

280  
C. 1990

THE RELATIONSHIP OF BIRTH  
ORDER TO NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT  
AND INTERNAL - EXTERNAL LOCUS  
OF CONTROL

---

VICKI RENEE JACKSON

THE RELATIONSHIP OF BIRTH ORDER  
TO NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND  
INTERNAL - EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL

---

An Abstract  
Presented to  
the Graduate Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in Psychology

---

by  
Vicki Renee Jackson  
July, 1980



## ABSTRACT

Two hundred and forty-six high school juniors served as subjects in this research which investigated the relationship of birth order to need for achievement and locus of control. The subjects completed a questionnaire entitled "Opinions Toward Work, Study, and People." This survey consisted of three sections designed to measure ordinal position, need for achievement, and locus of control.

An analysis of variance was used to determine the relationship of birth order to need for achievement and locus of control. A significant relationship was found between birth order and need for achievement. No relationship was found between birth order and locus of control. A Newman-Keuls Studentized Range Test was used to determine the differences between individual ordinal positions on need for achievement. Results of this investigation indicate that only children have a significantly higher need for achievement when compared to oldest, middle, or youngest children.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF BIRTH ORDER  
TO NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND  
INTERNAL - EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in Psychology

---

by  
Vicki Renee Jackson

July, 1980



To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Vicki Renee Jackson entitled "The Relationship of Birth Order to Need for Achievement and Internal - External Locus of Control." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Garland E. Blair  
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and  
recommend its acceptance:

Linda Rudolph  
Second Committee Member

Elizabeth H. Stokes  
Third Committee Member

Accepted for the Council:

William H. Ellis  
Dean of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Garland Blair for his assistance during the course of this research.

Gratefulness must go to the American History teachers and students at Clarksville High School for their time and cooperation.

Finally, my deepest appreciation is extended to my parents for their patience, support, and understanding.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER	
I.    INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II.   METHOD . . . . .	16
III.  RESULTS . . . . .	19
IV.  DISCUSSION . . . . .	20
REFERENCES . . . . .	23
APPENDICES	
A.    TABLES . . . . .	28
B.    QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	37



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Analysis of Variance with Birth Order and Need for Achievement . . .	29
2. Summary of Analysis of Variance with Birth Order and Locus of Control . . . . .	31
3. Means and Standard Deviations of Need for Achievement Scores for Each Ordinal Position . . . . .	33
4. Results of Newman-Keuls Analysis with Each Ordinal Position on Need for Achievement . . . . .	35

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION AND  
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For more than a century, birth order has been a research variable which has been widely investigated in the social science area. It has been used to examine educational attainment and eminence, juvenile delinquency, aspirations and motivation, affiliation, conformity, dependence, alcoholism, mental illness and various parent-child relationships (Adams, 1972). The research has led to the discovery that there are some significant differences between the various ordinal positions. These differences are not simply present in children but continue into adult life (Toman, 1961).

The predominant means of reporting birth order research involves dividing the subjects into two groups. These two groups are first-born and later-born. Roberts (1938) explained the reason for dividing the data in this way. The characteristics of the only and oldest groups and of the youngest and middle groups closely resemble each other. This grouping will be used in most of the research discussed in this paper.

Alfred Adler was one of the first people to become interested in the effects of birth order. He maintained that children of the same family were not reared in the

same environment. The psychological situation was different for each child due to the ordinal position occupied. It is not, however, the child's specific number in the ordinal succession that influenced his personality but the situation into which he was born and the way in which he interpreted that situation (Ansbacher, 1964).

Forer (1976) further explained that it is not the ordinal position that is important but it is instead the experiences with the other family members as a result of being the only, oldest, middle, or youngest child. All of the family members force certain behavior patterns upon each other as they interact together. The type of behavior which is forced on each member occurs, in part, because of his position in the family. This behavior pattern continues to influence the individual throughout life.

The notion of differing situations for various ordinal positions is often seen in terms of the parent-child relationship. It has been consistently shown that the parent-child relationship varies when considering different ordinal positions (Schachter, 1959; Lasko, 1952; Hilton, 1967).

Schachter (1959) concluded that the birth of the first-born has greater psychological importance to the parents than do later births. He found that mothers



were undoubtedly more worried and ill at ease with their first child than with their later children. Due to their insecurity, they responded more quickly to the needs of the first-born than they did with later children. They were more likely to use trial and error methods with first-born. When the second or third child was born, the mothers had less time to pay attention to their fears. They were also "more blase" and sophisticated about the business of child rearing" (Schachter, 1959, p. 42) with their later-born children.

Hilton (1967) also found that mothers differed in their interaction with first-born and later-born children. In this study, the children were instructed to work on various puzzles. The mother's behavior toward the child was then observed. It was found that the mothers of first-born were more likely to interfere with the child's activity than were the mothers of later-born. The mothers of first-born showed a high incidence of demonstrated love when their child was doing well and a significant decrease in the incidence of demonstrated love when he was doing poorly. Although the later-borns' mothers were not as extreme in their demonstrated love, they were consistent in their demonstrations regardless of how well the child was performing.

A report from the Fels Research Institute also indicated the differences between parent-child

relationships with first-born and later-born children. "The first child experienced a rather high-pitched relationship with his mother at the beginning which then steadily lessened in intensity" (Lasko, 1952, p. 301). The second child's relationship did not begin as high-pitched and remained stable across time.

Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) addressed the issue of the parent-child relationship in their book, The Sibling. They maintained that the parents of first-born were accustomed to dealing with adults and had a difficult time dealing with an infant. In fact, the parents of first-born often treated the child like an adult. This resulted in the parents having extremely high expectations for their first-born. They did not have such high expectations for their later-born children because they had learned to scale down these expectations by their experiences with the first-born.

Although the parent-child relationship is very influential in determining the effects of each ordinal position, there is another family interaction pattern which must be considered. This factor deals with sibling relationships. While the only child has no siblings, all of the other ordinal positions are affected by their relationships with brothers and sisters.

Forer (1976) discussed a power struggle which occurs in the sibling heirarchy. The first-born is born into

a position where he alone has power with his parents. When a second child is born, however, the first-born suddenly loses power over his parents. Their attention becomes focused on the second child. This is traumatic for the first-born. Since he can no longer have power over his parents, he chooses to have power over the new sibling. Thus, the first-born is often very dominant when dealing with younger siblings.

Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) conducted a study using both college students and children. They found that first-born perceived themselves, and were perceived by later-born, as having power. The first-born commanded, bossed, and scolded the other siblings. The later-born responded to this power struggle by being more externally and directly aggressive. This type of aggression was in contrast to the first-born, who displayed aggression in an adultlike way, such as deflating the younger sibling with verbal criticism.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the influence of birth order on two personality factors. The first of these factors is need for achievement. Need for achievement can be defined as "the disposition to strive for satisfaction derived from success in competition with some standard of excellence" (DeCharms, 1968, p. 165). It must be noted that although a high need for achievement may be developed as a result of external



influences, the actual disposition which motivates achievement is an internalized force (Wrightsmann and Sanford, 1961).

Although the research dealing directly with birth order and need for achievement is limited, there have been a few studies in this area. Schachter (1959) hypothesized that first-borns exhibit greater dependency than later-borns; thus, first-borns should have a lower need for achievement than later-borns. Rosen (1961) predicted the opposite. He based his predictions on the notion that first-borns assume responsibility at an earlier age than later-borns. He made the assumption that greater demands and expectations were placed on the first-born in their school performance. From this he concluded that first-borns had a higher need for achievement than later-borns.

Most of the research tends to support Rosen's prediction. Samson (1962) conducted a study on birth order, need for achievement, and conformity, and found a significant tendency for first-borns to have a higher need for achievement than later-borns. Mukherjee (1968) examined the relationship between birth order and verbalized need for achievement. He found no difference in first-born and later-born. The subjects were then divided into upper, middle, and lower economic classes. The first-borns from the middle class scored significantly

higher on verbalized need for achievement than later-borns. For the upper class group, the relationship was just the opposite. No difference was found in the lower class. This suggests that economic class and birth order may interact in their influence on verbalized need for achievement.

The second personality factor to be considered in this study is internal-external locus of control. Locus of control relates to whether a person feels he is in control of his life or whether he feels controlled by people or things outside of himself. When a reinforcement is perceived by the individual as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, he is said to believe in external control. If an individual perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, he is said to believe in internal control (Rotter, 1966).

The research dealing with birth order and locus of control was characterized by mixed results. Some studies (Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall, 1965; MacDonald, 1971) found a weak tendency for first-born to be more internal than later-born. This result was interpreted as reflecting the early assumption of responsibility expected of first-born.

In contrast, Eswara (1978) found that first-born were more external than middle-born. There were no significant differences found between middle-born and last-born or first-born and last-born. External control in first-born was explained in terms of the inconsistency shown by parents to first-born. Eswara concluded that this inconsistency created dependency which generalized to external forces. Eisenman and Platt (1968) found first-born males to be significantly more external than later-born males. Newhouse (1974) found that only children were more external than first-born or later-born children.

Along with these studies which looked directly at birth order in relation to need for achievement and locus of control, there were some additional studies which applied to this area. Research has uncovered some characteristics related to birth order which may also be linked to need for achievement and locus of control.

One of the consistent findings in the birth order literature dealt with dependency. Sears (1950) described tentative evidence that first-borns were more dependent than later-borns. His evidence was based on ratings and descriptions given by mothers and teachers. Hilton (1967) found that when children working on a puzzle were rated by observers, first-born and only children were rated as significantly more dependent than



were later-born children. First-born were also significantly more likely to ask for help and reassurance when working on the puzzle.

Forer (1976) attributed the dependency of first-borns to their relationship to their parents. The first-born is the only child who has ever had the parents all to himself. This close relationship with the parents results in dependency. As would be expected from the high dependency in first-borns, they also have a high need for approval. First-borns have been found to seek approval of people important to them. Later-born seem less concerned about other people's approval. It has been found that later-borns lose interest in projects if they are given too much approval. In contrast, first-borns thrive on that approval (Forer, 1976).

Locus of control has been attributed to dependency by some researchers. Hilton (1967) discussed the first-born's relationship to his parents. Since this relationship was characterized by a great deal of inconsistency and interference on the part of the parents, the child's opportunities to develop internal reference points were undermined. The lack of internal reference points created dependency and tended to make first-born feel externally controlled. Shore (cited in Lefcourt, 1976) found support for interference by the parents leading to external children in that children who perceived their parents

as having psychological control over them were more external in nature.

Along with exhibiting greater dependency and a higher need for approval, first-borns have also been found to be more conforming than later-borns. When studying only children, Guilford and Worchester (1930) found the only child to be very conforming to law and order. Schachter (1964) found that first-borns in college fraternities and sororities were more easily influenced by social pressures than were later-borns. Chemers (1970) conducted a study focused on birth order and leadership style. He found that first-borns were more responsive to authority and better socialized than later-borns.

Samson (1962) concluded that first-borns were more conforming only when conformity led to reinforcement. He arranged two conditions. In one condition, the subjects were rewarded for conforming and in the second condition there were no rewards used. Samson found that in the no reward condition, first-borns were more resistant to influence than later-borns. In the reward condition, however, first-borns were significantly more conforming.

Need for achievement could be related to birth order findings on conformity, need for approval, and parental expectations. If first-borns have a high need for

approval (Forer, 1976) and a high tendency to conform (Guilford and Worchester, 1930; Schachter, 1964), then one would expect them to comply with parental expectations. Since the parental expectations for first-born are high (McArthur, 1956; Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1970), it could be hypothesized that their need for achievement would be high.

Locus of control has also been examined in relation to conformity. Biondo and MacDonald (1971) found that externals conformed to both subtle and overt influence attempts. Internals reacted against the overt attempts and were not responsive to subtle influence attempts. Ritchie and Phares (1969) examined attitude change as a function of locus of control and the status of the communicator. Externals conformed more than internals when both groups received the high-prestige appeal. These findings could be tentatively related to first-born's high tendency to conform (Samson, 1962; Schachter, 1964).

Another rather consistent finding in birth order research was that first-borns were considered more responsible than later-borns. Samson (1962) found that first-born females were given responsibility at an earlier age than later-born children. The first-born was encouraged, at a young age, to help around the house and to help with the care of younger siblings. In another



study, MacDonald (1971) found that only children and first-borns were more socially responsible than later-borns. Bossard and Boll (1955), in a study on the personality roles in a large family, found that the children most often identified as the responsible types were the oldest children of their sex.

McArthur (1956) found that the first-born was more adult-oriented and conscientious when compared to the later-born child. He explained this in terms of the more demanding training given to the first child. This responsibility carried over into adult life in that first-born adults favored an earlier assumption of responsibility for their children than did later-born (Harris and Howard, 1968).

Responsible behavior has been shown to relate to need for achievement. Winterbottom (cited in Atkinson and Feather, 1966) found that mothers with boys who had a high need for achievement appeared to stress an early assumption for responsibility. They also provided stronger rewards for accomplishment than did mothers of boys who had a lower need for achievement. As has been previously discussed, mothers of first-born were more likely to exhibit these characteristics than mothers of later-born (Samson, 1962; Hilton, 1967).

One of the most consistent and well known findings in birth order research deals with first-born eminence



and educational attainment. Ellis (1926) published A Study of British Genius in which he found that the probability for a first-born child to be among the eminent and genius was much greater than for any other ordinal position. Altus (1966) conducted a three-year study at the University of California at Santa Barbara and concluded that over 60% of the students entering the school during that period were first-born. If the proportions were based on the proportion of first-born in the general population, only one-third of the students would be expected to be first-born (Warren, 1966).

Forer (1969) pointed to the close relationship between the parents and their first child as having been advantageous to the child's academic success. There existed more verbal communication between parents and their one child than between parents and each of their later children. First-born, thus, developed stronger verbal skills than did later-born. Forer concluded that these verbal skills played an advantageous role in the first-born's academic achievement.

Academic achievement in first-borns (Altus, 1966; Warren, 1966) could be related to need for achievement and locus of control. Atkinson and Feather (1966) found that subjects with a high need for achievement were twice as likely to enter college as subjects with a low need for achievement. They were also two-and-a-half times

as likely to have graduated as someone with a low need for achievement. Shultz and Pomerantz (1974) found that a high need for achievement was significantly related to college grade point average.

Lefcourt (1972) discussed the relationship between academic achievement and locus of control. He concluded that an overwhelming majority of studies support a positive relationship between academic achievement and internal control. This evidence was found despite the use of a wide range of measuring devices and, in many cases, the partialling out of IQ scores. In contrast to the findings on conformity, these findings, if examined in light of the birth order research, would point to first-borns being internally controlled.

In addition to research relating birth order to need for achievement and locus of control, there has been some research linking need for achievement to locus of control. Common sense suggests that a belief in the contingency between one's efforts and outcomes should precede any achievement striving (Lefcourt, 1976). Shultz and Pomerantz (1974) found support for the relationship between need for achievement and locus of control. They found a highly significant correlation between Hermans' (1970) Prestatie Motivatie Test and internal locus of control. Chan (1978) also pointed to this correlation when examining the implications of research

for the educational psychologist.

In summary, the present study will examine the effects of birth order on need for achievement and locus of control. It is hypothesized that only and oldest children will have a higher need for achievement than will middle and youngest children. In light of the conflicting research involving locus of control and birth order, it is hypothesized that there is no difference between only, oldest, middle, and youngest children when examining locus of control.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### Subjects

The subjects in this study were 246 juniors from Clarksville High School in Clarksville, Tennessee. Since all juniors are required to take American History, the subjects were taken from the American History classes. The sample was composed of 120 males and 126 females. The age range of the sample was 16 to 18 years old.

The subjects were divided into four groups according to their ordinal position. The sample included 11 only children, 60 oldest children, 95 middle children, and 80 youngest children.

#### Description of the Instrument

The instrument used was a questionnaire entitled "Opinions Toward Work, Study, and People." All of the items were multiple-choice with the possible answers ranging from two to five. The questionnaire was composed of three sections.

The first section consisted of four questions. These questions were designed to determine the subject's grade level, sex, age, and ordinal position.

The second section of the instrument was designed to measure need for achievement. This part of the



questionnaire was taken from a survey developed by Hermans (1970) called the Prestatie Motivatie Test. This survey consists of 29 questions and is based upon ten aspects of the achievement motive derived from a review of the related literature. Vocabulary modifications were made on four of the items in order to make them understandable to high school juniors. Verb tense changes were also made on some of the questions.

The third section of the instrument was Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Scale. This is a forced-choice scale with 29 items, six of which are fillers. The subject is asked to read a pair of statements and then indicate with which of the two statements he more strongly agrees (Rotter, 1971).

#### Administration and Scoring

The questionnaire was administered in a lecture room at Clarksville High School. The number of students in the lecture room during each class period ranged from 36 to 64. There was no time limit; however, all of the students finished within the 55 minute class period.

Before the questionnaires were distributed, the subjects were told not to put their names on the surveys. The importance of being completely honest in their responses and of answering all of the questions was also emphasized to the subjects. The surveys were then distributed with

the instructions included. The subjects were asked to read the directions and answer the questions. Following administration, the surveys were hand scored by this researcher.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

An analysis of variance was used in order to determine the relationship of birth order to need for achievement and locus of control. As indicated in Table 1, the results revealed a significant relationship between birth order and need for achievement. No significant relationship was found between birth order and locus of control (as shown in Table 2).

In order to determine the differences between the individual ordinal positions on need for achievement, a Newman-Keuls Studentized Range Test was used. The means and standard deviations for each ordinal position are shown in Table 3. As shown in Table 4, a significant difference at the .005 level was found between only children and each of the other ordinal positions. No other significant differences were found between the various ordinal positions when looking at need for achievement.

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

The data presented in this study partially support the hypothesis dealing with need for achievement. In this sample, it was found that only children had a significantly higher need for achievement than children in any other ordinal position. However, this high need for achievement was not found in oldest children.

These results may be attributable to several factors. One possible explanation for the high need for achievement found in only children deals with the adult orientation the only child experiences. The only child has no peers in his immediate family; thus, he becomes directed early in life toward adult ways and adult activities. Guilford and Worchester (1930) found that only children develop conversational abilities, high IQ's, and personality traits that are valued by adults. This early adult orientation could result in a strong achievement motivation.

A second factor which could be used to explain high need for achievement in only children relates to their self-confidence level. Only children grow up in an environment free from competition. They have no siblings with whom to compare themselves. They are given a great deal of parental attention and are often



led to believe that they can do anything (Forer, 1977). This results in a high degree of self-confidence in only children. If the only child has a great deal of self-confidence and is continually praised for his success, he is likely to develop a high need for achievement.

Parental expectations for only children also must be considered a factor in need for achievement. Although parental expectations are high for the oldest child, they are even higher for the only child. Parents of only children often want them to reach heights of achievement that meet parental ambitions that were not achievable by the parents themselves (Forer, 1969). These parental expectations might lead to the development of a high need for achievement in the child.

A fourth factor which must be considered is the economic status of the one-child family. Bonney (1944) found that parents of only children are likely to have a better economic status and a higher social status than parents of larger families. It would be reasonable to assume that the availability of resources which can facilitate achievement would increase achievement motivation. Thus, the economic advantage of only children probably plays a role in their high achievement motivation.

The data from this study supported the null hypothesis relating to locus of control; there is no significant difference in ordinal positions when examining internal-

external locus of control. This finding is in opposition to some of the previous research in this area. It may be that some of the studies relating birth order to locus of control may actually be measuring some other variable. For example, Hilton (1967) concluded that interference and inconsistency on the part of mothers of first-born would prevent the child from developing internal reference points. It could be that this lack of internal reference points may be attributable to factors other than birth order.

The results supporting the null hypothesis may be attributable to the large and varied sample used in this investigation. The influences of intervening variables, such as gender, race, socio-economic level, and family background were broadly distributed in this sample. Studies which have found a significant relationship between birth order and locus of control have selected samples which were more restrictive on these variables.

In conclusion, this study has attempted to determine how birth order influences need for achievement and locus of control. The evidence leads to the conclusion that only children have a significantly higher need for achievement than any other ordinal position. No conclusions can be drawn about locus of control and birth order based on the evidence in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, B. N. Birth order: a critical review.  
Sociometry, 1972, 35, 411-439.
- Altus, W. D. Birth order and its sequelae. Science,  
1966, 151, 44-48.
- Ansbacher, H. L. The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Atkinson, J. W., & Feather, N.T. (Eds.). A theory of achievement motivation. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- Biondo, J., & MacDonald, A. P. Internal-external locus of control and response to influence attempts.  
Journal of Personality, 1971, 39, 407-419.
- Bonney, M. E. Relationships between social success, family size, socio-economic home background, and intelligence among school children in grades 3 to 5. Sociometry, 1944, 7, 26-39.
- Bossard, J. H. S., & Boll, E. S. Personality roles in the large family. Child Development, 1955, 26, 71-78.
- Chan, K. S. Locus of control and achievement motivation: critical factors in educational psychology.  
Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 104-110.
- Chemers, M. M. The relationship between birth order and leadership style. Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 80, 243-244.



Crandall, V. C., Katkovsky, W., & Crandall, V. J.

Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.

DeCharms, R. Personal causation: the internal affective determinants of behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Eisenman, R., & Platt, J. J. Birth order and sex differences in academic achievement and internal-external control. Journal of General Psychology, 1968, 78, 279-285.

Ellis, H. A study of British genius. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1926.

Eswara, H. S. Birth order and internal-external locus of control. Journal of Social Psychology, 1978, 104, 145-146.

Forer, L. K. Birth order and life roles. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.

Forer, L. K. Birth order and personality. Psychology Today, Tape 80. New York: Ziff-Davis Publishing Co., 1977.

Forer, L. K. The birth order factor. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1976.

Guilford, R. B., & Worchester, D. A. A comparative study of the only and non-only child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1930, 38, 411-426.



- Harris, I. D., & Howard, K. I. Birth order and responsibility. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30, 427-432.
- Hermans, H. J. M. A questionnaire measure of achievement motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 353-363.
- Hilton, I. Differences in the behavior of mothers toward first and later-born children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 282-290.
- Lasko, J. K. Parent-child relationships: Report from Fels Research Institute. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1952, 22, 300-304.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control - Current trends in theory and research. Hilldale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1976.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- MacDonald, A. P. Birth order and personality. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 171-176.
- McArthur, C. Personalities of first and second children. Psychiatry, 1956, 19, 47-54.

- Mukherjee, B. N. Birth order and verbalized need for achievement. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 75, 223-229.
- Newhouse, R. C. Reinforcement-responsibility differences in birth order, grade level, and sex of children in grades 4, 5, and 6. Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, 699-705.
- Ritchie, E., & Phares, J. E. Attitude change as a function of internal-external control and communicator status. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 429-443.
- Roberts, C. S. Ordinal position and its relationship to some personality aspects. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1938, 53, 173-213.
- Rosen, B. C. Family structure and achievement motivation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 574-585.
- Rotter, J. B. External control and internal control. Psychology Today, 1971, 5, 37-59.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, No. 1 (Whole No. 609).
- Samson, E. E. Birth order, need achievement, and conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 155-159.
- Schachter, S. Birth order and sociometric choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 453-456.

Schachter, S. The psychology of affiliation. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Sears, R. R. Ordinal position in the family as a psychological variable. American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 397-401.

Shultz, C. B., & Pomerantz, M. Some problems in the application of achievement motivation to education: the assessment of motive to succeed and probability of success. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 599-608.

Sutton-Smith, B., & Rosenberg, B. G. The sibling. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Toman, W. Family constellation. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1961.

Warren, J. R. Birth order and social behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 38-49.

Wrightsman, L., & Sanford, F. H. Psychology: a scientific study of human behavior. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks Cole Publishing Co., 1961.

## APPENDIX A: TABLES



Table 1 - Summary of Analysis of Variance with  
Birth Order and Need for Achievement

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH  
BIRTH ORDER AND NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT

---

---

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Total	33,447.83	245			
Within	32,152.72	241	133.42		
Between	1,295.11	3	431.70	3.25	.02

---

Table 2 - Summary of Analysis of Variance with  
Birth Order and Locus of Control

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH  
BIRTH ORDER AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

---

---

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Total	2,444.81	245			
Within	2,426.52	241	10.01		
Between	18.29	3	6.10	.608	.61

---



Table 3 - Means and Standard Deviations of Need for  
Achievement Scores for Each Ordinal Position

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF NEED FOR  
ACHIEVEMENT SCORES FOR EACH ORDINAL POSITION

---

---

Birth Order	Mean	SD
Oldest	68.7	10.92
Middle	71.2	11.23
Youngest	69.15	11.02
Only	79.64	17.31

---

Table 4 - Results of Newman-Keuls Analysis with  
Each Ordinal Position on Need for Achievement

RESULTS OF NEWMAN-KEULS ANALYSIS WITH  
EACH ORDINAL POSITION ON NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT

---

---

	N-K
Oldest and Middle	1.20
Oldest and Youngest	.22
Oldest and Only	5.23 *
Middle and Youngest	.98
Middle and Only	4.04 *
Youngest and Only	5.02 *

---

\* Significant beyond the .005 level



APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

## OPINIONS TOWARD WORK, STUDY, AND PEOPLE

This questionnaire is designed to give you an opportunity to indicate your opinions relative to work, school, and certain people. Please answer each question or statement with the one best answer which describes your opinion.

1. What grade are you in?
  - a. 10th
  - b. 11th
  - c. 12th
2. What is your sex?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
3. How old are you?
  - a. 16
  - b. 17
  - c. 18
  - d. 19
4. Which of the following descriptions fits you?
  - a. I have no brothers or sisters.
  - b. I have at least one brother or sister who is older than I but none who are younger than I.
  - c. I have at least one brother or sister who is younger than I but none who are older than I.
  - d. I have brothers and sisters who are older and younger than I.
5. Working is something:
  - a. I would rather not do.
  - b. I don't like doing very much.
  - c. I would rather do now and then.
  - d. I like doing.
  - e. I like doing very much.

6. At school, people think I am:
  - a. very industrious.
  - b. industrious.
  - c. not always so industrious.
  - d. rather easy-going.
  - e. very easy-going.
7. Other people think I:
  - a. work very hard.
  - b. work hard.
  - c. work pretty hard.
  - d. do not work very hard.
  - e. do not work hard.
8. To prepare yourself a long time for an important task:
  - a. really is senseless.
  - b. often is rather rash.
  - c. can often be useful.
  - d. testifies to a sense of reality.
  - e. is necessary to succeed.
9. When I am working, the demands I make upon myself are:
  - a. very high.
  - b. high.
  - c. pretty high.
  - d. not so high.
  - e. low.
  - f. very low.
10. When the teacher gives lessons at school:
  - a. I usually set my heart on doing my best and making a favorable impression.
  - b. I usually pay great attention to the things being said.
  - c. my thoughts often stray to other things.
  - d. I am more interested in things that have nothing to do with school.
11. I usually do:
  - a. much more than I set out to do.
  - b. a bit more than I set out to do.
  - c. a little more than I set out to do.
  - d. much less than I set out to do.

12. If I have not reached my goal and have not done a task well then:
- I continue to do my best to reach the goal.
  - I exert myself once again to reach the goal.
  - I find it difficult to not lose heart.
  - I am inclined to give up.
  - I usually give up.
13. At high school, I think the ability to stick with a task until it is completed is:
- very unimportant.
  - rather unimportant.
  - important.
  - very important.
14. To begin with homework is:
- a very great effort.
  - a great effort.
  - a rather great effort.
  - not much effort.
  - very little effort.
15. In high school, the standards I set for myself with regard to my studies are:
- very high.
  - average.
  - low.
  - very low.
16. If I am called from my homework to watch television or listen to the radio, then afterward:
- I always go straight back to work.
  - I will only take a short pause and then go back to work.
  - I will always wait a little before starting back.
  - I will find it very difficult to begin again.
17. Work that requires great responsibility:
- I would like to do very much.
  - I would only do if I was paid well.
  - I don't think I would be capable of doing.
  - is completely unattractive to me.



18. I would find a life in which one wouldn't have to do work at all:
- ideal.
  - very pleasant.
  - pleasant.
  - unpleasant.
  - very unpleasant.
19. I think to attain a high position in society is:
- unimportant.
  - of little importance.
  - not so important.
  - rather important.
  - very important.
20. When doing something difficult:
- I give it up very quickly.
  - I give it up quickly.
  - I give it up rather quickly.
  - I don't give it up too soon.
  - I usually see it through.
21. In general I am:
- very strongly future-oriented.
  - strongly future-oriented.
  - not so strongly future-oriented.
  - not at all future-oriented.
22. At school, I find classmates who study very hard:
- very nice.
  - nice.
  - just as nice as others who didn't work as hard.
  - not nice.
  - not nice at all.
23. At school, I admire persons who reach a very high position in life:
- very much.
  - much.
  - little.
  - not at all.

24. For life's extra pleasures:
- a. I usually have no time.
  - b. I often have no time.
  - c. I sometimes have too little time.
  - d. I usually have enough time.
  - e. I always have time.
25. I usually am:
- a. very busy.
  - b. busy.
  - c. not so busy.
  - d. not busy.
  - e. not busy at all.
26. I can work at something without getting tired for:
- a. a very long time.
  - b. a long time.
  - c. not too long a time.
  - d. only a short time.
  - e. only a very short time.
27. Good relations with my teachers in high school:
- a. are appreciated very much.
  - b. are appreciated.
  - c. are thought not to be so important.
  - d. are thought to be exaggerated in value.
  - e. are thought to be completely unimportant.
28. Boys succeed their father as manager of the business because:
- a. they want to enlarge and extend the business.
  - b. they are lucky their father is manager.
  - c. they can put their new views into practice.
  - d. this is the easiest way to earn a lot of money.
29. I am:
- a. extremely ambitious.
  - b. very ambitious.
  - c. not so ambitious.
  - d. a little ambitious.
  - e. hardly ambitious at all.

30. Organizing is something:

- a. I like doing very much.
- b. I like doing.
- c. I do not like doing very much.
- d. I do not like doing at all.

31. When I begin something I:

- a. never carry it to a successful conclusion.
- b. seldom carry it to a successful conclusion.
- c. sometimes carry it to a successful conclusion.
- d. usually carry it to a successful conclusion.
- e. always carry it to a successful conclusion.

32. I am:

- a. very often bored.
- b. often bored.
- c. sometimes bored.
- d. hardly ever bored.
- e. never bored.

33. Shopping is something:

- a. I like very much.
- b. I like.
- c. I do not like.
- d. I hate.

For the remainder of the items, select the statement which you most agree with. Select only one statement from each pair.

- 34.
  - a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
  - b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy on them.
- 35.
  - a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
  - b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- 36.
  - a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people do not take enough interest in politics.
  - b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

37. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.  
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
38. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.  
b. Most students do not realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
39. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.  
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
40. a. No matter how hard you try some people just do not like you.  
b. People who cannot get others to like them do not understand how to get along with others.
41. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.  
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.
42. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.  
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
43. a. In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test.  
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
44. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
45. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.  
b. This world is run by the few people in power and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
46. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.  
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.



47. a. There are certain people who are just no good.  
b. There is some good in everybody.
48. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.  
b. Many times we might as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
49. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.  
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
50. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand or control.  
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.
51. a. Most people do not realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.  
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."
52. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.  
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
53. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.  
b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.
54. a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good things.  
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
55. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.  
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
56. a. Sometimes I cannot understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.  
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
57. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.  
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

- 58. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.  
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 59. a. People are lonely because they do not try to be friendly.  
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.
- 60. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.  
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 61. a. What happens to me is my own doing.  
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 62. a. Most of the time I cannot understand why politicians behave the way they do.  
b. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.