CHAPTER - 2

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 DYSFUNCTIONAL CAREER THOUGHTS

Our work identity is an amalgam of the kind of work we do, the relationships and organizations that form part of our work-life and the story we tell about why we do what we do and how we arrived at that point.

Individuals assume that they need to plan a career for the rest of their lives, this assumption lies at the heart of much of the anxiety individuals feel about the whole process. The decision seems so monumental and so permanent, that individuals may become overwhelmed confused and anxious about choosing their career. These powerful emotions often cause individuals to avoid or inappropriately engage in career behaviors.

A career identity is an equation that helps individuals define themselves and give them focus in their work life. Excavating this, true self often forgotten in a dead-end pursuit of fame, fortune of social approval—should be starting point of any career orientation.

It is common to have barriers related to negative thoughts, behavior and emotions when choosing a major or a career. Career barriers can also involve inadequate self awareness, insufficient decision making skills, lack of motivation, external pressures and influences from peers and family or physical and learning barriers. However, not resolving these barriers can counter act the process of effective decision making when developing our career plan.

THE INFLUENCE OF COGNITIONS ON CAREER DECISION MAKING

Cognitions have been generally recognized as important factors that affect an individual’s career decision making process and overall vocational development (Keller, Briggs and Gysbers, 1982; Sampson, Peterson, Lenz, Reardon and Saunders, 1996).
Keller, Biggs, and Gysbers (1982) identified the following propositions about career behavior:

a) Career behavior can be conceptualized as response to cognitive representations of career environments.

b) These cognitive representations are functionally related to and are modifiable through application of laws of human learning and cognitive development.

c) Cognitions, behaviors, and environments interact to influence behavior and

d) Career behavior changes are cognitively mediated.

Some individuals tend to verbalize negative or dysfunctional statements regarding the career decision making process. These negative verbalizations make the career problem solving and decision making process more difficult and often cause the individuals to avoid it altogether (Sampson et al., 1996), with the potential negative impact of dysfunctional career thoughts on the career decision making process, researchers have focused efforts on gaining a better understanding of dysfunctional career thoughts.

THE INFLUENCE OF DYSFUNCTIONAL CAREER THINKING

Practitioners, researchers, and theorists have noted over time that some clients verbalize dysfunctional statements about career choice that make career problem solving and decision making more difficult. Dysfunctional career thinking has been characterized as misconceptions (Thompson,1976), self-defeating assumptions (Dryden,1979), self-defeating behavior (Hornak and Gillingham, 1980), myths (Dorn and Welch, 1985; Lewis and Gilhousen,1981), private rules (Krumbloltz,1983), self-defeating statements (Strawser and Figler,1986), irrational expectations (Nevo,1987), self beliefs (Borders and Archadel,1987), dysfunctional cognitions (Corbishley and Yost,1989), and dysfunctional career beliefs (Krumboltz,1990).
Dysfunctional career thoughts can have a negative impact on the career decision making process and an individual's career and vocational development. Negative and dysfunctional career thoughts and beliefs have been characterized as dysfunctional career beliefs (Krumboltz, 1990), dysfunctional cognitions (Corbishley and Yost, 1989), dysfunctional self-beliefs (Borders and Archadel, 1987), self-defeating assumptions (Dryden, 1999) and faulty self-efficacy beliefs (Brown and Lent, 1996). Corbishley and Yost (1989) noted that clients reveal dysfunctional cognitions via their behavior (e.g., incomplete homework assignments and indecision), their emotions (e.g., depression and anger), and verbal expression (e.g., client statements). Kinnier and Krumboltz (1986) observed that biased, misinformed, or distorted career beliefs generally remain unnoticed and lead to self-defeating experiences. Dysfunctional career thoughts usually revolve around issues of self-worth, perfectionism and overgeneralization and have a tendency to decrease the likelihood of overall life satisfaction (Sampson et al, 1996; Sampson, Peterson, Lenz, Reardon and Saunders, 1998).

Dysfunctional career thoughts processes were also related to subjective well-being or person's self perception of their current status, job dissatisfaction, or poor job performance, unhappy significant others, job failure, job avoidance, depression and anxiety (Judge and Locke, 1993; Newman, Faqua and Seaworth, 1989; Saunders, Peterson, Sampson and Reardon, 2000; Serling and Betz, 1990).

CAREER PROBLEM SOLVING, INDECISIVENESS AND DYSFUNCTIONAL CAREER THOUGHTS

Two fundamental realities of career problem solving are that it can be cognitively complex and affectively unsettling task. Bruner (1985) pointed out that ordinary problems are often poorly defined; have multiple interdependent goals and shifting standards of success. Similarly individuals attempting to resolve the career problems are
faced with ambiguous cues, interdependent alternatives and uncertain outcomes. Furthermore, solving one career problem usually creates only new problems requiring attention (Peterson, Sampson and Reardon, 1991; Peterson, Sampson, Lenz, Reardon, 2002; Sampson, Reardon, Peterson and Lenz, 2004).

Because of high level of complexity many of us have difficulty working through the career problem solving process. However, it is our indecisiveness which causes us to have a maladaptive approach to problem solving accompanied by a dysfunctional level of anxiety (Gordon, 1998; Peterson, Sampson, Jr, Reardon and Lenz, 1996; Peterson et al, 1991; Sampson et al., 2004). The high level of anxiety limits cognitive capacity and motivation for career choice. Intensifying emotion has been found to further bias recall and perception, thus creating a self-perpetuating cycle of increasing cognitive dysfunction and affect (Freeman, Pretzer, Fleming and Simon, 1990).

The conceptual evolution of career indecision has been described by Savickas (1995) as moving from a dichotomy to a one-dimensional continuum, to a multidimensional concept. For example, in undergraduate college students, career indecision has been found to be a, "-----complex problem space of both cognitive and affective variables that are in themselves highly interrelated and ostensibly interactive. Vocational identity, state and trait anxiety, locus of control, depression and dysfunctional career thoughts are all significantly associated with each other" (Saunders, Peterson, Sampson and Reardon, 2000, p. 240). Specifically, Saunders found that dysfunctional career thoughts captured significant amount of independent variation in career indecision (Saunders, 1998).

According to cognitive therapy even small events such as forgetting an appointment can make individuals feel depressed or anxious. If unwanted negative interpretations of the events are generated, such as "that's just like me." "I forget everything" or "I blew it ", they'll never want to meet with me again."They can typically make
the event look worse than it really is. As such, they reflect inaccurate assumptions and conclusions which can be classified as cognitive fallacies (Irwin and Bassham, 2003).

Such thoughts have the power to make individual feel hopeless, guilty, angry and discouraged. The assumption, that dysfunctional thoughts underlie mood (and other) disorders is at the heart of cognitive therapy, which aims to alter negatively biased thoughts, also referred to as “dysfunctional thoughts” or “cognitive distortions”. Dysfunctional thoughts generally express negative perceptions of oneself, others and the world, and the future (Blackburn and Eunson, 1989; Sacco and Beck, 1995). Dysfunctional thoughts become default interpretations and are believed to be accurate (Beck, 1967, 1976; Sacco and Beck, 1995), which is why they are often called “automatic thoughts”. Everybody generates occasional inaccurate interpretations, but depressed individuals are characterized by an overall, systematic negative bias (Beck, 1967). Research has shown a significant relation between the fluency of dysfunctional career thoughts and the severity of clinical symptoms (Fennell and Campbell, 1984).

Twelve types of dysfunctional thoughts were proposed by the pioneer of cognitive therapy, Aaron T. Beck (1976; Beck, Rush, Shaw and Emery, 1979). Examples of negative thoughts are “mind reading (e.g. she hates me) and negative predictors (e.g. I will fail this test),”

**CAREER THOUGHTS AND CIP APPROACH**

In an effort to describe and intervene in the career choice process numerous theories of career problem solving and decision making have been created. One theory which considers the effect of dysfunctional thoughts and accompanying negative affect on choice is the Cognitive Information Process Approach to problem solving and decision making (CIP) (Peterson et al., 1996; Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Sampson et al., 2004).
Osborn (1998) noted a strong basis in counseling theory and research for the way thoughts impact behavior, emotion and decision making. This paradigm is the foundation for the approach to career decision making and problem solving that is the basis for this study. According to Sampson et al., (1996b), the cognitive information processing approach is grounded in earlier work in Cognitive therapy (Beck, 1976; Beck, Emery and Greenberg, 1985; Beck, Rush, Shaw and Emery, 1979) and Information processing theory (Newell and Simon, 1972).

Beck (1967) identified cognitions common to individuals experiencing depression: the common denominator is a distortion of reality. From this Beck concluded dysfunctional cognitions have a detrimental impact on behavior and emotions. As noted by Sampson et al., (1996 b), continued study revealed that individuals maintain dysfunctional cognitions by six systematic thinking errors (Beck et al., 1979; Becketal., 1985):

1. Arriving at specific conclusions without supporting evidence or in the face of contradictory evidence.
2. Filtering out all information except that which confirms the original cognitions.
3. Generalizing unsubstantiated conclusion to unrelated situations.
4. Distorting information beyond reasonable significance.
5. Inappropriately attributing external events to self; and
6. Erroneously assigning experiences into absolute categories (e.g., all or nothing, right or wrong either/or).

Sampson et al., (1996b) summarized the four steps of the cognitive therapy process, postulated by Beck et al., (1979), to change dysfunctional thoughts as follows:

(a) Cognitive restructuring
(b) Collaboration between the counselor and client to systematically test dysfunctional cognitions

(c) Understanding the linkage between cognitions, emotions and behavior; and

(d) Developing and maintaining an effective helping relationship. These steps play an integral role in the CIP approach.

In addition to Beck’s (1979) work, which stresses faulty thinking styles, Sampson et al., (1996 b) also attributed the theoretical basis for cognitive restructuring in the CIP approach to Ellis’s (1962, 1977) Rational-Emotive therapy and Meichenbaum’s (1977) cognitive behavior modification approach. Ellis (1977) identified various irrational beliefs which when, acted on as reality, caused distortions of actual reality (e.g., it is an absolute necessity to be loved by everyone). Meichenbaum’s focus on dysfunctional thoughts was directed toward internal speed and coping skills as causative factors for faulty thinking. Stone (1983) concluded all three theorists focused on the impact of dysfunctional cognitions on emotions and behaviors. Another similarity between the theories advanced by Beck, Ellis and Meichenbaum is the use of cognitive-behavioral methods to restructure thoughts and behaviors. In summary, Ellis identified irrational beliefs individuals use to distort reality and cause distress. Beck (1976) addressed the thought processes underlying irrational beliefs and Meichenbaum developed a generalized set of ways to deal with the problems caused by irrational thinking.

At about the same time Beck (1967) began formulating a theory of cognitive therapy when other disciplines within psychology were examining analogies between human thought capabilities and computer systems. The impetus for this research was an attempt to develop computer programs to simulate human thought processes (Herr and Shahnasarin, 2001). Noting both computers and human acquire, store and apply information, Newell and Simon (1972) developed and advanced a comprehensive theory of human problem
solving using an information processing approach which evolved into information processing theory (Eysenck and Keane, 2005). Newell and Simon (1972) identified the major concern in problem solving as “finding paths from initial states to described states” (p. 788). Peterson et al, (1991) later used this finding as the basis for describing a career problem as a gap between an individual's present situation and his/her desired career goal. Information processing theory was integrated into the field of cognitive psychology and became referred to as cognitive information processing theory.

As defined in cognitive psychology, cognitive information processing theory described the development of human information processing skills in terms of meta-cognitive skills and memory development (Eysenck and Keane, 2005). To this point, cognitive psychologists had employed cognitive information processing theory as way to explain the way knowledge enters, is stored, and is retrieved from human memory (Eysenck and Keane, 2005). In 1991 Peterson et al. integrated cognitive information processing theory with the work completed by Beck (1976), Ellis (1973) and Meichenbaum (1977). The result was framework of theory and practice used to address career decision making and career problem solving which was referred to as the Cognitive Information Processing (CIP) approach (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004).

However, what is somewhat unique about CIP theory is the Executing processing Domain, which emphasized the importance of Meta cognitive skills, (Peterson et al, 1991; Peterson et al, 2002; Sampson et al, 2004). Assisting indecisive people to become aware of their cognitive distortions requires that they should be aware of their metacognitions that is to “able to think about their thoughts”. The concept the metacognitions has many different labels in the literature. These labels have included the executive process of Belmont and Butterfield (1977) called cognitive strategies. According to wells
metacognition is defined as any knowledge or cognitive process that is involved in the appraisal, monitoring or control of cognition.”

Several studies have found that young children process limited metacognitive knowledge and ability (Flavell, 1979); thus we must practice and develop metacognitive skills as we mature, learning to use these metacognitive skills helps individuals “.........to orchestrate cognitive aspect of problem solving.” (Paris and Winograd, 1990). Specifically, metacognitions can lead individuals to: (1) establish new goals and revise or abandon previous goals. (2) add to, delete from, or revise their metacognitive knowledge or (3) active strategies that generate additional cognitive or metacognitive goals (Flavell, 1979). When such metacognitive skills are limited, dysfunctional thoughts may be frequent and subsequent efforts to resolve the content or process problems of career choices are hindered.

Cognitive information processing approach (CIP)

The CIP approach to career problem solving and decision making is intended to be a convergence of career development theory and practice (Sampson et al., 2004). At the same time, the CIP approach also seeks to instill what Peterson and Swain (1978) termed “a critical appreciation” (p. 293) for career problem solving and decision making skills for students lifetimes (Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 1998). The CIP approach is based on integration of career problem solving theories from cognitive psychology with perspectives on human information processing to arrive at a new way of dealing with career choices and decision making (Peterson et al., 1996). As described by Peterson et al. (1991), the CIP approach provides a theoretical basis for examining dysfunctional career thoughts.

The Cognitive Information Processing approach to career problem solving and Decision making (CIP) assumes that career choice involves complex problem solving, which can be vulnerable to
dysfunctional cognitions (Sampson et al, 2004). These dysfunctional cognitions can interfere in the career choice process and impact career decidedness. Indecisive individuals can be characterized by their high degree of anxiety, while undecided individuals may be developmentally immature. In both cases, engaging in learning experiences may help to modify preexisting schemata, thereby reducing dysfunctional cognitions and anxiety and enabling growth and movement.

Krumboltz (Krumboltz, 1976; Krumboltz, Mitchell and Jones, 1976; Krumboltz, and Jackson, 1993) noted the importance of using assessment not only for matching and evaluating purpose in career assessment, but also to promote learning in career decision making. Thus, assessment becomes the mediator between identifying values, interests, skills and benefits based upon past experience and identifying needs that can be fulfilled by future learning. It is through learning that one can begin to “unblock” his/her problem solving attempts, develop new self knowledge, and more toward fulfilling career goals.

In keeping with Krumboltz’s emphasis on learning, CIP identifies the content and process of career choice while emphasizing the important role of metacognitions (Peterson, Sampson and Reardon, 1991; Peterson, Sampson, Lenz and Reardon, 2002; Sampson et al., 2004).

According to Sampson et al., (2006), the CIP approach is founded on two concepts, the pyramid of Information processing domains and the CASVE cycle. The pyramid of information processing domains addresses the content (i.e., information, skills and thoughts) of career problem solving and decision making while the CASVE cycle describes the process (sequence) involved (Sampson et al., 1996).

**The pyramid of information processing domains**

The pyramid of information processing Domains (Fig 1.1) is a conceptual representation of the cognitive elements of career decision
making. The component parts of the pyramid are arranged in a hierarchical order relating to Parson’s (1909) three factors for making satisfactory career choices (Peterson et al., 1996). Parsons described self-understanding, occupational knowledge and the process of relating them to each other as the three factors involved career decision making. Peterson et al., 1991 noted that Parson’s three factors are represented by three components of the pyramid of Information Processing Domains: self-knowledge, occupational knowledge and decision making skills.

As described by Peterson et al., (1991), self knowledge and occupational knowledge comprise the knowledge domain forming the base of the pyramid of Information Processing Domains. Self-knowledge encompasses an individual’s knowledge of values, interests, skills and employment preferences (Sampson et al., 2004). From an individual’s perspective (Sampson, Peterson, Lenz and Reardon, 1992) referred to this information as “knowing about myself” (p.70). According to Tulving (1972), self knowledge is stored as perceptions of a series of events over time (i.e., episodic memory) and is influenced by an individual’s interpretations of what happened instead of the actual events. Occupational knowledge is made up of “knowledge of individual occupations and possession of a schema for how the world of work is organized “(Sampson et al., 2004, p.23). As described by Tulving (1972), both knowledge of occupations and an individual’s schema about the world of work are stored as semantic (Composed of verifiable facts) rather than episodic memory. Sampson et al. (1992) described occupational knowledge as “knowing about my options”. Sampson et al., (2004) described the knowledge domain as the foundation for the two other domains located above it in the pyramid. The decision making skills domain is the middle element of the pyramid. This is the location of the CASVE cycle, the CIP conceptualization of decision making (Peterson et al. 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004). Sampson et
al., (1992) functionally describe this domain as the process of "knowing how I make decisions" (p.70).

The top of the pyramid represents the executive processing domain which includes the metacognitive processes that control the functioning of the two domains below it (Sampson et al., 1996b). Sampson et al., (1999) described the function of metacognitive skills in the CIP approach as one of influencing the way individuals think and act as they deal with career decision making and problem solving. The three principal metacognitions in this domain that exert control over the decision making skills and knowledge domains are self-talk, self-awareness, and monitoring and control functions (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004).

Sampson et al., (1999) described self talk as "the silent conversations an individual have with him/her self about his/her past, present and future capability to complete-------- (career) problem solving and decision making" (p.13). Self-talk can be either positive or negative and influences an individual's self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) for career problem solving and decision making (Sampson et al., 1999). Positive self talk can help individuals involved in career problem solving and decision making remain motivated, actively seek needed information, stay focused, think clearly about options, and look for help when they need it, or follow-through with the actions needed to execute a plan of action (Sampson et al., 1999). Negative self-talk can make an individual less likely to clearly state his/her objective on a job resume, remain motivated enough to find possible sources of employment, follow-up leads for expanding their network of employment contacts, prepare for job interviews by researching potential employers, offer positive insights or project enthusiasm in job interviews or follow-up job interviews with thank you letters (Sampson et al., 1996).
Self-awareness is a concept describing the ability of an individual to act as a spectator observing his/her own career decision making and problem solving behavior (Peterson and Swain, 1978). This metacognitive function provides individuals the means to monitor negative self-talk, the need for more information, or emotional impact on a decision making task. It is also required to deal with these situations in the monitoring and control function in the executive processing domain (Peterson et al., 1996).

Functions in the executive processing domain also provide the means for individuals to monitor and control the other processes taking place in the knowledge and decision making skills domain (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2001). As part of the executive processing, the monitoring provides an individual a way of knowing when to stop a task and move on to the next one, gather information and find help. The control function allows an individual to regulate his/her actions (e.g., set priorities, initiate, stop or re-visit the various actions taken in the decision making cycle; or control negative thoughts that may interfere with the process) (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 1996b). The difference between these two regulatory processes is between “knowing” (the monitoring process) and “doing “(the control process) (Sampson et al., 2004, p.48).

**CASVE Cycle**

The other major concept in the CIP approach is the CASVE cycle (Fig.1.2) described by Peterson et al. (1991 ), Peterson et al. (1996), Peterson et al., (2002), and Sampson et al. (2004). This cycle is the CIP modal for decision making and is in the center of the pyramid of Information Processing Domains. CASVE is an acronym referring to the five phases involved in the cycle including: Communication, Analysis, Synthesis, Valuing and Execution.
1) The Communication phase of the CASVE cycle is the starting point from which signals internal or external to an individual are processed (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004). Career problems are signaled by some external condition (e.g. the need to decide upon a course of action after graduating from high school) or by an internal state which may demand attention (e.g., anxiety over career indecision). In either case, these signals cause an individual to communicate internally or with someone else by seeking ways to more desirable one. The communication process needed to identify the problem gap which exists between current and desired reality was first identified by Newell and Simon (1972) and is the initial step in the CIP approach to career problem solving.
The second phase of the CASVE cycle, Analysis, involves gathering and examining information relevant to the career problem (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al.; 1996; Sampson et al, 2004). Information analyzed at this phase of the process could involve self-knowledge or knowledge about occupations, information about the career decision making, or understanding dysfunctional career thoughts. The goal of this phase is for the individual to identify the reasons for the problem gap between one’s present situation and a desired state of events.

Peterson et al., (1991), Peterson et al., (2002) Peterson et al., (1996), and Sampson et al., (2004) noted the goal of the third phase, Synthesis, was for a person with a career problem to formulate options which could reduce or eliminate his/her problem gap. Two processes used to identify solution options are elaboration (generating a wide range of possible solutions) and crystallization (reducing options to a manageable number).

During the Valuing phase individuals seek to choose the best course of action from the options generated in the synthesis phase (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004). The goal for individuals going through this phase is to identify, by using internal assessments mediated by individual value systems (Super, 1980), the one choice most likely to reduce or remove a career problem. In addition to providing a preferred solution, which becomes a vision of the future, the valuing phase also creates an internal commitment for the individual to act on that choice.

The Execution phase is the implementation of the course of action identified in the valuing phase (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004). At this point in the CASVE cycle, a person develops a plan to transform his/her first choice of options into a viable
plan of action. This is done through identification and achievement of logical, intermediate steps or goals each of which is realistic and attainable for the individual. According to Peterson et al., (1996), the best evidence an individual has made a career decision is when a person acts on his/her plan.

After completing all five phases of the CASVE cycle, individuals evaluate the results of the process by returning to the communication phase to determine if the demands which defined the career problem have been satisfied by the chosen solution. If this is the case, the process is complete. If not, individuals reenter the cycle at the Analysis phase to identify and implement alternative solutions or to determine whether or not problem has a solution (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004).

**DYSFUNCTIONAL CAREER COGNITION**

Prior to the advent of the CIP approach (Peterson et al., 1991; Peterson et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1996; Sampson et al., 2004), several researchers began to explore the impact of irrational thinking on career development by identifying dysfunctional ways of thinking specific to career decision making (i.e., irrational or maladaptive beliefs that adversely impact an individual's ability to make rational career choices) (Corbishley and Yost, 1989; Dryden, 1979; Krumboltz, 1983; Lewis and Gilhousen, 1981; Nevo, 1987; Thompson, 1976).

Thompson (1976) was one of the first to address the relationship between faulty cognitions and career problems. He identified four misconceptions peculiar to career decision making that tended to dominate students' attributes toward career development. First, Thompson noted students had the idea career decision making and problem solving were precise processes producing a plan fitting their needs exactly. Second, He also identified the erroneous idea that students believed career decisions were made at a point in time and that these decisions were final. Third, Thompson reported students
believed career assessment instruments would produce answers that would tell them," what they should do" (p. 32). Finally, Thompson identified a faulty causal relationship between interest and abilities. He noted many students mistakenly believed if they identified their interests, success in their areas of interest would follow as a matter of course.

Corbishley and Yost (1989) loosely grouped dysfunctional career cognitions into three categories. The first constraining category (I can't) dealt with an individual's belief he/she lacked the ability or resources, or was restrained by someone else from pursuing career decisions. Cognitions described in this category included beliefs about being unable to make satisfying career decisions or not being good enough at the process to meet others' expectations. The second category (I won't) was used to classify individuals who chose to withdraw from or refused to participate in the career choice process. Cognitions in this category included withdrawing or refusing to participate because the career choice process was too difficult and unfair or the process would likely not end in a satisfying solution. Finally, the third category (I shouldn't) was based on the theme individuals should not have to participate in a process that violated their own or someone else's rules (e.g., participation would displease family members or go against rigid role expectations or occupational stereotypes).

Based on the "irrational beliefs originally identified by Ellis (1962), Dryden (1979) identified four common irrational beliefs found in career counseling; (a) "there is only one career for me and it will be an absolute disaster--------If I am not accepted," (b) "It is absolutely essential for me to reach the top of my career," (c) "It is absolutely essential for me to be approved of by the people I go to work with," and (d) "My parents want me to go into "x" category of career--------how can I pursue the career of my choice?" (p. 186)
Krumboltz (1983) postulated unfounded or inappropriate private rules people use to make career decisions that cause failure in the process of making career choices. Krumboltz believed these troublesome beliefs about career choice were based on (a) faulty generalizations, (b) self-comparisons with a single standard, (c) exaggerated estimates of the emotional impact of an outcome, (d) false causal relationships, (e) ignorance of relevant facts, (f) giving undue weight to low probability events, or (g) self-deception. Later Mitchell and Krumboltz (1987) identified two categories of beliefs that caused problems in career decision making. The first category included maladaptive beliefs and generalizations grouped under four following areas: (a) faulty self-observations, (b) inaccurate world views, (c) poor decision making self-efficacy, and (d) unrealistic condition required for a satisfactory career choice.

The second category of beliefs Mitchell and Krumboltz (1987) discussed was composed of seven myths specifically identified for their adverse impact on career decision making. These myths and their underlying irrational ideas were first introduced by Lewis and Gilhosen (1981) as a way to aid counselors to expose and challenge maladaptive thoughts common in inappropriate career exploration. In the following description of these myths, Mitchell and Krumboltz's (1987) terminology is followed by Lewis and Gilhousen's presentation of the same dysfunctional thought:

1. Mitchell and Krumboltz: "I must be absolutely certain before I can act" (p. 171).

   Lewis and Gilhousen: "Crystal Ball myth" (P. 296). The suggestion is that successful career decision makers have clear pictures of their career paths.

2. Mitchell and Krumboltz: "career development involves only one decision" (p. 171).
Lewis and Gilhousen: “when Are You Going to Decide, You Dummy!” (p. 297). This myth is based on the idea that a career decision is a single event that should occur within close proximity of high school.

(3) Mitchell and Krumboltz: “If I change, I have failed” (p. 171. Lewis and Gilhousen: “Quitters never win” (p. 297). The implication is that once a career choice is made, it must be followed regardless of consequences.

(4) Mitchell and Krumboltz: “If I can just do this, then I will be happy” (p. 171).

Lewis and Gilhousen: “I want you to have it better than I did” (p. 297). There are two ideas behind this myth. The first is that success can be achieved if an established set of rules is followed. The second idea is children must out-perform their parents in terms of career achievements.

(5) Mitchell and Krumboltz: “My work would and should satisfy all my needs” (p. 171).

Lewis and Gilhousen: “My work is my life” (p. 298). This myth reflects the belief one’s work is the center and most important element of a person’s life.

(6) Mitchell and Krumboltz: “I can do anything as long as I’m willing to work hard enough” (p. 171).

Lewis and Gilhousen: “Anyone can be president” (p. 298). This myth implies lack of success merely means a person has not worked hard enough.

(7) Mitchell and Krumboltz: “My worth as a person is integrally related to my occupation “(p. 171).

Lewis and Gilhousen: “My son or daughter the Doctor” (p. 298). The belief supporting this myth stems from the idea being in the
right occupation will bring more happiness and self-worth than being in other occupations perceived to have less prestige.

Nevo (1987) drew on the work of Thompson (1976) and Lewis and Gilhousen (1981) to formulate a series of irrational expectations that frustrate the career decision making and problem solving process. Nevo’s seven irrational expectations were: (a) the need to find one, perfect occupation that satisfies all significant players in a person’s life; (b) over-reliance on counselors and assessment to identify a specific occupation; (c) the notion hard work can make any occupational choice successful; (d) being an acknowledged expert in an occupation is essential; (e) finding a suitable occupation to solve all other problems a person may have; (f) using intuition to validate a career choice; and (g) the idea vocational choice is a one-time act requiring no further career decisions.

**COGNITIVE THERAPY**

**The impact of dysfunctional cognitions**

The underlying theoretical rationale for cognitive therapy is that an individual’s affect and behavior are largely determined by his/her cognitions. “The cognitive model is not simply that thoughts cause feelings and actions. It is recognized that emotions can influence cognitive processes and that behaviors can influence the evaluation of a situation by modifying the situation itself or by eliciting responses from others” (Freeman, Pretzer, Fleming, and Simon, 1990, p. 6).

Cognitions are viewed as verbal or pictorial events in an individual’s stream of consciousness. Cognitions are based on attitudes or assumptions in the form of schemata developed from past experiences. A schema is used to screen out, differentiate, and code incoming stimuli. Schemata can become dysfunctional for individuals as a result of their experience, with subsequent incoming stimuli being distorted in order to fit their dysfunctional schemata. As individuals behave in response to their dysfunctional schemata,
reactions from significant others may further reinforce these schemata. The use of dysfunctional schemata over time leads to faulty information processing or errors in systematic thinking. Used over time, these systematic thinking errors can become autonomous. Individuals’ negative thoughts are perceived as plausible in spite of available contrary evidence, making it difficult for them to accept the possibility that their thoughts are erroneous (Beck et al., 1979).

A variety of systematic thinking errors maintain negative thoughts despite contradictory evidence. Six systematic thinking errors (Beck et al., 1985; Beck et al., 1979) relating to career problem solving and decision making are presented in the following paragraphs.

1. An individual may reach a conclusion in the absence of evidence or in the presence of contrary evidence (i.e., arbitrary inference). For example, an individual may believe that a parent wishes he/she will make a specific occupational choice even though the parent has expressed that the individual is free to make any choice that satisfies him/her self.

2. An individual may attend only to input that supports his/her original cognition (i.e., selective abstraction). For example, an individual who has had previous negative experiences with career counseling may not attend to current messages from a counselor that successful career decision making is possible and that useful resources are available.

3. An individual may reach a conclusion on the basis of a limited number of isolated incidents and then apply that conclusion across the board to related and unrelated situations (i.e., overgeneralization). For example, an individual who disagreed with the results of prior aptitude testing may conclude that the use of all career assessments and career information resources is a waste of time.
4. An individual may distort factors or events out of proportion to their actual significance (i.e. magnification and minimization). For example, an individual may magnify the importance of satisfying the value of variety or minimize the importance of considering the wishes of his/her spouse in making career decision.

5. An individual may relate external events to him/her self when there is no logical basis for the conclusion (i.e., personalization). For example, an individual may conclude that a computer-assisted career guidance system failed because of his/her own incompetence, when, in reality, it was a simple matter of a printer not being turned on.

6. An individual may place all experiences into either/or absolute categories (i.e., dichotomous reasoning). For example, an individual may perceive that occupational alternatives will be either perfectly satisfying or totally inappropriate, as opposed to perceiving the “shades of gray” that characterize most options.

Dysfunctional thinking often results in intense negative affect and diverts the individual from productively focusing on actual reality-based problems (Beck et al., 1979). A vicious cycle ensues, where the capacity to solve the problem is restricted by dysfunctional thinking and the continued inability to solve the problem further reinforces the dysfunctional thinking. For positive change to occur, this cycle needs to be broken. By reducing the negative impact of dysfunctional cognitions, affect becomes more positive, and the individual can use his/her resources more productively to solve the problems.

**The process of cognitive therapy**

Cognitive therapy is an active, directive, time-limited, structured approach for resolving a variety of mental health issues, such as depression, anxiety, and phobias. Techniques are designed to identify, reality-test, and correct dysfunctional thoughts as well as the
schemata underlying these cognitions. Through cognitive restructuring, clients learn to monitor negative automatic thoughts, examine the evidence for and against these thoughts, and then substitute more appropriate reality-based interpretations for their biased thoughts (Beck et al., 1979). Therapeutic interventions are based on concrete and mutually agreed upon goals that are, in turn, based on an assessment of the client (Freeman et al., 1990).

Collaborative empiricism is another key element of cognitive therapy; it involves the client's collaboration with the therapist in objectively and systematically testing dysfunctional cognitions in a supportive environment (Beck et al., 1979). A team approach or therapeutic alliance is used, where the client supplies the raw data and follows through with homework while the therapist provides structure and expertise (Beck et al., 1985). Collaborative empiricism also minimizes client resistance by avoiding an authoritarian role (Freeman et al., 1990).

Emotions play a key role in cognitive therapy. One of the goals of cognitive therapy is to relieve emotional distress. It is critical that clients understand the linkage among cognition, emotions, and behavior (Beck et al., 1985; Beck et al., 1979). An individual's mood can bias his/her recall and perception so that the individual experiences additional dysfunctional cognitions. As a result, the mood becomes more intense, further biasing recall and perception, and the whole process becomes self-perpetuating (Freeman et al., 1990). Emotions also interact with the therapeutic process. For anxious clients, the structure inherent in cognitive therapy reassures clients and promotes learning (Beck et al., 1985). Anxiety has been shown to be a prominent feature of career indecision (Newman, Fuqua, and Seaworth, 1989).

Therapeutic skills also play a key role in cognitive therapy. In particular, the therapist needs to have good skills in developing and maintaining a therapeutic relationship, showing acceptance, sincerity,
accurate empathy, and the expression of non possessive warmth (Beck et al., 1985; Beck et al., 1979). It is important for the client and the therapist to establish a relationship that includes mutual confidence, openness, caring, and trust (Freeman et al., 1990). The existence of an effective therapeutic relationship provides the foundation necessary for the client to engage in the collaborative empiricism necessary to alter his/her cognitions, behavior, and emotions.

A variety of research studies to date have evaluated the use of the Career Thoughts Inventory with different populations in an effort to determine correlations between dysfunctional career thoughts and various psychological constructs. Such correlations add to both an understanding of the career and mental health constructs that are associated with dysfunctional career thoughts and to the convergent validity of the CTI. All correlations were in the hypothesized direction, and ranged from minimal association to high correlations. On the other hand vocational identity, lack of information need, lack of barriers, certainty, decidedness, comfort with choice, self clarity, knowledge about occupations and training, and decisiveness were inversely correlated with CTI measures of dysfunctional career thoughts (CTI Total), decision-making confusion, commitment anxiety, and external conflict. On the other hand, indecision, neuroticism, anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability, were directly correlated with dysfunctional career thoughts, decision-making confusion, commitment anxiety, and external conflict.

Dysfunctional career thoughts have been found to be positively associated with the inability to choose a major field of study for undecided college students (Kilk, 1997), self-appraised problem solving ability for substance abusers (Slatten, 1999), perfectionism and career indecision (Osborn, 1998), state anger (Strausberger, 1998), ego identity (Voight, 1999), and depression and career indecision.
Dysfunctional career thoughts have been found to be differentially correlated with work status among women from low socioeconomic status who are not seeking employment, women pursuing their General equivalency diploma prior to seeking employment, and women with disabilities, all of whom were involved in readiness to work programs (Strauser, Keim and Ketz, 2000). Dysfunctional career thoughts have been found to be negatively correlated with having a learning disability and positive adjustment to disability by college students (Dipeolu, 1997). No significant correlations were found between the overall construct of dysfunctional career thoughts and offender status (Railey, 1997) or level of career decidedness and satisfaction with occupational choice (Wright, 2000). There have been no significant correlations identified between dysfunctional career thoughts and first term academic performance of undecided college students (Durbin, 2000).

Dysfunctional career thoughts can be defined as a self-protective attributional strategy in which a person creates impediments to his/her efforts or performance and allows for enhanced attributions of competence in success. Since not much work has been done with dysfunctional career thoughts, some of the available findings as follow:

Sud and Kumar (2006) conducted a study on 160 University students (Girls= 80, boys=80), and reported that individuals with dysfunctional career thoughts, low achievement motivation and high test anxiety are related by characteristics having logical similarities, indicating that perhaps they are distinct but related constructs. Since it is empirically demonstrated that the two components of test anxiety, worry (the cognitive component) and emotionality (the affective component) show different and specific relationship with performance (Stober, 2004). In the present study information on both these components was also collected along with the total test anxiety scores. Findings revealed emotionality component of test anxiety to be the
most important variable for this sample, showing positive and significant relationship with dysfunctional career thoughts and negative and significant relationship with achievement motivation.

Herring (1990) investigated the career myths or irrational career attitudes and their effect on career decisions among Native American youth and found that career myths can result in dysfunctional cognitive schemata when individuals are contemplating career decisions.

Saunders, Peterson, Sampson and Reardon (2000) studied depression and dysfunctional career thinking as components of the state of career indecision. Participants were 215 undergraduate students. The relative contribution of depression, dysfunctional career thoughts and selected control variables including state/trait anxiety, vocational identity and locus of control were ascertained. Results support the existence of dysfunctional career thoughts as a significant component of career indecision. Depression associated significantly with career indecision.

Osborn (1998) found a positive correlation between dysfunctional career thoughts, career indecision and perfectionism. 123 undergraduates at Appalachian state University were studied for the purpose.

Blustein (1989) tested the hypothesis that an overall sense of goal-directedness and self efficacious beliefs about career decision making would be positively associated with exploratory activity in late adolescence and early adulthood. 106 college students completed measures of global instability, career decision making, self-efficacy and exploratory activity. Results support the preposition that the tendency to engage in exploratory activity is linked to internal motivational process.
Voight (1997) in a study of 131 University students, enrolled in undergraduate psychology course, reported that dysfunctional career thoughts were positively correlated with ego identity.

Dysfunctional career thoughts have also been associated with subjective well being or a person’s self perception of their current status, job dissatisfaction, poor job performance, unhappy significant others, job failure, job avoidance, depression and anxiety (Judge and Locke, 1993; Newman, Faqua and Seaworth, 1989; Saunders, Peterson, Sampson and Reardon, 2000; Serling and Betz, 1990).

Young and Chen (1999) proposed that with cognitive processes and career thoughts playing such a significant role in the career and vocational development process, it is important for individuals to have healthy and appropriate career thoughts and to minimize their dysfunctional thoughts.

Betz (1992) noted that study of dysfunctional career thoughts was shifting from the process of identifying and characterizing them to finding ways to assess dysfunctional career thoughts and reduce their impact. Although interventions to reduce the detrimental impact of dysfunctional Career thoughts are many, most approaches include some type of cognitive restructuring. Kinnier and Krumboltz (1986) recommended using cognitive restructuring to intervene in dysfunctional career thinking, but did not identify a reliable way to identify dysfunctional thoughts. Their recommendation was for counselors to be vigilant in looking for evidence of dysfunctional career thoughts, noting that maladaptive thoughts are often subtle and hidden. Kinnier and Krumboltz, implied the presence of dysfunctional career thoughts could be assessed only by probing and asking questions based on an individual counselor’s style and each client’s (individual’s) unique situation.

One of the first studies to examine the relationship between dysfunctional career thoughts and a cognitively-based approach to reducing them was completed by Mitchell and Krumboltz (1987).
Mitchell and Krumboltz based their study on the assumption that dysfunctional thought influenced career decision making. They tested the effectiveness of a cognitive restructuring intervention in reducing maladaptive career thoughts on university students who had difficulty making career decisions. The level of dysfunctional career thinking evidenced by the students was assessed by 36-item questionnaire developed for the study. Results showed the number of maladaptive career thoughts decreased significantly after a cognitive restructuring intervention.
2.2 LIFE SATISFACTION

Life satisfaction is the internal feeling of happiness which comes as a result of many factors such as socio-economic status, age, nature of occupational region and attitudes.

Satisfaction is a Latin word that means to make or do enough. Satisfaction with one's life implies contentment with or acceptance of one's life circumstances, or the fulfillment of one's wants and need for one's life as a whole. In essence, life satisfaction is a subjective assessment of the quality of one's life.

Some people grow with a sense of fulfillment and gratitude, whereas, other remains preoccupied with bitterness and self pity. There have been two general points of view to measure psychological well-being. One takes into account the social criteria i.e., greater the extent of social participation, the greater is the well being. The other view focuses upon the individual's internal frame of references, his/her own evaluations of his/her satisfaction and happiness.

Life and the degree to which a person enjoys it becomes the measure of life satisfaction. Variously called psychological well being (Ryff and Keys, 1995 ), subjective well being (Diener, 1984 ), affective well being (Warr, 1990 ), and global well being (Staudinger, Fleeson and Baltes, 1999 ). These various labels reflect different ways of conceptualizing and measuring essentially the same concept.

Life satisfaction is an overall assessment of feelings and attitudes about one's life at a particular point in time ranging from negative to positive. Positive affect and negative affect (Diener, 1984). Although satisfaction with current life circumstances is often assessed, Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith (1999) also include the following under life satisfaction: Desire to change one's life, satisfaction with past, satisfaction with future and significant other's views of one's life. Related terms in the literature include happiness (sometimes used interchangeably with life satisfaction), quality of life.
and subjective and psychological well being (a broader term than life satisfaction). Life satisfaction is frequently included as an outcome or consequence variable in work-family research (Allen, Herst, Bruck, Sutton, 2000).

Life satisfaction is often considered a desirable goal, in and of itself, stemming from the Aristotelian ethical model, endoimonomism (from endoimonia, the Greek word of happiness), where correct actions lead to individual well being, with happiness representing the supreme good (Myes, 1992). Moreover, life satisfaction is related to better physical (Veenhoven, 1991), and mental health (Beutell, 2006), longevity and other outcomes that are considered positive in nature.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN RELATED CONSTRUCTS

Life satisfaction and well being

According to Ed Diener and his colleagues (1999), subjective well being or happiness, has both an affective (i.e., emotional) and a cognitive (i.e., judgmental) component. The affective component consists of how frequently an individual reports experiencing positive and negative affect. Life satisfaction is considered to be the cognitive component of this broader construct.

Life satisfaction Vs life domain-satisfaction

Researchers differentiate between life domain satisfaction and life-as-a-whole (or global) life satisfaction. Life-domain satisfaction refers to satisfaction with specific areas of individual’s life, such as work, marriage and income, whereas judgments of global life satisfaction are much more broad, consisting of as individual’s comprehensive judgment of his/her life.

The success of a community or nation is frequently judged by objective standards. Political parties often remind citizens of the prosperity of the nation during their party’s governance as a method to encourage appreciation and re-election. To persuade people the quality of life has improved under their administration, they cite such
factors as low unemployment rates, greater income, lower taxes, lower
crime rates and improvements in education and health care. The
quality of the life of an individual however, cannot be quantified in
this manner. Indeed, objective measures of quality of life (i.e., income,
education) are often weakly related to people’s subjective self-reports
of the extent to which they are satisfied with their lives.

**HOW DO PEOPLE MAKE LIFE SATISFACTION JUDGEMENTS?**

We know that most people are fully capable of rating the level of
their own life satisfaction. However, the question still remains, how
exactly do people make such judgments? The conceptualization of life
satisfaction proposed by the theorists in this area offer special clues.
For example, Angus Campbell and his colleagues (1976)
conceptualized life satisfaction as the difference between what one
wants and what one has—essentially a comparison between reality and
the ideal. Thus one’s judgment of his/her life satisfaction involves
drawing on his/her personal standards and expectations for him/her
self and assessing the extent to which his/her life measures up.

Alex Michalo’s multiple-discrepancy theory (1985) also specifies
how one might arrive at his/her personal level of satisfaction.
According to this theory, satisfaction is determined by one’s
perceptions of “how things are” Vs “how they should be”. Comparisons
between how things are and what one wants, what one had, what one
expected, what others have and what one feels one deserves combine
to determine life satisfaction. Small discrepancies among these areas
result in greater life satisfaction. Large discrepancies among these
areas result in greater life-dissatisfaction.

Joseph Sirgy’s theory (1998) similarly mentions several
comparisons that one may consider before arriving at a judgment of
his/her life satisfaction. He suggests that expectations of what one is
capable of accomplishing, one’s past circumstances, one’s ideals, what
one feels one deserves, what one minimally requires to be content and
what one ultimately believes will occur are comparisons that help
determine overall life satisfaction.

Other researchers have investigated whether people determine
their personal estimate of their life satisfaction through a “top-down”
or a “bottom-up” approach. If an individual were to use a top-down
procedure, they might reflect on the value of their life as a whole,
probe their sense of intuition for how happy and satisfied they are
overall, and, therefore, conclude that they must have a good (or not-
so-good) life. Alternatively, if they were to use a bottom-up approach,
they might think about the various domains of their life (e.g.,
marrige, children, work, friendship, income) and arrive at their life
satisfaction judgment based upon the average satisfaction they obtain
from each of these domains. In other words, the individual have a
good life because they are satisfied or they are satisfied because they
have a good life?

WHAT DETERMINES LIFE SATISFACTION?

Environment Vs personality

Most of the research in this area can be subsumed under two
categories—namely, evidence implicating personality (i.e., genetics,
inborn traits) and evidence implicating environment (i.e., life
circumstances and life events). A great deal of work has investigated
whether life satisfaction is a stable, enduring trait or whether it is a
variable that is highly influenced by external events and life
circumstances. For example, will the experience of discrimination or
harassment, the birth of a child, a divorce, purchasing a house,
obtaining an advanced degree, or the day today hassles of balancing
work and home life greatly influence people’s satisfaction with their
life? Alternatively, will an individual’s stable characteristics patterns of
responding to events determine their life satisfaction, such that they
remain satisfied despite changes in income, social relationships,
employment or other significant life events? In support of the latter
view, research has shown that individuals tend to show similar levels
of satisfaction across time and across life domains. For example, individuals who are content with their marriages are likely to be content with their work, their children, their financial situation and even the daily weather. However, it is certainly possible to be dissatisfied with one's partner but satisfied with one's job. In support of the alternative perspective, it has been found that the proportion of positive to negative life events experienced during the previous year may predict an individual's life satisfaction during the following year. Thus life events such as a one's marriage or a new job may indeed significantly boost or deflate one's overall life satisfaction.

Supporting the argument that personality plays a role in determining life satisfaction, personality variables such as psychological resilience, assertiveness, and empathy, internal locus of control, extroversion and openness to experience have been found to be related to life satisfaction (Robert Plomin and his colleagues, 1990).

"Personality 'or "environmental "explanation may not be sufficient to explain the source of people's life satisfaction judgments. That is, life satisfaction may have both stable, trait-like components (reflecting the effect of a personality predisposition), as well as variable, state-like components (reflecting environmental influences).

**FACTORS INFLUENCING LIFE SATISFACTION**

These are various factors influencing life satisfaction. Some factors are situational and others are intrinsic to human beings:

**Situational factors**

1) Marital status (Wood et al., 1999; Lucas, lark, Georgellis and Diener, 2003) documented differential rates of change in life satisfaction in the years following marriage. There are substantial individual differences in rate of change in life satisfaction, some people decline rapidly after marriage, others returned to baseline after a number of years and others
continued to increase over time. However, nearly everyone received a boost in life satisfaction immediately after marriage.

Easterlin (2003) also documented increase in life satisfaction among those who are married in first decade of adulthood.

2) Family life is generally the most important aspect of a person’s life (Andrews and Withey, 1976) and contributes heavily along with job satisfaction to general life satisfaction (Campbell, et al., 1976).

The experienced work family conflict reduces one’s value attainment, which in turn lowers life satisfaction (Perrewe, Hock, Warter, Kiewitz, 1999).

The relationship between work and family can be simultaneously characterized by conflict and support. High level of work interfering with family predicted lower levels of family emotional and instrumental support (Adams, King and king, 1996).

3) It seems reasonable to assume that individuals who are happy with their job or work would tend to be happy with life in general. One study did find that unhappy workers were also unhappy with life in general.

4) Unemployment (Lucas, Clark, Georgellins and Diener, 2004), money (Diener and Fujita, 1995), culture (Schimmack, et al., 2002) and non-work hassles, non-work uplifts, work hassles, work uplifts (Hart, 1999) are some other situational factors influencing life satisfaction.

Intrinsic Factors

1) In many ways life satisfaction is the ultimate goal of human development. The power of person and situational influence on psychological life is perhaps no more apparent than it is the study of subjective well-being (Diener, et al., 1999).
On the other hand a large body of research shows that people’s overall sense of happiness and life satisfaction appears to be strongly influenced by their personality particularly the traits of extraversion and neuroticism (De Neve and Cooper, 1998).

2) Health is one of the most important factors influencing life satisfaction (Diener, 1984; Mehnert, Kraus, Nadler and Boyd, 1990). These studies have shown that reports of good physical health are associated with higher level of life satisfaction. Poor health appears to have lasting and harmful influences on life satisfaction across different age groups (Easterlin, 2003).

3) Research suggests that affective temperament is related to subjective well being (Brief, Butcher, George and Link, 1993), a concept equivalent in meaning to life satisfaction.

4) Some other intrinsic factors influencing life satisfaction include: Sociability (Emmons and Diener, 1986), Spirituality (Kim, Heinemann, Bude, Sliwa, King, 2000), Future planning (Prenda and Lachman, 2001), Optimism and pessimism (Chang and Sanna, 2001).

GENDER AND LIFE SATISFACTION

An apparently paradoxical finding in the literature is that women show higher rates depression than men, but also report higher levels of well being. At the same time, the majority of studies find no gender differences in the life satisfaction. These conflicting findings can be resolved by considering the range of affect that men and women typically experience. Women report experiencing affect both positive and negative with greater intensity and frequency than do men. That is, women tend to experience greater joy and deeper sadness and experience these emotions very often than men. Hence, measures of depression and subjective well being, which include affective components, appear to capture the extreme lows that leave women vulnerable to depression, as well as the extreme highs that
allow for greater well being. By contrast, men and women report similar rates of global life satisfaction, which is primarily cognitive assessment.

Despite similar levels of life satisfaction across gender, women and men appear to derive life satisfaction from different sources. For example, Ed Diener and Frank Fujita (1995) found that social resources (i.e., family, friends, and access to social services) are predictive of life satisfaction for both men and women, but they are more predictive of life satisfaction for women. Perhaps women’s role as the conservators of contact with friends and family both a blessing and a burden lead to their relatively greater reliance on social support. By contrast, factors that may be more relevant to men’s personal goals such as athleticism, influential connections and authority are found to be related to life satisfaction for men, but not for women.

Life satisfaction is more highly related to income for men than for women. Because men are more socialized to allow their sense of identity form work and income, they tend to look income as a barometer of their success and satisfaction with their life. In addition, more women live in poverty than do men, so it may be easier for men to obtain satisfaction from their financial situation than it is for women (Pinquart and Sorensen, 2000).

Several studies have demonstrated greater the gender equality within a culture (i.e., freedom to make reproductive choices, equal pay, equal value under the law, equal opportunity to education and achievement ), the greater reported life satisfaction. Women seem to achieve greater satisfaction with their lives, when marital equality may manifest itself in the sharing of house hold chores and responsibility for childcare, as well as equal say in the family decision-making (Cowan and her colleagues, 1998).

Woman who perceives her success to be due to hard work determination would report greater satisfaction than a woman who perceives her success to be due to luck or chance. This is not
surprising, as a belief in one's own ability to effect changes and choose the course of one's life is undoubtedly more satisfying than believing that one has no control over life's outcomes (Haworth and his colleagues, 1970).

Men and women are similar in overall level of life satisfaction (Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith, 1999), although men do not report more positive and negative affect.

Numerous studies (Diener and Suh, 1998; Ryff, 1991) have provided evidence that, contrary to common expectations, life satisfaction does not decline with age. Life satisfaction generally remains stable throughout the life span, showing just a slight increasing trend between the ages of 20 and 80 years. Accommodative coping does tend to increase with age. Alternatively as women age they may achieve their goals with greater frequency (i.e., family, career success, and financial comfort) moving close their ideal self (Brandtstaedter and Renner, 1990).

**Employment and Life Satisfaction**

An individual's employment status regardless of income appears to predict life satisfaction, such that the unemployed report significantly diminished satisfaction compared with the employed. When gender is taken into account, it appears that employment (or lack of thereof) is more strongly associated with life satisfaction for men than for women. This finding is not surprising given that there is less cultural pressure on women to work outside the home. However, this pattern may change as existing gender roles broaden. At present, men's sense of self and identity is more strongly tied to their employment status than it is for women.

**Education and Life Satisfaction**

The relationship between education and life satisfaction is probably due to the fact that higher levels of education are associated with higher incomes.
Education also appears to be more highly related to life satisfaction for individuals with lower incomes and in poor nations. Perhaps poorer persons obtain greater satisfaction from education because the achievement surpasses their expectation of what is attainable. For example, individuals in some cultures have little access to education, so when they do gain access, they may value and appreciate the experience more than those who perceive access to education as universal and easily available. Education may also provide access to greater occupational and income opportunities, which may additionally influence life satisfaction.

Despite the overall trend suggesting that education is more strongly related to life satisfaction for the poor, recent studies have found that the most highly educated individuals seem to be dissatisfied with their lives. It is possible that the educational elite have higher expectations or greater cynicism about their lives. Indeed income appears to be better predictor of life satisfaction than level of education.

The "adaptation level theory" suggests that humans become accustomed to their circumstances or 'level of stimuli' and that is only when there is a change in these factors that there is resulting change in overall satisfaction (Argle and Martin, 1991). This theory is useful in explaining the absence of a robust relationship between income and satisfaction—it is only changes in income that invoke a change in satisfaction. This could be put more generally to say that it is deviations from the individual's perceived norm that invokes heightened or diminished satisfaction. Thus a person's income relative to the average income in their neighborhood or socio-economic circle may be more important than absolute income in shaping the feelings of satisfaction.

The term "habituation" also appears for the phenomenon of people becoming satisfied with the circumstances they are used to
and “rivalry”, for the tendency of the people to base their satisfaction on their circumstances relative to others (Layard, 2003).

Life satisfaction refers to one’s assessment of one’s satisfaction in many different aspects. There are at least 12 domains involved in contributing to life satisfaction: health, finances, and family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, living, partner, recreational activity, religion, self-esteem, transportation and education (Campbell, 1981).

Positive relationships have consistently been obtained between life satisfaction and socio-economic status, perceived adequacy of income and perceived health status (e.g., Kutner, Fanshel, Togo and Langner, 1956; Cutler, 1973; Edwards and Klemmack, 1973). It has also been found to be associated with high levels of activity and social interaction (Tobin and Neugarten, 1961; Maddox, 1965; Lippman and Smith, 1968).

Satisfaction with life is generally recognized to be an important component in determining psychological health. Life satisfaction is often conceptualized as one of three key aspects of psychological (or subjective) well being, the others being positive and negative affect (Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith, 1999; Myers and Diener, 1995). These three are known collectively as hedonic well being (e.g., Ryan and Deci, 2001).

Life satisfaction stands together with the affective elements to yield a relatively comprehensive picture of psychological well being (Andrews and Withey, 1976; Deiner et al., 1999; Herzog, Rodgers and Wood Worth, 1982). Life satisfaction is also highly heritable (Lykkens and Tellegen, 1996).

Subjective life satisfaction is a measure of an individual’s perceived level of well-being. It is sometimes used as a synonym for subjective happiness and well-being.
George (1981) defined life satisfaction as a cognitive process by which an individual assesses his/her progress towards desired goals.

Life satisfaction is a cognitive judgment which reflects conscious evaluation of the condition of one's life (Diener, Oishi and Lucas, 2003). These evaluations are made in terms of what is thought to be an appropriate standard, which the individuals themselves set, if not extremely imposed.

Adams, King and King (1996) observed that work interfering with family was negatively related to both job and life satisfaction.

Chen, Cheung, Bond, Michale, Leung and Jin (2006) observed that interpersonal relationship and social axioms tapping perceptions of social context were significantly related to life satisfaction.

Coutinho and Woolery (2004) on a sample of 157 undergraduate university students conducted a study to examine the relationship between the need for recognition and life satisfaction. The need for recognition occurred as a predictor of life satisfaction among college students.

Peng, Wu, Lin, Shiao and Lyu (2006) did a study to investigate the correlates of life satisfaction among aboriginal adolescents in northern Taiwan. The study was a panel design follow up survey. In total, 234 aboriginal adolescent participants from a preliminary survey were recruited into this follow-up survey. Data were collected through face to face interviews. Findings indicated that five leading causes of subjects' daily life distress: poor academic performance, economic difficulties, relationships and/or emotional problems, health problems, and poor family communication. Overall, 79.5% of the subjects perceived their health status as being good, and 66.2% were satisfied with their lives.

Li, Zhang, Sun and Gao (2010) explored the relationship between life style, self-esteem and life-satisfaction among Chinese adolescents. 10899 adolescents were investigated by using Chinese
Adolescent Lifestyle Scale (CALS) and Rosenberg self-esteem scale (SES). A high percentage of adolescents in cities (58.9%) reported a healthy lifestyle with high life-satisfaction while most adolescents in rural areas (58.9%) reported poor lifestyles with little satisfaction. The lifestyle is significantly correlated with self-esteem and life satisfaction and self-esteem is also significantly correlated with life-satisfaction. Self-esteem was the mediator of the other two parameters.

Judge, Bono, Erez and Locke (2005) observed how the core self-evaluations (i.e., positive self-regard) concept is linked to job and life satisfaction. The self-concordance model, which focuses on motives underlying goal pursuit, was used as an explanatory framework. Data were collected from 2 samples: (a) 183 university students and (b) 251 employees (Longitudinal measures of goal attainment and job satisfaction were utilized). In both studies, individuals with positive self-regard were more likely to pursue goals for intrinsic and identified (value-congruent) reasons. Furthermore, in both studies, goal self-concordance was related to satisfaction (job satisfaction in study 1 and life satisfaction in study 2).

Social support is related to higher life satisfaction (Bischof, 1976), males had a higher level of life satisfaction than females.

Tangri, Thomas, Mednick and Lee (2003) in a study of African American women found that women are highly satisfied with their work situation, their personal life and generally with how their life had turned out so far. Overall life satisfaction was predicted by the women’s perception of personal control and role quality. Lastly household burden and physical well being emerged as significant factors of personal satisfaction.

Burke, Divinegracia and Mamo (1999) examined the predictors of life satisfaction of 200 Fillipine managerial and professional women. Two types of correlates were considered, personal and work situations characteristics and work experience and work outcomes. Personal and
situational characteristics were generally unrelated to self reported life satisfaction. However, work experiences and work outcomes were consistently and strongly related to self reported life satisfaction. Managerial and professional women reporting more positive work experiences and more favorable work outcomes also reported greater life satisfaction.

Dysfunctional career thoughts usually revolve around the issues of self-worth. They have been linked to subjective well being or a person’s self-perception of their current status, job-dissatisfaction and have a tendency to decrease the likelihood of overall life satisfaction (Lustig and Strauser, 2003; Sampson et al., 1996; Judge and Locke, 1993; Newman et al., 1989; Saunders et al., 2000). However, not much research pertaining to the relationship between dysfunctional career thoughts and life satisfaction are available.
2.3 SELF-EFFICACY

Without confidence in one's ability an individual cannot perform to his/her potential. It is even possible that someone with lesser ability but with confidence can outperform this person because belief in oneself can be a powerful influence.

Self-efficacy is a person’s belief in his/her ability to succeed in particular situation. A self-efficacy belief in human functioning is that 'people's level of motivation, affective states and actions are based more on what they believe than on what is objectively true (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy has been defined in variety of ways: as the belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner to attain certain goals (Ormrod, 2006). It is a belief that one has the capabilities to execute the courses of actions required to manage prospective situations. It has been described in other ways as the concept has evolved in the literature and in the society : as the sense of belief that one's actions have an effect on the environment (Steinberg, 1998), as a person's judgment of his/her capabilities based on mastery criteria; a sense of a person's competence within a specific framework, focusing on the person's assessment of their abilities to perform specific tasks in relation to goals and standards rather than in comparison with other's capabilities.

Self-efficacy has been defined as individuals' beliefs about their performance, capabilities in a particular domain, (Alderman, 1999; Maltby, 1995; Woolfolk, 2001). Self-efficacy beliefs influence on the choices individual make and the course of action they pursue (Pajares, 1996). An individual's sense of self-efficacy is also related to achievement goals (Briguglio, 2000), attribution (Chase, 2001; Sherman, 2002), self regulation (Joe, Bong and Choi, 2000; Malpass, O'Neil and Hocevar, 1999) and volition (Gracia, Mc Cann, Turner, Roska, 1998).
Self-efficacy refers to a person's expectations about being able to successfully execute selected course of action (e.g., for reviews, see Bandura, 1986, 1997; Maddux, 1991). Self-efficacy expectancies have been shown to predict behavior well in a wide variety of contexts including such diverse areas as persuasion (Maddux and Rogers, 1983), health outcomes (Ewart, Stewart, Gillian. Keleman, 1986; Schiaffino and Rivinson, 1992), social performance (Sanna, 1992; Sanna and Pusecker, 1994), and decision making (Cervone, Jiwani and Wood, 1991; Wood and Bandura, 1989).

Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes. Self-efficacy to a person's perception of their ability to reach a goal. People generally avoid tasks where their self-efficacy is low, but will engage in tasks where their self-efficacy is high. People with high self-efficacy in a task are more likely to expend more effort and persist longer, than those with low efficacy.

Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. A strong sense of efficacy enhances accomplishment and personal well being in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or set back. They attribute failures to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. In the face of difficulties, people who entertain serious self doubts about their capabilities, slacken their efforts or give up altogether, whereas those who have a strong sense of efficacy exert greater effort to master the challenges (Brown and Inouye, 1978; Schunk, 1981).
SELF-BELIEFS AND BANDURA'S SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY

According to Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory, individuals possess a self system that enables them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings, motivation and actions. This self system reference mechanisms and a set of sub functions for perceiving, regulating and evaluating behavior, results from the interplay between the system and environmental sources of influence. As such they serve a self-regulatory function by providing individuals with the capability to influence their own cognitive processes and actions and thus alter their environments.

Through the process of self reflection, Individuals are able to evaluate their experiences and thought processes, According to (Bandura,1986 ; Dewey, 1933) this view, what people know, the skill they possess, or what they have previously accomplished are not always good predictors of subsequent attainments because of the beliefs they hold about their capabilities. However, then capabilities can often be better predicted by these beliefs than by the results of their previous performances. This does not mean that people can accomplish tasks beyond their capabilities simply by believing that they can. For competent functioning requires harmony between self-beliefs on the one hand and possessed skills and knowledge on the other. Rather it means that self-perceptions of capabilities help determine what individuals do with the knowledge and skills they have. Most important, self-efficacy beliefs are critical determinants of how well knowledge and skills are acquired in the first place.

The process of creating and using these self beliefs is an intuitive one; individuals engage in a behavior, interpret the result of their actions, use these interpretations to create and develop beliefs about their capability to engage in subsequent behaviors in similar domains and behave in concert with the beliefs created. In school, for example, the beliefs that students develop about their academic capabilities help determine what they do with the knowledge and
skills they have learned. Consequently, their academic performances are in part the result of what they come to believe that they have accomplished and can accomplish. This helps explain why students' academic performances may differ markedly when they have similar ability. Researchers have suggested that these self-beliefs may play a meditational role in relation to cognitive engagement and that enhancing them might lead to increased use of cognitive strategies that, in turn, lead to improve performance (Pintrich and De Groot, 1990). This view of self-belief as a mediating construct in human behavior is consistent with those of numerous scholars and theorists who have argued that the potent evaluative nature of beliefs make them a filter through which new phenomena are interpreted and subsequent behavior mediated (Abelson, 1979; Calderhead and Robson, 1991; Dewey, 1933; Goodman, 1988; James, 1885/1975; Lewis, 1991; Maslow, 1943; Mead, 1982; Nespor, 1987; Nisbett, and Ross, 1980; Pajares, 1992; Posner, Strike, Hewson and Gertzog, 1982;).

SELF-EFFICACY COMPONENT OF SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY

The self-beliefs that individuals use to exercise a measure of control over their environments include self-efficacy beliefs—"beliefs in one's capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations" (Bandura, 1997).

Sources of self-efficacy

The case for the contextual and meditational role of self-efficacy in human behavior can be made by exploring the four sources from which these beliefs are developed. The most influential source of these beliefs is the interpreted result of one's purposive performance, or mastery experience. Simply put, individuals gauge the effects of their actions and their interpretations of these effects which help create their efficacy beliefs. Outcomes interpreted successfully raised self-efficacy; those interpreted as failures lower it. Bandura (1986) emphasis that one's mastery experiences are the most influential
source of self-efficacy. This information has important implications for the self-enhancement model of academic achievement, which contends that, to increase student achievement in school, educational efforts should focus on altering students' beliefs of their self-worth or competence.

The second source of efficacy information is the vicarious experience of the effects produced by the actions of others. This source of information is weaker than the interpreted results of mastery experiences, but when people are uncertain about their own abilities or have limited prior experience, they become more sensitive to it. As Schunk (1981, 1983a, 1987) has demonstrated, the effects of models are particularly relevant in this context. A significant model in one's life can help instill self-beliefs that will influence the course and direction that life will take. Part of one's vicarious experience also involves the social comparisons along with peer modeling and can be powerful influences on developing self-perceptions of competence (Schunk, 1983a); interaction effects can complicate evaluation of the relative power of different modes of influence. For example, a model's failure has a more negative effect on the self-efficacy of observers when observers judge themselves as having comparable ability to the model. If, on the other hand when observers judge their capability as good, failure of the model does not have a negative effect (Brown and Inouye, 1978).

Individuals also create and develop self-efficacy beliefs as a result of the verbal persuasions they receive from others. Those persuasions involve exposure to the verbal judgments that others provide and are a weaker source of efficacy information than mastery or vicarious experiences, but persuaders can play an important part in the development of an individual's self-beliefs (Zedlin and Pajares, 1997). Effective persuasions should not be confused with knee-jerk praise or empty inspirational homilies (Bandura, 1997). This is consistent with Erikson's (1959/1980) caution that a weak ego is not...
strengthened by being persistently bolstered and that “(p. 95), “a strong ego, secured in its identity by a strong society, does not need, and in fact is immune to any attempt at artificial inflation” (p. 47). Persuaders must cultivate people’s beliefs in their capabilities while at the same time ensuring that the envisioned success is attainable, and, just as positive persuasions may work to encourage and empower, negative persuasions can work to defeat and weaken self-beliefs. In fact, it is usually easier to weaken self-efficacy beliefs through negative appraisals then to strengthen such beliefs through positive encouragement (Bandura, 1986).

Physiological states such as anxiety, stress, arousal, fatigue and mood states also provide information about self-efficacy beliefs. Because individuals have the capability to alter their own thinking, self-efficacy beliefs, in turn, also powerfully influence the physiological states themselves. Bandura (1997) has observed that people live with psychic environments that are primarily of their own making. It is often said that people can “read” themselves and so this reading comes to be a realization of the thoughts and emotional states that individuals have themselves created. Often, they can gauge their confidence by the emotional state they experienced as they contemplate an action. Moreover, when people experience aversive thoughts and fears about their capabilities, those negative affective reactions can themselves further lower perceptions of capability and trigger the stress and agitation. This is not to say that the typical anxiety experienced before an important endeavor is a guide to low self-efficacy. Strong emotional reactions to a task, however provides cues about the anticipated success or failure of the outcome.

It is important to restate that these sources of efficacy information are not direct translated into judgments of competence, individuals interpret the results of events and these Interpretations provide the information on which judgments are based. The types of information people attend to and use to make efficacy judgments, and
the rules they employ for weighting and integrating them, form the basis for such interpretations. Thus the selection, integration and recollection of information influence judgments of self-efficacy.

**Effect of self-efficacy beliefs**

Self-efficacy beliefs influence motivational and self-regulatory processes in several ways. They influence the choices people make and the courses of action they pursue. Most people engage in tasks in which they feel competent and confident and avoid those in which they do not. William James (1892/1985) wrote that experience is essentially what individuals choose to attend to. If this is the case, then the self beliefs that influence those choices are instrumental in defining one's experience and providing an avenue through which individuals exercise control over the events that affect their lives. Beliefs of personal competence also help determine how much effort people will expend on an activity, how long they will preserve when confronting obstacles, and how resilient they will prove in the face of adverse situations - the higher the sense of efficacy, the greater the effort, persistence and resilience. Efficacy beliefs also influence the amount of stress and anxiety individuals experience as they engage in a task and the level of accomplishment they realize.

Strong self-efficacy beliefs enhance human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. People with a strong sense of personal competence in a domain approach difficult tasks in that domain as challenges to be mastered rather than as dangers to be avoided, have greater intrinsic interest in activities, set challenging goals and maintain a strong commitment to them, heighten their efforts in the face of failure, more easily recover their confidence after failures or setbacks, and attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which they believe they are capable of acquiring. High self-efficacy help create feeling of serenity in approaching difficult tasks and activities. Conversely, people with low self-efficacy may believe that things are tougher than they really are, a
belief that fasters stress, depression and a narrow vision of how best to solve a problem. As a result of these influences, self-efficacy beliefs are strong determinants and predictors of the level of accomplishment that individual finally attain. For these reasons (Bandura, 1986, 1997) has made the strong claim that beliefs of personal efficacy constitute the key factor of human agency.

Reactions to stimulated outcomes that are better than actually, or upward counterfactuals, and stimulated outcomes that are worse than actuality, or downward counterfactuals, most probably depend on person's level of self-efficacy. Consider for example a nascent PhD who takes a job at a university that he/she considers as mediocre. This person might engage in upward counterfactual thinking (e.g., "If only I had a better position in which the climate is more supportive"). Alternatively, this same person might engage in downward counterfactual thinking (e.g., At least I have a job; there are other jobs that are much worse than mine"). Prior research might suggest that the former case may help to prepare the person for future betterment but may make him/her feel bad, whereas in the latter case the person may feel good but may be ill prepared. However, consider now that the person actually believes that these outcomes can or will occur. In this example, in contrast, it is likely that the person will feel better when stimulating upward counterfactuals, and perhaps worse when stimulating downward counterfactuals. That is, upward counterfactuals might now serve as a source of inspiration and hope to a person who believes that these better alternatives can be attained (i.e., a better position is possible), whereas downward counterfactuals might now serve as examples of failure or potential further deterioration (i.e., that a worse job is also possible). Whether a person believes that he/she can efficaciously attain or avoid particular simulated outcomes, therefore, appears to be an important moderator of reactions to upward and downward counterfactual thinking.
Efficacy Activated Processes

Cognitive processes

The effects of self-beliefs on cognitive processes take a variety of forms. Much human behavior being purposive is regulated by forethought embodying valued goals.

Most courses of action are initially organized in thought. People's belief in their efficacy shapes the types of anticipatory scenarios they construct and rehearse. A major function of thought is to enable people to predict events and to develop ways to control those that affect their lives; such skills require effective cognitive processing of information that contains many ambiguities and uncertainties. In learning predictive and regulative rules people must draw on their knowledge to construct options, to weight and integrate predictive factors, to test and revise their judgments against the immediate and distal results of their actions and to remember which factors they had tested and how well they had worked. It requires a strong sense of efficacy to remain task oriented in the face of pressing situational demands, failures and setbacks that have significant repercussions.

Motivational processes

Self beliefs of efficacy play a key role in the self regulation motivation. Most human motivation is cognitively generated. People motivate themselves and guide their actions anticipatorily by the exercise of forethought.

There are three different forms of cognitive motivators around which different theories have been built. They include causal attributions, outcome expectancies and cognized goals. The corresponding theories are attribution theory, expectancy-value theory and goal theory, respectively. Self-efficacy beliefs operate in each of these types of cognitive motivation.

In attribution theory people who regard themselves as highly efficacious attribute their failures to insufficient effort, those who
regard themselves as inefficacious attribute their failures to low ability. Causal attributions affect motivation, performance and affective reactions mainly through beliefs of self-efficacy.

In expectancy-value theory, motivation is regulated by the expectation that a given course of behavior will produce certain outcomes and the value of those outcomes. The predictiveness of expectancy-value theory is enhanced by including the influence of perceived self-efficacy. By making self-satisfaction conditional on matching adopted goals, people give direction to their behavior and create incentives to persist in their efforts until they fulfill their goals. Thus satisfying the goal cognized theory.

Self-efficacy beliefs contribute to motivation in several ways: They determine the goals people set for themselves; how much effort they expend; how long they persevere in the face of difficulties; and their resilience to failures.

**Affective processes**

People's beliefs in their coping capabilities affect how much stress and depression they experience in threatening or difficult situations, as well as their level of motivation, perceived self-efficacy to exercise control over stressors plays a central role in anxiety arousal. The stronger the senses of self-efficacy the bolder people are in taking on taxing and threatening activities.

Anxiety arousal is affected not only by perceived coping efficacy but by perceived efficacy to control disturbing thoughts. The exercise of control over one's own consciousness is summed up well in the proverb, "You cannot prevent the birds of worry and care from flying over your head. But you can stop them from building a nest in your head." It is not the sheer frequency of disturbing thoughts but the perceived inability to turn them off that is the major source of distress. Both perceived coping self-efficacy and thought control efficacy operate jointly to reduce anxiety and avoidant behavior. Once
people develop a resilient sense of efficacy they can withstand difficulties and adversities without adverse effects.

A low sense of efficacy to exercise control produces depression as well as anxiety. It is not stressful life condition per say, but the perceived inability to manage them that is debilitating.

Biological systems are highly interdependent. A weak sense of efficacy to exercise control over stressors activates autonomic reactions, catecholamine secretion and release of endogenous opioids.

Lifestyle habits can enhance or impair health. The stronger the perceived self-regulatory efficacy the more successful people are in reducing health impairing habits and adopting and integrating health-promoting habits into their regular lifestyle.

**Selection processes**

People are partly the product of their environment. Therefore, beliefs of personal efficacy can shape the course lives taken by influencing the types of activities and environment people choose. Career choice and development is one example of the power of self-efficacy beliefs to affect the course of life paths through choice-related processes. The higher the level of people’s perceived self-efficacy the wider the range of career options they seriously consider, the greater their interest in them, and the better they prepare themselves educationally for the occupational pursuits they choose and the greater is their success. Occupations structure a good part of people’s lives and provide them with a major source of personal growth.

**ADAPTIVE BENEFITS OF OPTIMISTIC SELF-BELIEFS OF EFFICACY**

Human accomplishments and positive well being require an optimistic sense of personal efficacy, because ordinary social realities are strewn with difficulties. They are full of impediments, adversities, setbacks, frustrations and inequities. People must have a robust sense of personal efficacy to sustain the perseverant effort needed to
succeed. People with high sense of efficacy have the staying power to endure the obstacles and setbacks that characterize difficult undertakings.

Innovative achievements also require a resilient sense of efficacy. In pursuit strewn with obstacles, realities either forsake them, abort their efforts prematurely when difficulties arise or become cynical about the prospects of effective significant changes.

The successful, the venturesome, the sociable, the non-anxious, the non-depressed, the social reformers and the innovators take and optimistic view of their personal capabilities to exercise influence over events that affect their lives. If not unrealistically exaggerated such self-beliefs foster positive well-being and human accomplishments.

Tracy (1993) observed that whatever we accomplish is determined by the way we think and use our mind. Studies have shown that people with limited self beliefs Simon (1988) and low self-efficacy (Al Derman (1999) often lack confidence, are negative and pessimistic and they expect to fail (see also Sud and Kumar, 2006).

**DEVELOPMENT AND EXERCISE OF SELF-EFFICACY OVER THE LIFE SPAN**

Different periods of life present certain types of competency demands for successful functioning.

1) **Origins of sense of personal agency**

The newborn comes without any sense of self shaking a rattle produces predictable sounds, energetic kicks shake their cribs and screams bring adults. The self become differentiated from others through dissimilar experience. As infants begin to mature those around them refer to them and treat them as distinct persons. Based on growing personal and social experience they eventually form a symbolic representation of themselves as distinct self.
2) **Family sources of self-efficacy**

Young children must gain self-knowledge of their capabilities in broadening areas of functioning. They have to develop, appraise and test their physical capabilities, their social competencies, their linguistic skills and cognitive skills.

Initial efficacy experiences are centered in the family. But as the growing child’s social world rapidly expands, peers become increasingly important in children’s developing self-knowledge of their capabilities.

3) **Broadening of self-efficacy through peer influences**

Children’s efficacy testing experiences change substantially as they move increasingly into the larger community. It is in peer relationships that they broaden self-knowledge of their capabilities. Peers serve several important efficacy functions. A vast amount of social learning occurs among peers. In addition, age-mates provides highly informative comparisons for judging and verifying one’s self-efficacy.

4) **School as an agency for cultivating cognitive self-efficacy**

During the crucial formative period of children’s lives, the school functions as the primary setting for the cultivation and social validation of cognitive competencies. As children master cognitive skills, they develop a growing sense of their intellectual efficacy.

Social comparisons with the performances of other students, motivational environment through goals and positive incentives and teachers interpretations of children’s successes and failures in ways that reflect favorably and unfavorably on their ability also affect children’s judgment on their intellectual efficacy.

Cooperative learning structures, in which students work together and help one another, also tend to promote positive self evaluations of capability and higher academic attainments.
5) **Growth of self-efficacy through transitional experiences of adolescence**

Each period of development brings with it new challenges for coping efficacy. As adolescents approach the demands of adulthood, they must learn to assume full responsibility for themselves in almost every dimension of life. The ease with which the transition from childhood to the demands of adulthood is made similarly depends on the strength of personal efficacy built up through prior mastery experiences.

6) **Self-efficacy concerns of adulthood**

Young adulthood is a period when people have to cope with many new developments that arise from lasting partnership, marital relationships, parenthood and occupational careers.

In preparatory phases, people perceived self-efficacy partly determines how well they develop the basic cognitive self-management or interpersonal skills on which occupational careers are founded. Beliefs concerning one's capabilities are influential determinants of the vocational life paths that are chosen.

Developments of coping capabilities and skills in managing one's motivation, emotional states and thoughts processes increased perceived self-regulatory efficacy. The higher the sense of self-regulatory efficacy the better the occupational functioning.

7) **Reappraisals of self-efficacy with advancing age**

The roles into which older adults are cast impose socio-cultural constraints on the cultivation and maintenance of perceived self-efficacy. Major life changes into later years are brought about by retirement, relocation and loss of friend or spouses. It requires a strong sense of personal efficacy to reshape and maintain productive life.

Recent researches has revealed Phillips and Gully (1997) observed that self-efficacy and need for achievement were positively
related to goal level, which was positively related to performance in combination with ability and self-efficacy. Participants in this study were 405 undergraduate students, seventy two percent of the samples were women, and the average age was 19-54 years. In addition to showing that personality traits can influence the motivational process at various steps, the result highlight the unique contribution of self-efficacy and goal level to the motivational process after the effects of ability and other individual differences has been identified.

An individual’s self-efficacy has been found to affect choice of goal level, with greater self-efficacy being associated with the setting of higher goals and ultimately with higher performance (Locke, Frederick, Lee and Bobko, 1984; Thomas and Mathieu, 1994; Wood and Bandura, 1989a,1989 b; Wood, Bandura and Bailey, 1990).

Taylor, Locke, Lee and Gist (1984); and Wood et al., (1990) found that stronger self-efficacy leads to higher self-set goals. As it is also possible that self-efficacy might directly impact performance through cognitive and regulatory processes such as coping and persistence (Gist and Mitchell, 1992).

Gist and Mitchell (1992) pointed out that self-efficacy has direct effects on performance suggesting effort, coping and persistence, which are thought to be influenced by self-efficacy itself also have influence on performance. It was found that ability was related to performance but that regardless of ability level, students with high self-efficacy completed more problems correctly and reworked more on the ones they missed.

Kumar and Lal (2006) studied the role of self-efficacy and gender differences among the adolescents. A significant gender differences were found, where female scored higher than their male counterparts.

Kammer and Smith (1986) conducted a study to examine the relationships among gender, career self-efficacy and interests. The
subjects were 30 males and 101 females. Results of regression analysis suggest obsessive that consideration of career is most highly related to interest in the career. For females confidence in meeting educational requirements was shown to be related to consideration of a career and self-efficacy expectations were found to be an important cognitive determinant of whether individuals will attempt a behavior (Hackett and Betz, 1981).

Further research reveals that high levels of learning orientation tend to buffer individuals from the negative effects of failure, thereby helping to increase or maintain self-efficacy (Button, Mathieu, Zajae, 1996; Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, and Salas, 1998; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Phillips and Gully, 1997).

Specific self-efficacy expectancies concerning the abilities have predicted career indecision (Taylor and Betz, 1983).

Prominent theorists have argued that trait-like positive beliefs may contribute to healthy personality adjustment (Beck, 1976) and foster well-being (Bandura, 1989). In theory, trait-like expectancies, including dispositional optimism (a general expectancy of favorable outcomes) and generalized self-efficacy (a general belief in one’s ability to persevere even in the face of adversity), affect positive outcomes both in new situation and across many different settings by promoting effort expenditure (Lightsey, 1996; Scheier and Carver, 1985). Indeed vigorous mastery of chronic stressors appears to produce lasting immunological changes and a general sense of coping efficacy that helps protect against a wide range of psychological stressors (Wiedenfeld et al., 1990).

Kavanaugh (1992) found that improvement of self-efficacy expectations accounted for 50% of the variance in subsequent improvements of depression. Barlow’s (Barlow, 1988; Craske, Barlow and O’Leary, 1992) treatment programs for anxiety disorders emphasize the importance of being able to make accurate judgments
about one's ability to perform coping behavior as a primary source of change.

Bandura (1986) argued that a strong self-efficacy expectation about a given behavior increases the likelihood that a behavior will be performed when appropriate. Therefore strong academic self-efficacy expectations are expected to result in more effective more academic behaviors and may reduce dysfunctional career thoughts. As a consequence of performing academic related behaviors such as asking questions in class, studying and so on, once personal adjustment in college should be improved.

GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY AND SELF-ESTEEM

Self-evaluations have long been known to have strong impact on well-being, motivation, behavior, and performance in work-settings. Two of the most commonly studied self-evaluation constructs are self-efficacy and self-esteem, both of which have been examined as task-specific states and generalized traits (Eden, 1988; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, and Dunham, 1989).

Judge and Bono’s (2001) meta-analysis found that general self-efficacy and self-esteem are positively related to work performance. Both global self esteem (henceforth self-esteem) and general self-efficacy (GSE) are important traits that help explain individual differences in motivation, attitudes, learning, and task performance (Chen, Gully, Whitemen, and Kilcullen, 2000; Judge, Locke and Durham, 1997).

Judge et al., (1997) theory of core self-evaluations suggests further that general self-efficacy and self esteem are basic self evaluation traits that strongly affect how people act and react in various settings.
GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY AND SELF-ESTEEM: CONCEPTUAL MEANING AND DISTINCTIONS

Several studies (Chen et al., 2000; Chen, Gully, and Eden, 2001) reported that General self-efficacy is distinguishable from the concept of self-efficacy as a relatively malleable, task-specific belief, general self-efficacy is a relatively stable, trait-like, generalized competence belief. In particular, Judge, Erez, and Bono defined General Self-efficacy as “individuals’ perception of their ability to perform across a variety of different situations.” (1998a. p. 170). Likewise, according to Chen et al., (2000), general self-efficacy captures enduring individual differences in the tendency to view oneself as capable or incapable of meeting task demands in a wide variety of situations. Self-esteem, on the other hand, is a trait referring to individuals’ degree of liking or disliking for themselves (Brockner, 1988, p. 11).

Brown (1998) found that irrespective of their beliefs about their abilities, skills and other characteristics, individuals high on self-esteem generally feel good about themselves, whereas low self-esteem individuals tend to feel bad about themselves even if they conceive of themselves as highly efficacious.

Both general self-efficacy and self-esteem have been conceptualized as general self-evaluations (Judges et al., 1997) and both constructs contain cognitive (i.e. evaluative), affective and motivational components. Research has also revealed that an important difference between general self-efficacy and self-esteem is that general self-efficacy captures more of a motivational belief (or a judgment) regarding task capabilities, whereas self-esteem captures more of an affective evaluation of (or feeling regarding) the self (Betz and Klein, 1996; Brockner, 1988; Chen et al., 2001; Gardner and Pierce, 1998).

Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) pointed out that general self-efficacy should be more strongly related to achievement/approach
motivational processes, whereas self-esteem should be more strongly associated with anxiety/avoidance affective processes.

Indeed, in contrast to Judge's core self-evaluation theory, Chen et al., 2001 found, through content and factorial validation procedures, that items measuring self-esteem, and Betz and Klein (1996) found that general self-efficacy relates more strongly to task-specific self-efficacy beliefs than does self-esteem.
### 2.4 SELF ESTEEM

Self esteem refers to individual’s sense of his/her value or worth or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes or likes him/her self.

Given a long and varied history, the term has no less than three major types of definitions in the field, each of which has generated its own tradition of research findings and practical applications.

The original definition presents self esteem as a ratio found by dividing one’s success in areas of life of importance to a given individual by the failures in them or one’s “success/pretensions” (James, 1890). Problems with this approach come from making self esteem contingent upon success: this implies inherent instability because failure can occur at any moment (Crocker and Park, 2004).

In the mid 1960’s Morris Rosenberg and social learning theorists defined self esteem in terms of a stable sense of personal worth or worthiness (see Rosenberg self esteem scale). This became the most frequently used definition for research, but involves problems of boundary-definition, making self esteem in distinguishable from such things as narcissism or simple bragging (Baumeister, Smart and Boden, 1996).

Rosenberg (1965) described self esteem as favorable or unfavorable attitudes towards the self. It is generally considered the evaluative component of the self-concept, a broader representation of self that includes cognitive or behaviorable aspects as well as evaluative or affective ones. While the construct most often refers to global sense of self worth, narrower concepts such as self confidence and body esteem are used to imply a sense of self esteem in more specific domains. It is also widely assumed that self-esteem functions as a trait, that is, it is stable across time within individuals (Blascovich and Tomaka, 1991).
Rosenberg’s conceptualization of self esteem is heavily slanted towards the positive. He saw the high self esteem person as likely to seek personal growth, development and improvement by pushing themselves to the limits to exercise their capabilities. He characterized the individual with high self esteem as not having feelings of superiority, in the sense of arrogance, conceit, contempt of others, overwhelming pride. Rather, they have self-respect, considering themselves as person of work, appreciating their own merits, yet recognizing personal faults. The person with high self esteem doesn’t consider him/her self as better as others, but neither does he/she consider him/her self as inferior to others.

Rosenberg found that a deficient sense of self has a profound impact on psychological functioning and mental health as well as on interpersonal behavior. He found that low self esteem people are more likely to feel awkward, shy, conspicuous and unable to express themselves with confidence. They are always worried about making mistakes, being embarrassed or themselves to ridicule. For them, the self is a tender and delicate object sensitive to slight touch. They have a strong incentive to avoid people or circumstances that reflect negatively on their felling of self worth. They are hypersensitive and hyper alert to signs of rejection, inadequacy or rebuff. They tend to adopt a characteristic strategy for dealing with life that is protective and defensive.

People with low self esteem are more depressed and unhappy, have greater levels of anxiety, show greater impulse to aggression, imitability and resentment and suffer from lack of satisfaction with life in general. They have greater vulnerability to criticism, less stability in self concept. They tend to look for evidence that they are inadequate. For them accepting positive feedback is a more subtle kind of risk than accepting negative feedback. They attribute success to external influence. Their general approach to life is avoiding risk and embarrassment.
Nathanial Branden in 1969 briefly defined self esteem as "the experience of being competent to cope with the basic challenges of life and being worthy of happiness". This two factor approach, as some have also called it, provides a balanced definition that seems to be capable of dealing with limits of defining self esteem primarily in terms of competence of worth alone (Mruk, 2006).

Branden's (1969) description of self esteem includes the following primary properties:

1. Self esteem as a basic human need, i.e., it makes an essential contribution to the life process," is indispensable to normal and healthy self development and have a normal value for survival”.
2. Self esteem as automatic and inevitable consequence of the sum of individual's choice in using their consciousness.
3. Something experienced as a part of, or background to, all of the individuals thoughts, feelings and actions.

Self esteem is a concept of personality, for it to grow, we need to have worthy self and this worthy self will be sought from embracing challenges that result in the showing of success.

WHAT IS SELF ESTEEM?

Self esteem describes the values beliefs and attitudes we have towards ourselves. It reflects the overall opinion we have about ourselves. Our opinion may be positive (e.g., I am a worthwhile person") or it may be negative (e.g., I am a bad person). Healthy self esteem is about ourselves for who we are.

Parts of being human means that we are not perfect and that at times we will all make mistakes, or do things of which we are not proud. Building healthy self esteem means letting go to your mistakes and accepting your bad points or weakness as part of being human. It is about being comfortable in accepting yourself just as you are.
However, for some people their self esteem is often fragile and easily affected by day-to-day events such as a poor mark on an assignment or a poor performance on the sports field. Such people fall into the trap of mixing up who they are with what they do, instead of valuing themselves for their own unique contribution to the world.

**CONTINGENCIES OF SELF WORTH**

Contingencies of self worth comprise those qualities a person believes he/she have in order to be classified as a person of value; proponents claim the contingencies as the core of self esteem.

Jennifer Crocker has carried out major research on the topic of contingencies of self worth. This research explores "What it is that people believe they need to be or do to have value and worth as a person and the consequences of those beliefs." The research claims that people pursue self esteem by trying to prove that they have worth and value, and this pursuit affects the satisfaction of the fundamental human needs for learning, relationships, autonomy, self-regulation and mental and physical health (Crocker, 2007). Crocker (2007) argues that this pursuit of self worth affects not only the individual, but everyone around the person as well.

According to the contingencies of the self worth model (Crocker and Wolfe, 2001) people differ in their bases of self esteem. Their beliefs about what they think they need to do or who they need to be in order to class as a person of worth form these bases. Crocker and Her colleagues (2001) identified seven domains in which people frequently derive their self worth:

1. Virtue
2. God's love
3. Support of family
4. Academic competence
5. Physical attractiveness
6. Gaining other's approval
7. Outdoing others in competition

Individuals who base their self worth in a specific domain (Such as for example, academic success) leave themselves much more vulnerable to having their self esteem threatened when negative events happen to them within that domain (Such as when they fail a test at school or college). Crocker et al., (2003) found that students who based their contingency on self worth on academic criteria has a great likelihood of experiencing lower self esteem, greater negative affect and negative self-evaluative thoughts when they do not perform well on academic tasks, when they receive poor grades or when they get rejected (Crocker, Karpinski, Quinn, and Chase, 2003; Crocker, Sommers and luhtanen, 2002).

Crocker and her colleagues (2003) have constructed the "contingencies of self worth scale“, which measures the seven domains mentioned above. They provide important internal and external sources of self esteem as well. Crocker argues that the domains on which people base self worth play a greater role than whether self worth is actually contingent or not. Contingencies of self worth can function internally and externally or somewhere in between. Some research has shown that external contingencies of self worth, such as physical appearance and academic success correlate negatively to well being, even promoting depression and eating disorders (Jambekar, Quinn and Crocker, 2001). Other research has found internal contingencies, on the other hand, are unrelated or even positively related to well-being (Sargent, Crocker, and Luhtanen,2006).

Research by Crocker and her colleagues also suggest that contingencies of self worth have self-regulatory properties (Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper and Bourrette, 2003). Crocker et al.,(2003) define successful self-regulation as “the willingness to exert effort toward one's most important goals, while taking setbacks and failures as
opportunities to learn, identify weaknesses and address them and develop new strategies toward achieving these goals (Crocker, Brook and Niiya, 2006). Since many individuals strive for a feeling of value, it makes sense that those people would experience special motivation to succeed and actively try to avoid failure in the domains on which they base their own self worth. Accordingly, self regulation can prove difficult for people aiming to maintain and enhance their self esteem, because they would have to actually embrace failure or criticism as a learning opportunity, rather avoid it. Instead, when a task which individuals see as fundamental to their self worth proves difficult and failure seems probable, contingencies of self worth lead to stress, feelings of pressure, and a loss of intrinsic motivation. In these cases, highly contingent people may withdraw from the situation. On the other hand, positive emotional affect following success in a domain of contingency may become addictive for the highly contingent individual (Baumeister and Vohs, 2001). Over time, these people may require even greater successes to achieve the same satisfaction or emotional “high”. Therefore, the goal to succeed can become a relentless quest for these individuals (Crocker and Nuer, 2004).

Researchers such as Crocker believe that people confuse the boosts to self esteem resulting from successes with true human needs, such as learning, mutually supportive relationships, autonomy and safety (Crocker and Nuer, 2004; Crocker and park, 2004; Deci and Ryan, 2000). Crocker (2007) claims that people do not seek “self esteem”, but basic human needs and that the contingencies on which they base their self esteem have more importance than the levels of self esteem itself.

According to Psyzezynski et al., (2004), people need self esteem to quell their anxiety; therefore they pursue self esteem, trying to prove they have worth by demonstrating that they satisfy contingencies of self-worth. The question remains that whether pursuing self-esteem is an effective solution to the problem of anxiety
when people seek to prove their worth and values by demonstrating that they meet the standards of value specified by their cultural worldview and satisfy contingencies of self-worth, their behavior has many costs to themselves and other people. When their self-esteem is at stake, people are motivated to succeed, but they react to threats or potential threats in ways that are destructive or self-destructive (Crocker and Park, 2004). The pursuit of self-esteem can actually exacerbate anxiety. For example, Regardless of their actual grades or level of self-esteem, students who base their self-esteem on their academic performance report more time pressure, conflict with professors, dissatisfaction with their performance and less intrinsic motivation (Crocker and Lahtaren, 2003). Thus, pursuing self-esteem does not seem to solve the problem of anxiety.

It is true that when people achieve success in the domains in which their self-esteem is staked, they experience a boost to self-esteem, an increase in positive affect and a decrease in negative affect, including anxiety (Crocker, Karpinski, Quinn and chase, 2003; Crocker, sommers and Luhtanen, 2002). But even significant success in domains is only a temporary boost to self-esteem and decrease in negative affect. For example, although college seniors who base their self-esteem on academic show a boost in self-esteem and a reduction of negative affect when they are admitted to a graduate program, the boost to self-esteem lasts at most a few days, and then return to its baseline level (Crocker et al, 2002).

If people pursue self-esteem to relieve their anxiety, it is not surprising that the relief would be short lived. Boosts to self-esteem do not solve the real problem: instead pursuing self-esteem is an attempt to escape the anxiety (Cooper, Frone, Russell and Mudar, 1995). It is not surprising that once the boost to self-esteem dissipates, the anxiety returns, because the real problem— the inevitability and unpredictability—remains. As a result, the pursuit of self-esteem becomes relentless— the anxiety always returns, necessitating another
boost to self-esteem and requiring even greater successes and accomplishments to achieve (Crocker and Nuer, 2003). Pursuing self-esteem to relieve anxiety is like running on a treadmill despite enormous effort, one never really gets anywhere.

**DOES PURSUING SELF ESTEEM FACILITATE IMPORTANT GOALS?**

People need self esteem as a means to avoid being paralyzed by anxiety so that they can accomplish their important non-self esteem goals. Yet, research suggests that when people pursue self esteem, they often create obstacles to accomplishments of their most important goals. Self-handicapping is an excellent example of creating barriers to one's own sake for the sake of protecting or enhancing self esteem by creating an excuse for failure (Tice, 1991). Students who have the goal of validating their intelligence show a downward spiral of performance in a difficult course if they are not initially successful (Grant and Dweck, 2003). People who pursue self esteem through other's approval and regard often create rejection rather than acceptance or love. Although reassurance seeking may, in short term, relieve anxiety about social inclusion when it elicits desired reassurance from others, over time people who are high in reassurance seeking tend to be rejected by those who are close to them (Joiner, Alfano, Metalsky, 1992). Similarly, people who are high in rejection sensitivity anxiously expect rejection and are vigilant, they quickly see it and they overreact causing others to reject them (Downey, Freitas, Michaelis and Khouri, 1998). In sum, instead of facilitating the accomplishment of goals or creating safety and acceptance, the pursuit of self esteem can create the opposite of what people want.

Rather than helping people achieve their important goals, the pursuit of self esteem causes people to lose sight of their most important goals; people confuse the means with the end. On the other hand, people can become so preoccupied with proving that they are
not worthless that they lose sight of other goals, such as connecting with others, they can actually create well-being over the long term (Crocker and Park, 2004; Vohs and Heatherton, 2001). On the other hand, the high of positive emotion that comes with boosts to self esteem, the feeling of being great, can become addictive and people pursue self esteem to get that high (Baumeister and Vohs, 2001). The desire to validate self worth can blind people to goals that would in the long run increase well being and satisfy fundamental human needs (Crocker and Park, 2004). In this sense, high and low self esteem people pursue self esteem by trying to prove that they are worthy, not worthless, and in both cases they lose sight of other goals.

**Self esteem and self regulation**

Previous research on responses to failure attests to HSE’s greater ability to cope with failure, and in contrast, to the devastating effects of failure on those with low self esteem (LSE’s). LSE’s accept negative feedback about themselves more readily than do people with high self esteem (e.g., Mc Franklin and Blascovich, 1981; Shrauger, 1975) and their self-evaluations are more affected by failure (Shrauger and Rosenberg, 1970), even in domains related to the failure (Brown and Dutton, 1995). LSE’s also exhibit stronger emotional reactions to failure (Brown and Dutton, 1995; Kernis, Brockner and Frankel, 1989), as well as impaired motivation and performance on subsequent tasks (Baumeister and Tice, 1985; Brockner, Derr and Laing, 1987; Shrauger and Rosenberg, 1970). In contrast, failure often seems to enhance the motivation and persistence of HSE’S (Mc Franklin, Baumeister and Blascovich, 1984; Shrauger and Sorman, 1977).

Now the question is how do HSE’s withstand failure experiences with apparently less damage than LSE’s to their motivation and feelings of self-worth? Many studies indicate that they are more likely than LSE’s to use such strategies as attributing failures to external factors and discrediting negative feedback (Blaine and Crocker, 1993).
One recently identified coping strategy is compensation, which involves attempting to generate an experience that will reflect positively on the self and thereby counterbalance the negative feedback (Wood, Giordano-Beech and Ducharme, 1997). Compensation may involve trying to disconfirm the feedback, such as by trying to improve one's performance in a second attempt at a failed task (Mc Franklin et al., 1984) or behaving in ways that contradict the feedback (Baumeister, 1982; Steels and Liu, 1981). For example, people who are told that they are "self-oriented and apathetic to the concerns of others", are especially willing to offer help to others (Steele, 1975). One also may compensate indirectly; rather than trying to overturn the failure experience, a person may focus on his/her other favorable attributes. The idea that people may compensate for failure by focusing on dimensions that are unrelated to the failure is inconsistent with Steel's (1988) theory of self-affirmation, which holds that when encountering a threat to some domain of the self, people need not counter that specially but may affirm some other valued self-aspect to restore their overall self worth.

Recent studies have indicated that it is people with higher rather low esteem who are especially likely to engage in such compensatory strategies: following failure (Wood et al., 1997; Wood, Giordano-Beech, Tylor, Michela and Gaus, 1994; Baumeister, 1982; Brown and Smart, 1991; Josephs, Markus and Taforodi, 1992). Then the question arises what gives HSE's the courage to compensate to either challenge the negative feedback or to draw on other favorable attributes of the self? HSE's may be more able to focus on their talents after simply because they believe that they have more talents on which they can focus. LSE's in contrast, are thought to have "fewer and less distinct positive aspects of their self-image" (Spencer, Josephs and Steele, 1993; Campbell, 1990).

Crook, Healy and O'shea (1984) conducted a study to examine whether self-esteem and mature career attitudes related to one
another and complemented one another in predicting academic and work achievement for 174 college students. Analysis supported that self-esteem facilitates development of mature career attitudes, which in turn promote academic and work achievement.

Self-esteem plays a crucial role in managing anxiety and provides a super ordinate goal that organizes much human behavior. Pyszczynski and Cox (2004) found that it is extremely difficult and probably impossible for people to stop pursuing self-esteem. Self-esteem derived from self-determined standards of value, reduces defensiveness, closed-mindedness, and indifference to others, as well as promotes personal growth.

Hoyle, Kernis, Leary and Baldwin, (1999), and Sedikides and Gregg (2003) found that when self-esteem is threatened, people often become sad or depressed, or they may engage in active attempts to minimize the damage to their identities, sometimes by adjusting cognitions or behavior and sometimes by responding with hostility towards the source of the threat.

A few studies pointed out that people are motivated to maintain or enhance feelings of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging, efficacy and meaning in their identities. (Vignoles, Regalia and Manzi, Golledge, Scabini (2006).

Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas and Skelton (1981) conducted a study to explore the effects of strategic self-enhancement or self-deprecation on self-esteem. Subjects instructed to be self-deprecating subsequently showed lowered self-esteem. Thus self-perception theory can account for self-enhancing carry-over, whereas dissonance theory offers a more appropriate explanation for the carry-over or internalization of self-deprecating actions.

Several studies on responses to failure reported that HSE’s show greater ability to cope with failure, and, in contrast to the devastating effects of failure on those with low self-esteem. LSEs
accept negative feedback about themselves more readily than do people with high self-esteem (Mc Farlin and Blascovich, 1981; Shrauger, 1975) and their self evaluations are more affected by failure (Shrauger and Rosenberg, 1970) even in domains unrelated to failure (Brown and Dutton, 1995). LSEs also exhibit stronger negative emotional reactions to failure (Brown and Dutton, 1995; Kernis, Brockner, Frankel, 1989), as well as impaired motivation and performance on subsequent tasks (Baumeister and Tice, 1985; Shrauger, and Rosenberg, 1970). In contrast, failure often seems to enhance the motivation and persistence of HSEs (Mc Farlin, Baumeister and Blascovich, 1984; Shrauger and Sorman, 1977).

Sinha and Gupta (2006) examined self-worth protective subjects who intentionally withdraw effort from situations reflecting low ability. On occasions, when failure is unavoidable, self-worth protective subjects attribute their failures to internal attributions. This learned helplessness leads to low self-esteem, low self-concept, hopelessness and worthlessness. The sample of study consisted of 100 subjects. Pre-post-test design was used. To test the effect of individual counseling high self-worth protective subjects were selected. Counseling was given in order to modify the distorted perceptions of self-worth protective subjects. Results showed significant increase in self-esteem and external attributions and significant decrease in internal attributions of high self-worth protective subjects.

Self-esteem scores were found to be positively correlated with the educational status of the girls. Swan, (1983); Swan, Griffin, Predmore and Gaines (1987); Swan, Pelham, Krull, (1989) reported that HSEs are highly motivated to maintain a positive self view. HSEs try to counter the natural tendency to have unfavorable thoughts about the self with reminders of their attention to their strengths after failure should have several benefits for HSEs. It helps counteract the negative affect stemming from the failure, remind them of personal
assets they can draw on to offset the failure and motivate them to engage in further compensatory strategies (Wood and Dodgson 1996).

Ashtian, Ejei, Khodapanahi and Tarkhorani (2007) examined some of the personality characteristics of adolescents and their associations with academic achievement. Result indicates that self-concept is correlated with self-esteem and these two have positive impacts on augment of academic achievement. Moreover, the increase of self-concept and self-esteem are related to the decrease of anxiety and a negative significant relation exists between self-concept, self-esteem and depression which decrease academic achievement.

Recent studies (Wood et al, 1997; Wood, Giordano- Beech, Taylor, Michela and Gaus, 1994; Baumeister, 1982; Brown and Smart, 1991; Josephs, Markus and Tafarodi, 1992) have reported that it is people with high rather than low self-esteem who are especially likely to engage in compensatory strategies following failure. HSEs are more able to focus on their talents after failure simply because they believe that they have more talents on which they can focus. LSEs, in contrast, are thought to have fewer and less distinct positive aspects of their self image (Spencer, Josephs and Steele, 1993; Campbell, 1990).

Paula and Campbell (2002) examined self-esteem, persistence and rumination in the face of failure. LSE participants ruminated more than HSE participants. HSE'S had higher overall levels of persistence, higher grade point averages, and lower levels of rumination than LSE participants. HSE people appear more effective in self-regulating goal-directed behavior.

Baumeister and Tice (1985); Tice (1993) reported that an important difference between HSE and LSE individuals is the primary psychological outcomes that motivate their goal-directed behavior. HSE individuals are primarily motivated to achieve success (AS) or approach a positive outcome, whereas LSE individuals are primarily motivated to avoid failure (AF) or avoid a negative outcome.
Success-defined broadly as meeting important standards or receiving positive evaluations are widely assumed to be enjoyed equally by people with high self-esteem (HSEs) and low self-esteem (LSEs). Wood, Heimpel, Clark and Ross (2005) examined that HSEs react more favorably to success than do LSEs and that success brings about certain unfavorable consequences for LSEs. Self-esteem differences emerged in anxiety, thoughts about the self, and thoughts about non-self related aspects of the event. LSEs were more anxious than HSEs after succeeding, success improved HSEs self-relevant thoughts but not LSEs focused more on success's negative aspects.

Kernis, Grannemann and Barelay (1989) found that people with high but unstable (i.e. subject to daily fluctuations) self-esteem reported the highest tendencies toward hostility and anger, whereas people with stable high self-esteem reported the lowest tendencies towards them. Taylor and Brown (1988) found that HSE individuals have relatively high expectations of success.

Bennett and Holmes (1975) found that self-esteem threats cause anxiety. Gollwitzer, Earle and Stephan, (1982) reported that defensive responses to self-esteem threats are mediated by anxiety. In a similar study Mehlman and Synder (1985) found that the use of self-esteem defenses reduces anxiety.

Jordon, whitfield and Hill (2007) in a series of four studies examined whether the perceived validity of intuition increases the correspondence between implicit and explicit self-esteem. It was found that people who chronically view their intuition as valid have more consistent implicit and explicit self-esteem. In contrast people with relatively low faith in their intuition had a negative relation between implicit and explicit self-esteem, suggesting that they may overcorrect their explicit self-views for the potential bias posed by implicit self-esteem. Participants who were induced to view their intuition as valid reported explicit self-views (self-evaluations made under time pressure, or state self-esteem) that were more consistent with their
implicit self-esteem. These results suggest that people experience implicit self-esteem as intuitive evaluations. The correspondence between implicit and explicit self-esteem among individuals who view their intuition as valid suggest that these individuals incorporate implicit self-esteem into their explicit self-views.

In a study by Swann, Griffin, Predmore and Gaines (1987), various cognitive measures indicated that HSEs believed positive feedback more than negative. In contrast, both HSEs and LSEs reported feeling better after positive than after negative feedback.

Dodgson and Wood (1998) observed that people with high self-esteem (HSEs) respond less negatively to failure than people with low self-esteem (LSEs). Accessibility of strengths and weaknesses was measured by response latency on an unrelated task. Results confirmed that although strengths were typically more accessible than weaknesses for both groups, the discrepancy was larger for HSEs after failure feedback than after no feedback. This heightened discrepancy appears to result from HSEs recruiting their strengths and suppressing their weaknesses. In contrast, LSEs weaknesses appeared to become especially accessible after failure.

2.5 STATE-TRAIT ANXIETY

A distinction between state and trait anxiety has become common (Spielberger, 1972, 1983). State anxiety is defined as an unpleasant emotional arousal in face of threatening demands or dangers. A cognitive appraisal of threat is a prerequisite for the experience of this emotion (Lazarus, 1991), Trait anxiety, on the other hand, reflects the existence of stable individual differences in the tendency to respond with state anxiety in the anticipation of threatening situations.

Anxiety is a feeling of general uneasiness, a sense of foreboding and a feeling of tension is something that happens in our day-to-day lives. It may have been when we were dealing with issues of work, school-college, or relationships with family, friends or significant others. Anxiety is a vague unpleasant emotional state with qualities of apprehension, dread, distress and uneasiness. When some optimal level of stimulation or arousal is exceeded, one experiences anxiety. It can be an adaptive healthy response or a debilitating one. In the latter case mentioned, one may lose a large measure of ability to think, act and perform. Anxiety is manifested in three ways: in a person’s thoughts (cognitively), in a person’s actions (behaviorally), and in physiological reactions.

The stronger the anxiety trait, the more often the individual experience state anxiety in the past, and the greater the probability that intense elevations in state anxiety will be experienced in threatening situations in the future (Spielberger and Rickman, 1990).

Anxiety is not a unitary construct but instead may be composed of various dimensions underlying different aspects of vulnerability to the phenotype (Smoller and Tsuang, 1998). State anxiety is the transitory pattern of emotions elicited by environmental stressors, including physiological arousal and symptoms of apprehension, worry and tension (Spielberger, 1966). It has been associated with systems involved in the detection and vigilance for threat in the external world.
(Gray, 1988), and as such is thought to represent the environmentally reactive component of anxiety. In contrast, trait anxiety refers to individual differences in the predisposition to respond to threatening situations (Spielberger, 1966) and is often characterized as a personality disposition. Whilst trait anxiety may arise through negative evaluations by parents, teachers and peers during childhood (Purdue and Spielberger, 1966), it has also been associated with cognitive biases (Muris, Rapee, Meesters, Schovten and Geers, 2003) and personality dimensions of neuroticism (Smoller, and Tsuang, 1988), which may have biological and genetic underpinnings (Jardine, Martin and Henderson, 1984).

State and trait anxiety are different aspects of anxiety, and may even represent genetically and environmentally dissociable components of this phenotype. However, the mechanisms involved in their association have not yet been clearly delineated. This relationship between state and trait anxiety has been linked to that between kinetic and potential energy (Endler and Kocovski, 2001), such that trait anxiety is expressed through the tendency to respond with state anxiety under “threatening” circumstances. Thus individuals with high levels of trait anxiety are pre-disposed to exhibit the cognitive and physiological repertoire of state anxiety symptoms in the face of threat (Spielberger, 1966). Given that trait anxiety may reflect a genetically mediated disposition toward anxiety, state anxiety may be the product of an interaction between this disposition and a stressor. In other words, the association between state and trait anxiety may be the marker of the process whereby genetic vulnerability to anxiety symptoms is expressed through interplay with the environment.

Anxiety has both a physiological and a psychological aspect and it is the psychological aspect that affects the way we interpret sensations (Clarke, Davidson, Windsor and Pitts, 2000). One can become anxious in situations merely because one perceives a threat
even when there is none. William James, an early psychologist suggested that all human emotions actually come from our perception of the situation/condition we are in (Hayes, 1999): we do not weep because we feel sorrow: we feel sorrow because we weep. Further studies (Schacter and Singer as cited in Hayes, 1999) concluded that although it is our awareness of the situation that produces the emotions we actually feel, it is our physical condition which influences how strongly we can actually feel it. In a performance situation, we don’t feel anxious because of performing, the situation is anxious because of the way we feel. This describes pathological anxiety mentioned presently.

Several types of clinical anxiety have been identified:

1) Reactive anxiety results from inadequate preparation.

2) Adaptive anxiety is when the body adapts to a threatening situation by increasing our state of arousal. This means that a certain amount of anxiety may in fact improve performance.

3) Maladaptive anxiety is where the anxiety takes over and has a negative effect.

4) Pathological anxiety is when arousal occurs in situations where we can’t identify what we are afraid of. Either that or we know we can’t be harmed but still focus on feelings of anxiety.

So, what is Performance anxiety?

Each and every individual experiences performance anxiety in some form and to various degrees. This fear may be experienced while preparing for a performance, for days or even weeks before hand, and not just in that particular situation. It can be experienced in the present as apprehension (fear of what could happen) and arousal (anticipation), performance anxiety is no different from general anxiety. Feelings of fear and apprehension are accompanied by increased and prolonged physiological arousal. Severe anxiety is where the arousal is too high for optimal performance. This arousal
may be normal and temporary, or abnormal and long-lasting and symptoms can be cognitive, behavioral and physiological.

Physiological reactions to stress and anxiety include difficulty concentrating, loss of appetite, increased heart rate, and shortness of breath, dizziness, butterflies, shaking knees, shaking hands and sweaty palms. Generally the physiological symptoms are part of the fight or flight reflex.

Cognitive symptoms of anxiety include fear of making mistakes and feelings of inadequacy and worrying about things happening. Behavioral symptoms are not being able to do things, which normally happen naturally.

The three components of performance anxiety (physiological, cognitive and behavioral) are the same as in general anxiety and are not always co-related (Lehrer in Grindea, 1995). Sometimes the symptoms of performance anxiety come from one group and at other times all three. Interestingly, performance anxiety seems to affect more females than males (Deutsch, 1990). Abel and Larkin (1990) puts this down to the theory that males are less able to express their feelings than females.

The transactional model of stress suggests that anxiety occurs when individuals believe that they do not have the ability to handle the demands of a situation (Reactive anxiety). Studies have indicated that high levels of anxiety are related to low levels of confidence (Abel et al 1990). Mastery of task and anxiety are related.

Picard (1999) states that literature on performance anxiety is contradictory. Some research stresses performance anxiety's detrimental effects while others deal with the positive effects but most research on the causes of anxiety has focused on brain processes and psychological factors such as cognitive processes and learning processes. From the earliest work on anxiety, researchers have consistently reported a negative correlation between high level of
anxiety and achievement. The effects of anxiety on achievement are quite clear. Anxiety can be both the cause and effect of failure.

Anxiety becomes a response to something that may happen and not a response to something that does happen. Anxiety and stress may also affect the self-reflective capacity that we as human beings have (Gross, 1995). This in turn may influence self-esteem and faith in one's ability, which may also increase the anxiety, felt and increases the likelihood of pathological anxiety developing.

So, why is anxiety so common—particularly since it is an unpleasant experience? Like most psychological problems, general anxiety tends to run in families. Torgerson (as cited in Eysenck, 1998) found that anxiety states were around twice as common in close relatives.

Is anxiety a “trait” (due to personality) or is it a “state” (due to particular circumstances)?

This is a difficult question to answer. Steptoe and Fidler (1987) found that there was a direct correlation between performance anxiety and neuroticism (a personality trait) leading us to believe that there may be a connection between personality and performance anxiety. Eysenck (Robinson, 2000) also proposed that personality was made up of many traits and these traits give rise to tendencies to behave in particular ways, including being anxious. In addition, Kemp (1996) thinks that it is important to make a distinction between “trait anxiety” (tendency to be anxious) and state anxiety” (which is when a person’s anxiety levels are affected by a situation). However in reality the difference between state and trait is not as clear-cut.

Anxiety is an intrinsic part of human nature and a lot of research has been focused on how to harness stress and turn it into a positive force. If one learns why something happens, it usually becomes less frightening, (Jones, 2000) but unfortunately tension plays a disproportionate part of everyday life.
Anxiety basically is manifested in three ways: in a person's thoughts (cognitively), in person's actions (behaviorally) and in physiological reactions.

**BIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

According to the biological perspective, there are three basic conditions which elicit anxiety: overstimulation, cognitive incongruity and response unavailability. Overstimulation refers to when a person is flooded with information. Cognitive incongruity is when a person has difficulty reconciling with some event, for example, loss of a loved one. Response unavailability refers to when a person does not know how to handle a difficult situation.

According to the biological theory, the GABA System is responsible for the motivation of fear and anxiety. GABA is known as Gamma-Amino Butyric Acid, it is naturally occurring transmitter inhibitor. It is a substance in the body which helps us to maintain an optimal flow of stimulation or information thereby reducing the flow of neural transmission. There are GABA receptor sites which the GABA will bind and produce the effect mentioned previously. The ability to bind is not fixed and is dependent on the presence of benzodiapines.

Benzodiapines are anti-anxiety drugs such as valium, Librium, and Alprazolam, which help regulate neural transmissions. The body naturally produces this chemical, but it has not yet been isolated. When the benzodiapines bind to the sites, it increases the ability of GABA to bind to its own receptor sites (Tallman, 1980). The GABA receptors then trigger the opening of chloride channels which leads to a decrease in the firing rate of critical neurons in many parts of the Central Nervous System. Those who experience more anxiety then others, fail to produce or release benzodiapines which are necessary for the amount of GABA needed to regulate neural transmission.
COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

There are three reasons for the motivation of fear and anxiety from the cognitive perspective: loss of control, inability to make a coping response and state anxiety versus trait anxiety. Loss of control refers to a situation when there are unpredictable or uncontrollable events in one's life which lead to anxiety and/or depression. As a result, feeling of helplessness develops. The unpredictability which may be associated with a task may cause anxiety (Seligman, 1975). The inability or perceived inability to make an adaptive response to a threatening event or the fact or perception that no such response is available will lead to feelings of anxiety. Since anxiety is very ambiguous, it is the key which prevents the elaboration of clear action patterns to handle the situation effectively.

According to the cognitive perspective, the most effective way to deal with the anxiety is to transform the anxiety into fear. Then one will know exactly what is bothering him/her. Then a plan should be devised to deal with what is feared. Another notion of coping response is whether a person is self certain or not (Baumgardner, 1990, as cited by Franken, 1994). Self-certain people are those who know their own strengths and weaknesses. People who are not self-certain only know their strength. And since they do not know their own weaknesses, there is a lack of knowledge, thus an inability to create an effective coping response. These tend to be insecure, whereas self-certain people tend to have better self esteem; self-certain people tend to make plans to deal with their weaknesses. According to the cognitive perspective, one creates coping response by transforming the anxiety into fear and develops a plan to deal with it, which will create a sense of security.

State and traits of anxiety refers to the personality traits of an individual. State anxiety is a transitory emotional response involving feelings of tension and apprehension, and trait anxiety refers to an enduring characteristic of a person that can be used to explain a
person’s behavioral consistencies, and determines the likelihood that a person will experience anxiety in stressful situations.

It has also been suggested that people can be generally categorized into two groups; sensitizers and repressors (Franken, 1994), sensitizers tend to dwell on potential consequences of a threat and thus experience more anxiety. Whereas repressors avoid thinking about consequences and may experience less anxiety and stress at that particular moment. Neither response is considered an adaptive one. A recommended solution, according to the cognitive perspective, is to recognize that one has a problem and think of a way to handle it.

**LEARNING PERSPECTIVE**

Anxiety is an acquirable or conditioned drive which functions to motivate avoidance responding (Mowrer, 1939). There, the avoidance response is assumed to be reinforced by a reduction in anxiety. Fear is a conditioned response to pain. If one experiences pain in a specific situation, the stimuli associated with that situation acquires the ability to evoke the same emotional reaction that the pain originally elicited (Miller, 1992).

Human tends to exhibit less fear when encountered with a symbolic form of a stimulus, and extreme fear of a concrete stimulus. For example, a picture of a spider will not evoke as much fear as an actual spider. There are two methods of counter conditioning which will eliminate the stimulus: desensitization and flooding. Desensitization takes place when successive presentations of the stimulus are administered, with a milder stimulus being presented first. After the client is relaxed, a stronger stimulus is presented. This procedure is continued until the client is completely relaxed when presented with the concrete stimulus.

When the method of flooding is used, the client is presented with the actual stimulus and the full emotional reaction is permitted to run its course. The client must remain there throughout the
FEAR AND ANXIETY AS AN ADAPTIVE RESPONSE

The James-lange Theory argues that the bases of emotional experiences are based on peripheral and physiological sensations such as heart rate and blood pressure. Fear and anxiety can be adaptive response when one is confronted with an event that threatens their survival. Humans experience a kind of fight or flight response. Overall, sensory feedback controls emotional expression, mild to moderate anxiety. It is clear that high levels of anxiety can lead to impaired psychological functioning, intellectual errors, and disturb concentration and memory. Yet, there is evidence that suggests that moderate levels of anxiety may serve as an adaptive function. For example, a study of anxiety levels of patients undergoing minor surgery discovered that patients with moderate anxiety did better post surgically than those with high anxiety or minimal anxiety (Manyande et al., 1992). The two hormones related to stress were higher in the relaxed group (administered relaxation training) than in the control group (listened to a 15 minute informative type about the surgical procedure).

It is believed that moderate anticipatory anxiety about realistic threats is necessary for the development of coping behavior. From an existentialist perspective, moderate anxiety is an appropriate response as an adaptive function to particular events or threats in one’s life. This anxiety can be used as a motivation to change oneself or adapt to the situation.

The amount and severity of anxiety that is faced is important in determining whether it will impair the functioning of an individual. There are several different perspectives on the motivations of fear and anxiety: cognitive, learned and physiological. There is always some physiological reaction that occurs when an individual experiences fear.
and anxiety. Both the cognitive and learned perspectives help us understand the motivations of fear and anxiety. Condition may vary from situation to situation or culture to culture. Being afraid of spiders is a product of one’s experiences in the environment. And if one is attacked at night while walking home, the motivation behind one’s fear and anxiety may be a complex relationship of all three perspectives.

Luciano and Algarbel (2006) conducted a study to assess differences between repressors and non repressors in some aspects associated with conscious thought control. Sixty-three Spanish University students with different combinations of trait anxiety and defensiveness completed the Thought control Ability Questionnaire (TCAQ) and the white Bear Suppression inventory (WBSI). Data analysis showed that subjects with low anxiety (repressors and low anxious) reported higher perceived ability to control unpleasant thoughts and less tendency to suppress than did subjects with high anxiety (high anxious and defensive high anxious).

Students high on negative affectivity (depressed, high evaluative trait anxiety) tend to employ more palliative and less active coping behaviors in dealing with an evaluative ego-threatening situation. They also show elevated levels of academic strain as well as state anxiety under both daily routine and evaluative situations. Personal variables (i.e., social evaluation, trait anxiety, and depression) appear to bear a direct impact on anxiety. Research has suggested that clients tend to express their dysfunctional career thoughts through their behavior (incomplete task), emotions (i.e., depression and anxiety) and verbal expressions (i.e., negative statements, Corbishley and Yost, 1989). Dysfunctional career thoughts have also been related to distorted, misinformed and biased career beliefs that lead to self-defeating behaviors and experiences (Kinner and Krumboltz, 1986). Some research has also suggested that women tend to report higher levels of anxiety and lower self-esteem, which can lead to
dysfunctional cognitions and perceptions resulting in failure to realize individual career potential (Betz and Hackett, 1981; Herr and Cramer, 1996). Anxiety (Fuqua, Blum and Hartman, 1988, Gibbs, 1991) has been implicated in the development of dysfunctional career thoughts.
2.6 ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

Motivation can be defined as the driving force behind all the actions of an individual. Motivation is based on our emotions and achievement related goals. Achievement motivation can be defined as the need for success or the attainment of excellence. It is based on reaching success and achieving all of our aspirations in life. Achievement goals can affect the way a person performs a task and represent a desire to show competence (Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto and Elliot, 1997).

Most people in this world psychologically can be divided into two broad groups. There is that minority which is challenged by opportunity and is willing to work hard to achieve something and the majority which really does not care all that much.

Achievement motivation has been the focus of several highly successful research programs, beginning with the efforts of Mc Clelland, Atkinson and their associates at Wesleyan university in the late 1940s and the early 1950s. The initial investigations derived from Murray's (1938) concept of human motivation. Murray recognized the need to achieve as one of the universal human needs. He defined it as striving to "overcome obstacles, to exercise power, to strive to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible". Mc Clelland and his colleagues defined the achievement motive as a predisposition to compete against an internalized standard of excellence (Mc Clelland, Atkinson, Clark and Lowell, 1953). The achievement motive involves the desire for success. It is present whenever someone is concerned with attaining some sort of standard set by others or he/she will provide his own standards, when none exist. This standard implies a certain degree of excellence, so that the individual is pleased with competence and disappointed with incompetence (Heckhausen, 1967). The achievement motive is to accomplish something difficult, to master, to manipulate or organize physical objects, human beings or ideas, to do this as rapidly and as
independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival or surpass others. To increase self regard by the successful exercise of talent.

Achievement motivation is defined as a predisposition to strive for excellence. It can be expressed as a concern for excellence, a desire on the part of the person to perform in terms of a standard of excellence or to be successful in competitive situations. Persons dominated by this motive are generally active, work hard, set high goals, take challenging tasks, derive pleasure from doing difficult things and look for quality.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF n-Ach**

It is not difficult to understand why people who think constantly about “doing better” are more apt to do better at job hunting, to set moderate achievable goals for themselves, to dislike gambling (because they get no achievement satisfaction from success) and to prefer work situations where they can tell easily whether they are improving or not. But why some people and not others come to think this way is another question. The evidence suggests that it is not because they are born that way but because of special training they get in the home from parents who set moderately high achievement goals, but are warm encouraging and non-authoritarian in helping their children reach these goals.

**a) Family and Cultural Influences**

In this steady effort toward accomplishments, three significant family influences can be identified, one of which is the amount of independence training the child receives. Children who are encouraged to use their abilities constructively and to find out things for themselves, especially at the early ages are likely to be high in achievement motivation, in later years. Another influential factor is the parents’ occupational level, to which the child is regularly exposed. The higher the level, the greater is the probable achievement
motivation in the child. Third, birth order is the factor because the
greater the number of children, the less is the attention that the
parents can give each child. The first born child, alone with the
parents for some time, receives the most attention in the early years
and this child has been found to have higher need for achievement
than other brothers and sisters (Pfouts, 1980).

b) The n-Ach Person

The subsequent work on n-Ach has emphasized its two major
elements, a motive to achieve success and a motive to avoid failure.
The motive to achieve is positive-an approach motivation. The motive
to avoid failure is negative-an avoidant motivation. Atkinson has been
extremely influential in the development of this area of n-Ach
research. It is possible to predict rather accurately what sort of risks
an individual will choose to take. The key to the situation is the task
of intermediate difficulty. The person who rates high in the motive to
succeed will choose the task of intermediate difficulty because there is
a reasonable chance of success. The person with a high need to
achieve indeed has high aspirations, but not so high as to be
unattainable-if they were unattainable the person would be thwarting
the need to achieve. He/she prefers not to gamble at all. He/she
prefers to work at a problem rather than leave the outcome to chance
or to other. On the other hand, the person who rates high in the
motive to avoid failure will react differently. He/ She will choose either
the very easy task or the very difficult one, on which no one is
expected to succeed, failure is not as painful. In short, he/she is
apparently afraid to try, afraid of the subjective experience of failure.

SELF WORTH THEORY IN ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

Self-worth theory states that in certain situations students
stand to gain by not trying and deliberately with holding effort. If poor
performance is a threat to a person’s sense of self-esteem, this lack of
effort is likely to occur. This most often occurs after an experience of
failure. Failure threatens self-estimates of ability and creates
uncertainty about an individual's capability to perform well on a subsequent task. If the following performance turns out to be poor, then doubts concerning ability are confirmed. Self-worth theory states that one way to avoid threat to self-esteem is by withdrawing effort. Withdrawing effort allows failure to be attributed to lack of effort rather than low ability which reduces the overall risk to the value of one's self-esteem. When poor performance is likely to reflect poor ability, a situation of high threat is created to the individual's interaction. On the other hand, if an excuse allows poor performance to be attributed to a factor unrelated to ability, the threat to self-esteem and one's intellect is much lower (Thompson, Davidson and Barber, 1995).

**THE INTRINSIC/EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION MODELS**

To enjoy an activity is to desire doing it simply for its own sake (Rawls, 1971); we are most inclined to peruse an activity because of the activity itself rather than for reasons external to the activity (Deci, 1975). The distinction between being moved from within or without has come to be termed that between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Asking people whether they will continue to do an activity. If they are no longer required to do so will determine whether they are doing it for intrinsic or extrinsic reasons (Vallerand, 1997).

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) called the act of whole heartedly doing something just to do it "flow". Flow is an act of concentration in which time passes without any awareness of it having passed. It takes all of one's attention, leaving no space for the desire to be doing anything else (Csikszentmihalyi and Rathunde, 1993). Other requisites for flow are being in control of a task, having clear goals with in it and being challenged by it while possessing the skills to perform it. Such challenges must increase In proportion to increases in skills if one is to be truly able to put oneself into a task and enjoy concentrating on it fully and doing well. Lacking sufficient skills can over-challenge one and cause anxiety, while having more skills than require can lead to
boredom, Vallerand (1997) equated this concept of experiencing flow with receiving pleasure, but while one can re-experience a pleasurable activity by doing it in the same manner as before, being completely involved and having the enjoyment of a peak performance requires continual growth (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

The self-determination theory, an extension of Deci and Ryan's (1983) pioneering studies on the intrinsic/ extrinsic dichotomy pointed that for an activity to be intrinsically rewarding, it must fulfill the basic human needs for experiencing competence, relatedness and autonomy. People feel competence in repeatedly succeeding in an activity, relatedness in doing activities with others and autonomy in making choices about activities and having personal control over them. Satisfying any of these three needs increases intrinsic motivation, but competence and relatedness do so only if accompanied by some form of autonomy.

Deci and Ryan (1985) further differentiated extrinsic motivation into four types dependent on the degree of self-determination that learners have in it. These range from external regulation, extrinsic motivation for a task over which one has no control, to integrated regulation, extrinsic motivation for a task that one wholeheartedly accepts and adopts. While the more controlling and so less self-determining that regulation is, the less learning takes place (Deci et al, 1991). An extrinsically motivated activity, even a test, can be self-determining if learners accept the value of it.

Vallerand (1997) further refined the elements of self-determination theory into a hierarchy of motivation for doing an activity: In ascending order of effectiveness, a motivation, having no reason to do an activity; having to do an activity, feeling obligated to do it, and fully agreeing with the value of doing it and three types of intrinsic motivation, getting pleasure from doing an activity, achieving by doing it and satisfying a curiosity or desire for knowledge in doing it. In other words, learners are self-determining and intrinsically
motivated in learning when they are interested in it, want to do well in it, or enjoy doing it. They are self-determining but extrinsically motivated but less self-determining when learning what they feel they ought to and are not self-determined when learning what they have to do else. They are not motivated at all when they have no reason to learn.

Indeed, the most tasks are begin for externally motivated reasons, according to Csikszentmihalyi (1990), such as receiving money or recognition or something else of external value; only over time do people find themselves interested in and enjoying such tasks (Csikszentmihalyi and Nakamura, 1989).

**AVOIDANCE ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION**

An achievement goal is commonly defined as the purpose for engaging in a task and the specific type of goal taken on creates a framework for how individuals experience their achievement pursuits. Achievement goal theorists commonly identify two distinct ideas toward competence: a performance goal focused on demonstrating ability when compared to others and a mastery goal focused on the development of competence and task mastery. Performance goals are hypothesized to produce vulnerability to certain response patterns in achievement settings such as preference for easy tasks, with drawl of effort in the face of failure and decreased task enjoyment. Mastery goals can lead to a motivational pattern that creates a preference for moderately challenging tasks, persistence in the face of failure and increased enjoyment of tasks (Elliot and Church, 1997).

Most achievement goal theorists conceptualize both performance and mastery goals as the "approach" forms of motivation. More recently, the performance goal is separated into an independent approach component and avoidance component and three achievement orientations are conceived: a mastery goal focused on the development of competence and task mastery, a performance-approach goal directed toward the attainment of favorable judgment of
competence and a performance-avoidance goal centered on avoiding unfavorable judgments of competence. The mastery and performance-approach goals are characterized as self-regulating to promote potential positive outcomes and processes to absorb an individual in their task or to create excitement leading to a mastery pattern of achievement results. Performance-avoidance goals, however, are characterized as promoting negative circumstances. The avoidance motivation creates anxiety, task distraction and a pattern of helpless achievement outcomes. Intrinsic motivation, which is the enjoyment of an interest in an activity for its own sake, plays a role in achievement outcomes as well. Performance-avoidance goals undermined intrinsic motivation while both mastery and performance-approach goals helped to increase it (Elliot and Church, 1997).

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION**

Academic achievement motivation affects not only how well a student learns new skills and information, but also how well the student uses existing skills and knowledge in both familiar and novel situations (Lepper, 1983). There is convincing evidence that a variety of achievement deficits, such as those observed in unprepared students, are the result of motivational problems rather than factors attributable to specific cognitive abilities (Resnick and Klopfer, 1989).

A fairly recent model that attempts to explain academic achievement motivation is achievement goal theory (Ames, 1992; Urden, 1997). This theory contends that individual's interpretations of their achievement outcomes, rather than motivational dispositions or actual outcomes, determine achievement strivings by their effect on cognitive self-regulation processes. Cognitive self-regulation refers to students being actively engaged in their own learning, including analyzing the demands of assignments, planning for and utilizing their resources to meet these demands, and monitoring their progress toward completion of assignments (Pintrich, 1999). In order for students to accept responsibility for their own learning, they must be
motivated to succeed and possess the skills and abilities to engage in appropriate self-regulated learning strategies (Mc Combs, 1988).

**A TRIPARTITE MODEL OF MOTIVATION FOR ACHIEVEMENT: ATTITUDE/ DRIVE/ STRATEGY**

Achievement outcomes have been regarded as a function of two characteristics, "skill" and "will" (Mc Comb and MarZono, 1990), and these must be considered separately because possessing the will alone may not insure success if the skill is lacking. Where achievement measures such as scores on course examinations or grades are used as criteria of motivation to achieve, measures of skill have to be separated out or controlled for. To measure motivation for achievement directly measures of engagement must be examined.

Cognitive engagement represents the amount of effort spent in either studying or completing assignments. It is the result of motivation, not its source. Pintrich and Schraben (1992) review a large body of research that suggest that 1) the value of an outcome to the student affects the student's motivation and 2) motivation leads to cognitive engagement, such engagement manifesting itself in the use or application of various learning strategies.

**Attitude**

The attitude that is often used in conjunction with motivation to achieve is self-efficacy, or how capable people judge themselves to be to perform a task adequately and successfully (Bandura, 1977). Bandura (1997) concluded that self-efficacy is a key factor in the extent to which people can bring about significant outcomes in their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs contribute to academic achievement by enhancing the motivation to achieve.

The relation between self-efficacy and performance is best summed up by Bandura (1997).

"The evidence is relatively consistent in showing that efficacy beliefs contribute significantly to level of motivation and performance."
They predict not only the behavioral changes accompanying different environmental influences but also differences in behavior between individuals receiving the same environmental influence and even variation within the same individual in the tasks performed and those shunned or attempted but failed.”

**Drive**

One potential source of the drive to perform is the incentive value of the performance. Incentive theories of motivation (e.g., Rotter, Phares and Chance, 1972; Overmier and Lawry, 1979) suggest that people will perform an act when its performance is likely to result in some outcome they desire or that is important to them. For example, in anticipation of a situation in which a person is required to perform, that person may expend considerable effort in preparation because of the mediation provided by the desire to achieve success or avoid failure. That desire would be said to provide incentive motivation for the person to expend the effort. Accordingly, a test, as a stimulus situation, may be theorized to provoke students to study as a response, because of the mediation of the desire to achieve success or avoid failure on that test. Test is an incentive motivation here.

The importance of drive or value, using sources other than incentives, as a factor related to achievement has also been supported (Pintrich and Schrauben, 1992).

Wigfield and Eccles (1992) suggested that incentive value of a task is an important determinant of task choice and that individuals will tend to do tasks that they positively value and avoid those that they negatively value. Thereby a person’s drive to engage in the task having high incentive value increases level of achievement as a result and shows drive or desire to be an important component of motivation.
Strategy

Indeed the entire concept of self-regulation has focused upon the motivation scene to reflect the connection between specific strategies and performance outcomes, exemplified by the considerable work of Schunk and Zimmerman (e.g., Schunk, 1989; Schunk and Zimmerman, 1998 a; Zimmerman, 1989; 1990; Zimmerman and Martinez-pons, 1988). Strategies that have been shown to have a particular impact on achievement (Zimmermen, 1989) are self-observing, self-judging and self-reacting (e.g., goal setting, planning) and more recently, self-evaluation and monitoring, goal setting and strategic planning, strategy implementation and monitoring and strategic outcome monitoring (Zimmerman, 1998).

The unique combination of strategy condition and self-efficacy level determined the amount of performance (Tuckman, 1990). The goal setting strategy yielded the best performance from low self-efficacy students, the group outcome strategy yielded the best performance from middle self-efficacy students and no induced strategy or control yielded the best from high self-efficacy students. Similarly, Tuckman and Sexton (1992) showed that in a competitive performance situation, a feedback strategy worked better than a no feedback strategy for low and intermediate self-efficacy students while the reverse held true for high self-efficacy students.

Beyond believing in one's own capability and having the desire to achieve a particular outcome, being able to carry out specific strategies associated with success in a variety of fields appears critical (Zimmerman, 1998).

Attitude, drive and strategy each make a distinguishable but interrelated contribution to motivation for achievement. Without attitude, there is no reason to believe that one is capable of the necessary action to achieve and therefore no reason to even attempt it. Without drive, there is no energy to propel that action. And without
strategy, there is nothing to help select and guide the necessary action.

THE EXPECTANCY-VALUE MODEL OF MOTIVATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Research on motivation has tended to focus on either the valuing of doing an activity, whether for intrinsic or extrinsic reasons (Decharams, 1976, 1984; Deci, 1975; Deci and Ryan, 1985; Lepper, 1983; Csikszentmihalyi, 1985,1990) and/or on expecting to succeed in the activity (Weiner, 1986; Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1986 ; Schunk, 1983; 1989; Bandura and Schunk, 1981).

In this attribution theory Weiner (1984, 1986) proposed that the extent of future expectancy to succeed depends on what individuals attribute their past successes or failures, whether to a stable factor such as ability, or to less stable ones like effort, luck or task difficulty. Students who attribute a good grade on a test to ability are more likely to expect to do well on the next test than if they had attributed the grade to the test being easy or to being lucky. Conversely, attributing failure to inability, a stable factor, will have a more negative effect on the next test than attributing it to an unstable one like lack of study.

Expectancy of success in Weiner’s attribution theory is similar to Bandura’s (1977, 1982, 1986) concept of self-efficacy, the self-judgment of one’s ability to perform a specific act. For Bandura, expectancy and self-efficacy are analogous, with the qualification that “outcome expectations”, the beliefs that certain actions are necessary to produce an outcome, differ from “efficacy expectations, “the beliefs that one can actually perform these actions. Knowing what must be done is not the same as being able to do it (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Bandura and Shunk,1981 ).The greater one’s self-efficacy to do a task, the greater will be motivation to do it (Bandura,1991 ).People are motivated to do what they think is possible for them to do (Weiner,1986).
Eccles et al., (1983) proposed that expectancy for success in an achievement task and the subjective values for succeeding in the task are the best predictors of the subsequently choosing the task, making effort in the task, preserving in the task and succeeding in the task. The attributions within a specific domain are what we think are the reasons why we could or couldn’t succeed in doing a task in the domain in the past. The general self-competency beliefs in that domain are what we think that we can or cannot do, dependent in part on how hard the task is whether we were able to do one similar to it before. These self-competency beliefs influence in turn, expectancies for future success at the task, what we are likely to think we later can or cannot do (Wigfield, 1994). Weiner (1986) likewise held that attributions precede ability perceptions in an given domain, which then causally precede expectancies for doing a task in the domain.

Eccles et al., (1984) differentiated personal valuing into attainment value (or importance), intrinsic value (or intrinsic interest), extrinsic utility value or cost value. The attainment value of a task, a term introduced by Battle (1965), is the importance of doing the task, its personal, familial and social relevance to oneself. An example of personal importance is having an ongoing desire for mastery and achievement. The antecedents of achievement values for tasks in a specific domain are the achievement goals, which influence these achievement values and are the broader motivations for doing tasks, such as one’s career, or acting within the boundaries of socially-set behavior patterns such as honoring gender roles or parental values (Eccles, et al., 1983; Eccles, 1984). The intrinsic value of a task is the interest in doing the task and the enjoying of it that motivates one to want to do it. The extrinsic or utility value a task is its perceived usefulness, even if it is not currently important or interesting, perhaps due to a foreseeable future again. Eccles and Wigfield (1995) later demonstrated that attainment values, intrinsic values and utility values are independent factors. The cost value of a task is the effort spent in doing it that reduces the time available for other tasks and
the negative costs of doing it such as having anxiety during performance or fear of failure.

Other expectancy-value models similarly differentiate the types of values. In Pintrich's (1988) model, subjective value is composed of attainment value, intrinsic value and utility value. Feather's (1988) model's combines' importance of a task or the interest and enjoyment in a task intrinsically motivate.

Just as having a greater skills but no greater challenge can result in boredom (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), something that becomes too easy to do may lose its value. Atkinson (1957) was the first to posit a relationship between being able to succeed in an activity and choosing to preserve in it (Weigfield and Eccles, 1992). He proposed that achievement in a task requires having both the ability to do the task that is expectancy for success and the will to do the task due to a desire to succeed in it. Wigfield (1994) defined expectancy as anticipating success or failure on a task and incentive value as finding it attractive to succeed in the task.

While people may not value doing something that they feel very confident about succeeding in because they will not find it interesting then, the expectancy to succeed at something can also have a positive influence on the value of doing it. People, males especially, choose to do something because being good at it gives importance to them, so that the more they expect more to succeed in an activity, the more they value doing it (Weigfield and Eccles, 1992 ).Moreover, expectancy-value models of motivational achievement include multiple ways of valuing and valuing an activity is in itself motivating if one is challenged by it, or has interest in it, or involved in it, or enjoys it or wants to do well in it or likes doing it well or finds it useful.

An expectancy-value model is somewhat different from the representative one of Eccles et al., (1983) and Pintrich (1989), Locke and Latham's (1990) model for work motivation. Vroom (1964) had introduced the expectancy value theory to industrial/organizational
psychology, defining performance as a product of expectancy, instrumentality and valence, where expectancy is the belief that effort will result in performance, instrumentality is the belief that performance will be rewarded and valence is valuing of the rewards. If valence and instrumentality, the desire for rewards and the belief in receiving them, were kept constant on a task, expectancy would have a positive relationship with the performance of the task.

Expectancy and performance have generally been found related when, there are fixed goals and fixed rewards (Locke and Latham, 1990). Over 400 studies of goal-setting theory have revealed that when goals are specific and high and accompanied by high self-efficacy, performance is also high as long as there is commitment to the goals, the ability to fulfill them, sufficient autonomy and feedback when success is revealed. Unlike the lack of goals and easy and vague goals such as “Do your best”, clear, high goals, challenge workers even if these were assigned to them and self-efficacy makes them try harder and longer because they think that they can succeed.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION

In general, the relation between achievement motivation scores and behavioral measures of achievement is lower in women than is men and women do not show an increase in achievement imagery under achievement arousing condition (Hyland, Curtis, and Mason, 1985). High achievement, synonymous with masculinity has been seen as incompatible with the traditional concept of the ideal woman. In other words females in our culture are not supposed to be successful, at least not in some kinds of activity and attempting to succeed in some endeavors may lead to negative consequences. Though she may cross the so-called line successfully, in many ways, but that “it is a rare intellectual woman who will not have paid a price for it: a price in anxiety.” As a result some women learn to underplay their abilities, especially when in the company of men. Thereby providing greater opportunity for fulfilling the traditional female
affiliative motive (Stein and Bailey, 1973). The results of so many researches conducted in the area suggests that fear-of-success imagery reflects the strength of the conflict between attainment of success and traditionally defined femininity, may be the result not of inherent differences in ability, as is often assumed but of culturally imposed sex differences in motivation.

**AN ATTRIBUTION-THEORY APPROACH**

A theoretical framework similar to Schachter’s has been applied by Weiner to the study of achievement related behavior. Weiner has found that people usually attribute success or failure to one or more of the following four causes: ability, effort, task difficulty and luck. These four factors can be classified in terms of two dimensions, locus of control and stability.

Ability and effort are called internal factors because they seem to reside inside the person; task difficulty and luck is called external factors, because they seem to lie outside the person. Ability and task difficulty are classified as stable because they are unlikely to change, at least in short run, whereas effort and luck are both subject to change (i.e., are unstable).

These attributional differences help explain the behavioral differences documented by Atkinson and others. For example, people choose to undertake achievement related activities; perhaps they do so because they have experienced strong positive emotion after success in the past (having attributed it to ability and effort). Those low in achievement motivation gives up easily because they attribute failure to low ability and nothing can be done about it.

So for the gender differences in fear of success reported by have not received much attention from attribution theorists, but in an indirect manner it explains why female seem to take less pleasure in competition than males do. Because of certain socialization experiences females may not take enough personal credit for success.
and may be too quick to attribute failure to low ability. Weiner's work suggests that it is better, at least in terms of persistence and success, to attribute failure to insufficient effort. Than “if at first you don't succeed.” “You will conclude that you should try, again.”

University students’ adjustment to the campus environment is regarded as an important factor in predicting University outcomes.

Elias, Noordin and Mahyuddin (2010) examined some psychological characteristics of students. An online survey was conducted on 178 University students. Achievement motivation and self-efficacy were measured using questionnaires available on-line. The Achievement motivation and self-efficacy range from moderate to high levels indicating that they have the potentials to succeed. The two variables of namely achievement motivation and self-efficacy were found to be correlated positively with one another.

Capa, Audiffren and Ragot (2008) conducted a study to examine the effect of achievement motivation and task difficulty on invested mental effort postulated by Humphreys and Revelle (1984) using behavioral, subjective, and effort-related physiological measures. Eighteen approach-driven participants and 18 avoidance-driven participants were selected based on their motive to achieve success scores and their motive to avoid failure scores.

Tanake, Takehara and Yamauchi (2006) conducted a study to examine the linkages between achievement goals to task performance, as mediated by state anxiety arousal. Performance expectancy was also examined as antecedents of achievement goals. A presentation task in a computer practice class was used as achievement task. Fifty-three undergraduates (37 females and 16 males) were administered self-reported questionnaire measures before and immediately following the task performance. Results of regression analysis showed that performance-avoidance goals were positively related to state anxiety. State anxiety was related to poor task performance. Performance expectancy was related to state anxiety through achievement goals.
Shu-dong (2007) conducted a study on a sample of 570 students with a questionnaire on achievement motivation and family influence and discussed the relationship of achievement motivation, family influence, and academic achievement. Results indicated that family influence and academic achievement are closely related, and achievement motivation makes academic achievement predictable to some extent.

Elias and Rahman (1995) conducted a study to measure the achievement motivation of 1050 University students in relation to faculty, gender, locus of control, attitude towards learning, and study habits. The results showed that there were significant differences in achievement motivation among students based on faculty. Male students were more internal on locus of control than female students. Significant differences were also found in attitudes of study and faculty.

Pratap and Srivastava (1983) conducted a study to compare graduate, post-graduate, and PhD students in terms of achievement motivation. The sample consisted of 100 males and 60 female students. Their age ranged from 20-25 years. Analysis was made by T-test. The differences were significantly significant among the students in terms of achievement motivation.

Stericker and Johnson (1977) explored the relationship between sex-role identification, achievement motivation, and self-esteem. The subjects in this study were 312 male and female students. While achievement motivation was a significant correlate of self-esteem, for both males and females, the relationship was significantly stronger for females than for males.

Tal and Frieze (1977) on a sample of male and female college students, divided according to level of achievement motivation, conducted a study. The subjects were asked to do an anagram task at which their success or failure was determined by experimental manipulation of the problems they were given. Their ratings of ability,
effort, task difficulty and luck as possible causes for success or failure indicated that those with higher achievement motivation of both sexes made relatively higher ratings for ability and lower ratings of task difficulty. Females tended to employ higher ratings for luck and females with high achievement motivation made maximum use of effort as a causal factor.