipates possible problems and plans to overcome them
3. Quickly separates essential work from less essential
4. Organizes correctly after only the briefest of instructions
5. Plans are easily understood and useful to others
6. Recommends changes in policies or procedures which affect dollar economies

Satisfactory Performance:
1. Willing and able to plan for almost any job given them
2. Plans time for accurate and efficient use
3. Coordinates plans with other individuals and groups
4. Results generally on time due to good planning
5. Makes plans on their own regarding what needs to be done
6. Lives within their budgets

Poor Performance:
1. Confusion and chaos result due to their absolute lack of planning
2. Disorganized - causes extra costs and loss of time
3. Does not plan - waits to be told everything
4. Constantly goes on assignments unprepared - must call back for what they need
5. Disregards budget considerations
II. Perception

This factor of job performance refers to a person's skill in understanding information, seeing relationships between various pieces of information, and correctly perceiving characteristics of people.

Outstanding Performance:
1. Uses such factors as deadline dates for current projects, time required for additional projects, etc., in establishing due dates for projects
2. Perceives the importance of assignments and assigns priority numbers to them
3. Perceives details of a particular job and uses the information to successfully complete the job

Satisfactory Performance:
1. Perceives basic nature of tasks/assignments
2. Accurately estimates time required to complete a job
3. Accurately judges material requirements of a particular job

Poor Performance:
1. Doesn't perceive differences in assignments
2. Doesn't perceive differences in the factors of a particular task
3. Miscalculates time and material requirements of a particular job
III. Judgement/Decision-Making

This aspect of job performance refers to one's ability to use available data to arrive at logical conclusions. Given one's perception, decisions follow logically.

**Outstanding Performance:**
1. Anticipates decisions to be made and makes necessary preparations
2. Consistently makes practical, down to earth, workable decisions
3. Keeps analysis and decision making focused on objectives
4. Makes correct evaluation of facts others have treated incorrectly

**Satisfactory Performance:**
1. Not afraid of making decisions and learning if they fail
2. Decisions are logical and based on facts or sound judgement
3. Accepts responsibility for decisions they are expected to make
4. Grasps facts and situations completely
5. Statistical judgements are sound and reliable

**Poor Performance:**
1. Delays decisions until events or other persons solve problems
2. Carried away with techniques and makes erroneous evaluations of facts
3. Misuses statistical analysis and makes incorrect conclusions
4. Makes decisions without adequate analysis of facts, causing frequent mistakes
IV. Decisiveness

This aspect of job performance is concerned with the willingness of an individual to take action and the willingness to defend such action when challenged.

Outstanding Performance:
1. Logic of decisions is clear
2. Assembles data in compact manner to draw meaningful conclusions
3. Decisions are supported by facts, effects are fully considered

Satisfactory Performance:
1. Makes firm, confident decisions
2. Usually defends decisions with facts
3. Maintains a choice of actions when challenged by others

Poor Performance:
1. Won't accept responsibility for and refuses to make even minor decisions
2. Lacks confidence in decisions made
3. Spends too much time evaluating routine data before decision
V. Leadership

This factor refers to the ability to coordinate and direct the efforts of others toward task solution. This includes achieving results through effective delegation and follow-up.

Outstanding Performance:
1. Carries ideas through to successful completion
2. Assumes leadership responsibility in absence of supervisor
3. Inspires others to do good work through their example
4. Delegates responsibility and requisite authority when making assignments
5. Assures that subordinates completely understand and can accomplish assigned work
6. Commends work well done

Satisfactory Performance:
1. Has confidence of supervisor within their area of responsibility
2. Willing to assume leadership and does well at it
3. Can recognize and guide good work
4. Occasionally delegates responsibility and assignments

Poor Performance:
1. Makes work assignments without consideration for others understanding or ability
2. Follows up only to uncover shortcomings
3. Uses leadership destructively - tries to block progress
VI. Adaptability/Flexibility

This factor is concerned with how an individual effectively modifies their behavior as a function of situational changes as well as persons whom they interact.

Outstanding Performance:
1. Incorporates changes and new developments into work to speed accomplishment
2. Knows and applies new findings, developments or technology
3. Moves readily and effectively through many new and difficult situations
4. Recognizes and avoids potential problems in new and different situations
5. Recognizes the new and different and takes appropriate action

Satisfactory Performance:
1. Readily accepts new or different tasks
2. Flexible in responding to the new and different
3. Needs instructions or training but adapts to new situations readily
4. The new and different present them no problems

Poor Performance:
1. Panics and/or leaves new or different situations
2. Becomes bogged down or disorganized in new situations
3. Will not (or cannot) adapt self to changing procedures
4. Needs constant supervision in new or different situations
VII. Sensitivity/Interpersonal Characteristics

This refers to one's ability to interact effectively with others in a way which is considerate of their needs and feelings.

**Outstanding Performance:**
1. Is cooperative even in most adverse situations
2. Willingly extends assistance to all but avoids being taken advantage of
3. Makes constructive use of temporary disagreements

**Satisfactory Performance:**
1. Assists others whenever possible
2. Has good liaison with others
3. Gains the confidence and reciprocal helpfulness of others

**Poor Performance:**
1. Tries to create ill-will among others
2. Is impatient with others
3. Assistance is given only to those of higher rank

VIII. Oral Communication

This refers to one's ability to express oneself in individual or group situations (includes voice inflection, grammar, vocabulary, eye contact, and gestures).

IX. Written Communication

This refers to one's ability to communicate effectively in written form considering basic fundamentals of grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and legibility.
Performance Factors Guide

The purpose of the "Performance Factors Guide" is to provide a framework for rating employee performance. The guide is divided into a separate page for each performance factor and a further breakdown by levels of performance (i.e. outstanding, satisfactory, unsatisfactory). Each level contains examples of activities that are indicative of that level of performance.

Performance Rating Scale

The performance rating scale is made up of the same rating values as required in the State Personnel Rules and Regulations. The scale permits values for each rating element considered. The values and definitions which make up the rating scale are as follows:

Outstanding - Performance which is highly satisfactory and considerably above the performance standards of the position to which an employee has been assigned, and which cannot be exceeded by any appreciable difference by another employee.

Above Satisfactory - Performance which has been above the standard performance requirements of the position to which an employee has been assigned.

Satisfactory - Performance which fully meets the performance standards of the position to which an employee has been assigned; the employee is doing a good job.

Conditional - Performance which does not meet the minimum performance requirements for the position, but the employee shows some potential for improvement.

Unsatisfactory - Performance which fails considerably to meet the minimum performance standards of the position to which an employee has been assigned; no potential or promise for improvement.

Overall Ratings

The overall rating will be determined by the total number of points received from each performance factor. The rater then determines where each employee's overall performance falls within the range of values for each level as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seven Factors</th>
<th>Twelve Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>35-29</td>
<td>60-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Satisfactory</td>
<td>28-22</td>
<td>48-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>21-15</td>
<td>36-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>14-8</td>
<td>24-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>12-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section A

I. Quality of Work:

This factor is concerned with accuracy, completeness, neatness, and thoroughness of work performed. The standard is that quality of work which is desirable in the particular occupation or class of work which is acceptable to the agency. The quality of work is measured by comparing the work performed to the established standards.

Outstanding: The "5" employee's work exceeds the "3" employee's by consistently achieving new and higher levels of results by improving methods and techniques for achieving quality. Their quality standards have an uplifting effect on the unit.
1. Improves unit work quality through new work methods, training, or other means
2. Goes outside own job or field on their own to get all necessary information
3. Rigorously maintains an attitude of objectivity in their approach to a problem
4. Their example has greatly raised the quality standards of the unit
5. High quality of work is maintained under pressure and adverse circumstances

Satisfactory: The "3" employee's work is satisfactory in quality. They exceed the "1" employee because they find out expected quality results before they start and they can be relied upon for effective results.
1. Knows enough about expected results to correct something going wrong
2. Comes up with reliable results
3. Occasionally submits ideas for improving quality of work
4. Asks useful questions before starting to make sure of what is expected
5. Understands what they are doing

 Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory in maintaining quality of work. Their work does not meet the goals set for it and must be redone by others. They seem to reject the necessity for acceptable quality in the job.
1. Refuses to assume responsibility for work quality
2. Another person must be assigned with them to keep their mind on their work
3. Fails to use necessary tools and equipment
4. Does not seem to know or understand what they are doing
5. Has a negative attitude toward quality of work
6. Forgets parts of the job
II. Quantity of Work

This factor refers to the amount of work required to meet job standards and specific requirements of the job. This factor is also referred to as "VOLUME OF ACCEPTABLE WORK".

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" by their consistency in meeting or exceeding quantity goals, the priority they give to overcoming barriers and the energy they expend in devising ways to raise output quantity even higher.
1. Completes own work and helps others maintain quantity of their work
2. Sets a 'work pace' others try to achieve
3. Keeps assignments and jobs organized for high production
4. Wastes no time going to next task
5. Sticks to the job and sometimes gets bothered when others come in just to visit
6. Works rapidly

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They can be counted on to give the Department a full days work. They exceed the "1" employee because of the very few occasions that they fail to maintain quantity of work.
1. Work is turned out on time
2. Flexible in accommodating and coordinating the demands of the job
3. Knows what tasks to do next
4. Uses 'slack' periods to maintain quantity in other areas
5. Chooses priorities correctly

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. Often they are in passive or open rebellion to the established work quantity goals. They often fail badly in meeting quantity goals on most assigned tasks. They require a good deal of supervisory prodding for even marginal performance and without such prodding, may spend this time on low priority or non-work Department activities.
1. Lets outside interests interfere and decrease quantity of work
2. Does not do work in terms of priorities, responsibilities etc.
3. Sometimes sleeps on job if left alone
4. Assignments are not completed unless they are prodded
5. Does not boost quantity of work after requests by work supervisor
6. Spends too much time on phone or writing personal letters during work hours
III. Initiative:

This factor is concerned with resourcefulness, self-reliance, and willingness to accept and ability to carry out responsibility. It is possible for an employee who is not too experienced or too highly skilled to display initiative. An employee who attempts to solve problems, suggests improvements, and requests additional assignments when completed, tends to display the factor of initiative. This factor is referred to by many names—"INITIATIVE", "ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY", and "ACCEPTS DIRECTION".

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" because they are continuously looking for ways to accept additional responsibility and get new projects or programs going. They give the impression that they are ready for a bigger role.
1. A "self-starter"; conceives and carries through jobs on own initiative
2. Not afraid of making mistakes and assuming blame
3. Willing to accept additional responsibility
4. Searches for, finds, and follows methods of self-improvement
5. Takes decisive action on problems even when work supervisor out

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because they take full responsibility for all assigned tasks and voluntarily initiates action when they see problems that must be overcome.
1. Takes action on all tasks which are due to be completed
2. Handles unforeseen difficulties on their own
3. Does assignments to the best of their ability
4. Will accept additional responsibility
5. Completes jobs even without specific guidelines and instructions

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. They show little or no responsibility for their tasks and will initiate action only under direct supervision.
1. Intentionally disregards work and responsibilities
2. Fills time by doing personal things
3. Reacts to supervision and counseling in hostile manner
4. Grudgingly completes tasks but only under direct supervision
5. Requires 100% guidance to get anything done
IV. Technical Competence

This aspect of job performance refers to the knowledge of the technical aspects of the work possessed by the employee; the degree to which they are master of their trade or profession; their understanding of the products, processes, and operation of their job. This factor is often referred to as 'KNOWLEDGE OF WORK", "WORK JUDGEMENTS", "PLANNING AND ORGANIZING", 'JOB SKILL LEVEL', 'MEETING DEADLINES', and 'WORK COORDINATION'.

Outstanding: The '5' employee exceeds the '3' because of greater breadth of knowledge of the circumstances outside the immediate job that may permit newer methods or better results, or they give more thought to job problems and their insights into how new skills or knowledge can aid in solutions.
1. Possesses outstanding ability but may sometimes seem to 'hold back'
2. Converts knowledge from books to working situations with beneficial results
3. Keeps up to date with new knowledge and/or techniques in their field—interested in the profession
4. Knows other work fields and has reached out and effectively incorporated things from outside own job
5. Draws upon training and experience to handle difficult situations or tasks effectively

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory in applying the necessary knowledges and skills. They exceed the "3" because of their consistency in providing full and acceptable work results on their own in the range of duties in their job.
1. Still learning and grasps ideas and facts quickly
2. Can turn a job over to this employee and know it will be well done
3. Recognizes any of his knowledge or skill weaknesses and compensates for them
4. Requires some small degree of checking and supervision
5. Work is well done and completed unless there is a difficult problem
6. Possesses skill and knowledge for his immediate job but not necessarily in others
7. Contributes extra effort to complete jobs on time

Unsatisfactory: The '1' employee is unsatisfactory. They either do not possess the necessary knowledge or skill, or will not apply it appropriately except under supervisory surveillance.
1. Refuses to follow guidelines of work supervisor or Department
2. Dodges assignments if they can get away with it
3. Doesn't have or doesn't use necessary skills and knowledges
4. Can't be depended upon to do things that are not outlined for them
5. Uses their skills and knowledges against the Department
6. Waits to be told what to do and how to do it
7. Does not meet deadlines
V. Flexibility/Adaptability

This factor is concerned with how an individual effectively modifies their behavior as a function of situational changes as well as persons with whom they interact. Under this category are factors such as 'ACCEPTS CHANGE' and 'EFFECTIVENESS UNDER STRESS'.

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" because they see new and different earlier and is thus better prepared when it arrives. Also, they are better at judging the significance of the new and different.
1. Incorporates changes and new developments into work to speed accomplishment
2. Knows and applies new findings, developments or technology
3. Moves readily and effectively through many new and difficult situations
4. Recognizes and avoids potential problems in new and different situations
5. Recognizes the new and different and takes appropriate action

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because they interact with the new and different and take them in stride. Also, they use and quickly learn from orientation to the new and different.
1. Readily accepts new or different tasks
2. Flexible in responding to the new and different
3. Needs instructions on training but adapts to new situations readily
4. The new and different present them no problems
5. Knows when someone more qualified can help and seeks them out

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. A new or different situation often renders them very ineffective, causing more problems than they can solve for the unit.
1. Panics and/or leaves new or different situations
2. Becomes bogged down or disorganized in new situations
3. Will not (or cannot) adapt self to changing procedures
4. Needs constant supervision in new or different situations
5. Feels anything new is a threat to their security
VL Interpersonal Competence:

This factor refers to the employee's ability to cooperate with and to maintain effective relationships with other employees, with their supervisors, and with the general public. Under this category are factors such as "PUBLIC CONTACTS", "SUSPECT CONTACTS", and "EMPLOYEE CONTACTS".

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" employee because of their concern for others. They build the image of the Department by being so effective and knowledgeable or helpful that people remember them. People respond better to them.
1. Other workers value their cooperation and assistance and seek them out
2. Establishes an air or helpfulness, regardless of time involved
3. Makes an effort to know other workers - concerned when their upset
4. Cooperates because they want to and want the Department to gain
5. Makes constructive use of temporary disagreements
6. Wins cooperation for the Department from outsiders and groups
7. Has received letters of commendation from outsiders

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because they meet the needs of others. They help others and are pleasant to work with.
1. Has good liaison with colleagues and other workers and is well-liked
2. Assists others whenever possible
3. Gains the confidence and reciprocal helpfulness of others
4. Pleasant and courteous
5. Truthful, frank, and tactful with others
6. Makes outside contacts and gets the job done

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. They often cause distrust, hostility, and low morale. They create problems, making everyone else's job harder.
1. Uses ideas of others and takes full credit
2. Tries to create ill-will among other workers
3. Assistance is given only to other workers of higher ranks
4. Bullies, shouts at, or attempts to give orders
5. Has a belligerent approach to dealing with outside groups
6. Communicates their grudge against the Department to all outside groups
VII. Organizational Identification:

This aspect of job performance covers those characteristics that describe the way the employee carries out his work and conforms to organizational criteria. It also refers to loyalty to the organization and the degree to which the employee identifies with the goals and missions of the organization, believes in its products and services, and shows a general willingness to follow orders. It includes such housekeeping and general disciplinary factors as "OBSERVANCE OF WORK HOURS", "ATTENDANCE", "GROOMING AND DRESS", "COMPLIANCE WITH RULES", "SAFETY PRACTICES", "APPEARANCE OF WORK STATION", and "OPERATION AND CARE OF EQUIPMENT".

**Outstanding:** The '5' employee exceeds the '3' by going beyond just observing goals and rules to get an understanding.
1. Always regular and prompt in attendance; volunteers for overtime as needed
2. Unusually neat, clean, and orderly
3. Provides positive assistance and suggests alternative ways to do the job while complying with Department rules and regulations
4. Maintains pride in Departmental equipment and work area
5. Provides an example for other workers

**Satisfactory:** The '3' employee follows policies and procedures of the Department. They exceed the '1' employee because they make policies and procedures serve their intended purpose.
1. Uses good judgement in interpreting and applying policies and procedures
2. Usually present and on time

**Unsatisfactory:** The '1' employee is unsatisfactory in following policies and procedures. They may cause injury to themselves and hinder the work of others.
1. Absent from work without notice
2. Abuses leave and sick time
3. Has difficulty in following prescribed work procedures
4. Disregards code of ethics
5. Total disregard for equipment maintenance and appearance
VIII. Organizing and Planning

This factor refers to the ability to efficiently establish an appropriate course of action for oneself and/or others including the establishment or priorities and objectives towards task solution. This refers to the conversation of time and material as well as planning and organizing the work of subordinates. This includes "SCHEDULING AND COORDINATING" and "OPERATIONAL ECONOMY".

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" because their planning and organizing permits them to save enough time for useful activities or to respond to emergencies. Also, in research their plans may be better, perhaps justifying bypassing lots of work previously thought necessary.

1. Automatically plans ahead and for emergencies
2. Anticipates possible problems and plans to overcome them
3. Knows or calculates operational costs for units
4. Quickly separates essential work from less essential
5. Organizes correctly after only the briefest of instructions
6. Plans are easily understood and useful to others
7. Recommends changes in policies or procedures which might affect dollar economies

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because they complete and follow the necessary planning and organizing and the expected results occur within a specified time. Their activities generally flow quite smoothly.

1. Willing and able to plan for almost any job given them
2. Plans time for accurate and efficient use
3. Coordinates plans with other individuals and groups
4. Result generally on time due to good planning
5. Makes plans on their own regarding what needs to be done
6. Lives within their budgets

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. They are wasteful of time, resources, or research effort because of failure to plan ahead. Crises and crash efforts are common when they attempt to overcome lack of planning or organization.

1. Confusion and chaos result due to their absolute lack of planning
2. Disorganized - causes extra costs and loss of time
3. Does not plan -- waits to be told everything
4. Constantly goes on assignments unprepared -- must call back for what they need
5. If plans are required, copies from files or from others
6. Disregards budget considerations
IX. Judgement/Decision-Making:

This aspect of job performance refers to one's ability to use available data to arrive at logical conclusions. Given one's perception, decisions logically follow. Included under this category is "EVALUATING SUBORDINATES".

**Outstanding:** The "5" employee exceeds the "3" because their evaluation of facts are more penetrating, sharply focused, and may reveal potential problems to be avoided by appropriate decisions. Also, their decisions are better accepted due to their clear, concise, understandable quality.
1. Anticipates decisions to be made and makes necessary preparations
2. Consistently makes practical, down to earth, workable decisions
3. Keeps analysis and decision making focused on objectives
4. Makes correct evaluation of facts others have treated incorrectly

**Satisfactory:** The "3" employee exceeds the "1" employee because their evaluations are their own work, which is sound and comprehensive. Their decisions lead to good results or assistance to others.
1. Not afraid of making decisions and learning if they fail
2. Decisions are logical and based on facts or sound judgement
3. Accepts responsibility for decisions they are expected to make
4. Grasps facts and situations completely
5. Statistical judgements are sound and reliable

**Unsatisfactory:** The "1" employee is unsatisfactory if they evaluate facts or make decisions at all, they are frequently wrong, and time, money, or research effort are wasted. Others are usually forced to do their evaluation and decision making for them.
1. Delays decisions until events or other persons solve problems
2. Carried away with techniques and makes erroneous evaluations of facts
3. Misuses statistical analysis and makes incorrect conclusions
4. Makes decisions without adequate analysis of facts, causing frequent mistakes
X. Leadership:

This factor refers to the ability to coordinate and direct the efforts of others toward task solution. This includes achieving results through effective delegation and follow-up. It includes factors such as "TRAINING AND INSTRUCTING" and "SUPERVISORY CONTROL".

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" because they use their knowledge, confidence, or "salesmanship" skill to suggest or actually start needed action. Also, their accomplishments are greater and they have followers.
1. Carries ideas through to successful completion
2. Assumes leadership responsibility in absence of supervisor
3. Inspires others to do good work through their example
4. Delegates responsibility and requisite authority when making assignments
5. Assures that subordinates completely understand and can accomplish assigned work
6. Commends work well done

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because they voluntarily provide leadership which is helpful to others.
1. Has confidence of supervisor within their area of responsibility
2. Willing to assume leadership and does well at it
3. Can recognize and guide good work
4. Provides training opportunities for subordinates
5. Occasionally delegates responsibility and assignments

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. Because of past leadership they may be asked to speak but often with disastrous results. The "1" employee is often disruptive, exerting as much force as will be tolerated.
1. Advises others on how to spite the organization
2. Takes frustrations out on job
3. A negative leader - speaks up in protest to any proposal
4. Uses their leadership destructively - tries to block progress
5. Makes work assignments without consideration for subordinates understanding or ability
6. Follows up only to uncover shortcomings
XI. Decisiveness:

This aspect of job performance is concerned with the willingness of an individual to take action and the willingness to defend such action when challenged.

Outstanding: The "5" employee exceeds the "3" employee because the decisions will be more effective and can be made under short time limits and intense pressure.
1. Logic of decisions is clear
2. Assembles data in compact manner to draw meaningful conclusions
3. Decisions are supported by facts, effects fully considered

Satisfactory: The "3" employee is fully satisfactory. They exceed the "1" because evaluation of facts and decisions are getting completed.
1. Makes firm, confident decisions
2. Defends decisions with facts
3. Maintains a choice of actions when challenged by others

Unsatisfactory: The "1" employee is unsatisfactory. They have difficulty making decisions. Decisions come too slowly.
1. Won't accept responsibility for and refuses to make even minor decisions
2. Lacks confidence in decisions made
3. Spends too much time evaluating routine data before decision
XII. EEO:

This factor is concerned with the achievement of organizational EEO objectives and timetables; demonstrating sensitivity in EEO areas; and active implementation of management responsibilities in this area.

**Outstanding:** The "5" employee exceeds the "3" by actively engaging in affirmative action activities.
1. Makes available/provides EEO awareness programs for subordinates
2. Establishes rapport with minority organizations, groups through recruitment efforts
3. Recognizes the need to act positively in providing equal employment opportunities for all
4. Receptive and supportive of agency efforts to employ minorities and avoid adverse discriminatory actions

**Satisfactory:** The "3" employee is fully satisfactory in following EEO policies and procedures. They demonstrate sensitivity in EEO areas.
1. Knows Division affirmative action goals
2. Takes positive steps to meet EEO objectives and timetables
3. Provides an example for subordinates to follow

**Unsatisfactory:** The "1" employee is unsatisfactory in the achievement of organizational EEO goals.
1. Selection, promotion decisions do not contribute to or are not in compliance with EEO goals
2. They are unaware of EEO commitments
3. Doesn't apprise subordinates of EEO goals
4. Refuses to accept and support agency efforts to accomplish affirmative action goals/program
5. Adverse in speech and conduct on racial, sexual, and ethnic employee matters
6. Exhibits unacceptable prejudices and refuses to deal with them in a professional manner
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