



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 15, 2021

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

Fear of Success Is Everywhere: Fake or Real?

Agus Robi Widiyansa¹, Dwinto Martri Aji Buana²

^{1,2} Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Economics,
Widyatama University, Bandung – Indonesia
robi.widiyansa@widyatama.ac.id¹, dwinto.martri@widyatama.ac.id²

Abstract. Every human has what it takes to get past whatever they are going through if they decide to push through it. Tragedy and trials come to everybody. Only the strong can survive because the journey to our dreams always starts from within. Engle (2003) says that fear of success is a condition when a person gets fear of disruption of its ability to complete a task or job that is challenging. The next dimension is not only looking at fear of success, but elaborate on the negative effect, field of research, and decision-maker participation against the fear of success. The purpose of this study was to assess fear of success whether it occurs in various places, fields, and also in each individual. This research method is a review of various previous literature studies. The results showed that fear of success occurred in various places, fields, and identified in various individuals. Several suggestions and managerial implications are also put forward at the end of this paper. Originality for this paper analyzes the literature on fear of success from the point of view of various contexts, and the paper type in the preparation of this study is in the form of a literature review.

Keywords. Fear of Success, Gender, Motivation, Intrapersonal Factor, Interpersonal Factor

1. Introduction

Research on fear of success (FOS) has been the focus of attention in recent decades (Canavan, 1989). The theory of FOS was introduced by Horner about women's fear of participating in competition because success will have negative consequences for loss of femininity, social self-esteem, and social rejection. Recently, the idea of fear of success introduced by Horner was designated as material for systematic research in various scientific works and needs to be further developed with a more detailed measurement instrument to clearly describe FOS (Canavan, 1989). Horner's FOS research has received increasing attention from various researchers with more than 280 citations for the years 1969 - 1977 (Webb Collins & Eggleton, 1980). This shows that FOS is increasingly becoming a prominent topic and needs attention until now.

FOS is a phenomenon that always occurs around us, and many researchers have focused on two types of problems, namely measurement, and explanation (Hyland et al., 1985). However, there are very limited studies that ask how people are when they experience FOS (Canavan, 1989). The problem of FOS must be a sufficient focus of attention for various organizational leaders because the factors that influence FOS will always exist in the reality of life, the most important point is how to think and point of view these obstacles in order to be able to prepare and bring to the next level of skill that is much stronger and better.

To foster a strong determination so as to be able to achieve the success of researchers in this case, they chose to make a paper related to FOS and present the future agenda for these problems. Indeed, that obstacle moves the needle of life, no matter what happens, we must still have a strong reason to keep going until success arrives because success is a process.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition

The definition of fear of success was introduced by some researchers such as Horner (1970) fear of success especially in women is situations of achievement competition that will bring unpleasant consequences such as loss of femininity, loss of social self-esteem and social rejection. Engle (2003) says that fear of success is a condition when a person gets fear of disruption of its ability to complete a task or job that is challenging. Paludi (1984) The fear of success is simple needs to avoid success, because that success will bring changes to the challenges and responsibilities that will be negatively impacted.

It can be concluded that fear of success is a paradigm that a person has for success with negative consequences if it is achieved. These negative effects can include a variety of phenomena and are difficult to understand such as social rejection, loss of femininity, reduced leisure time, and responsibility beyond the means. This fear of success is not synonymous with the desire to fail.

2.2 Research Field

The field of FOS research occurred in various countries including: Indonesia by (Komalasari et al., 2017), (Ramadhani & Fakhurrozi, 2019), (Triyani et al., 2017). England by (Hyland et al., 1985). Australia by (Burt, 1987), (Ray, 1985), (Leder, 1988), (Orpen, 1989). Romania by (Stanculescu, 2013). Canada by (Goh & Mealiea, 1984). United States such as by (Zuckerman et al., 1980), (Hoffman, 1977), (Macdonald & Hyde, 1980), (Larkin, 1987), (Metzler & Conroy, 2009), (Zuckerman & Allison, 1976), (Griffore, 1977), (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975), (Olsen & Willemsen, 1978), (Piedmont, 1988).

Meanwhile, in the gender context, many researchers have tried to explore whether there is a difference in FOS between men and women. Several researchers who examined FOS from the context of female gender include: (Peplau, 1976), (Konstam, 1978). Furthermore, FOS research in the context male and female gender such as: by (Monahan et al., 1974), (Hoffman, 1977), (Burt, 1987), (Macdonald & Hyde, 1980), (Larkin, 1987), (Zuckerman & Allison, 1976), (Rothman, 1996).

Research on FOS related to (i) the age has been conducted by researchers such as (Condry & Dyer, 1976) and (Ivers & Downes, 2011). In addition, FOS research from a profession related to the (ii) profession by (Wood & Greenfeld, 1976), and (Fried-Buchalter Boca Raton, 1997). FOS research has also been carried out in the field of (iii) sports by (Metzler & Conroy, 2009). In the (iv) another field research, FOS has previously been conducted by various researchers such as: (Stanculescu, 2013), (Larkin, 1987), (Griffore, 1977), (Olsen & Willemsen, 1978), (Pappo, 1983), (Engle, 2003), (Gore et al., 2016), (Rothman, 1996), (Lew et al., 1998), (Daniels et al., 1981), (Orpen, 1989), (Santucci et al., 1989), (Illfelder, 1980) and (Orlofsky, 1978).

2.3. Operationalisation and Measurement or Dimension

The large number of factors that influence FOS as well as their scope that is difficult to understand both from an interpersonal and intrapersonal perspective results in an imbalance related to these issues that are repeatedly raised by FOS researchers. In this case, the researcher tries to review the FOS measurement from previous research as well as the latest developments

in various dimensions. Many investigations related to FOS issues are raised based on the personal experience, intuition, feelings, and values of the researcher (Shaver, 1976).

Basically, there are two main causes of FOS, namely neurotics, which were first recorded in the psychoanalytic literature by Freud (1915/1959), and then a socio-psychological perspective, it is more directed to the conscious mind condition motive between competing contemporary motives so that it becomes the main cause of fear of success. Thus both of these are very effective for measuring FOS because they use a person's situation model to predict the conditions in which individuals identified with FOS will be involved in anxiety or even avoiding success (Canavan, 1989).

It is important to revisit FOS measurements as they have been largely devised as improvements to Horner's (1968) projective. Horner realized that his own measurements were insufficient and thus developed what he believed to be a more general measure (Horner et al., 1973). There is so much that must be done before we can understand what each one measures and whether it is related to one another (Shaver, 1976).

In Haimowitz and Haimowitz's (1966) study, they used FOS measures using anecdotal evidence of cultural and neurotic factors. The FOS measure has not been used in subsequent studies, and almost nothing is known about its psychological psychometric sequences. The results of his research indicate that it is difficult to find a group of people in any period where FOS does not exist.

Homer's Original Measurement FOS uses projective measurements of its research subjects. This measurement has been discussed quite completely in research conducted by (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975). The results of his research conclusions suggest that it is difficult to assess and delay retesting. Then Spence's Objectively Scored Version of Homer's Original Measurement, in its measurement using a series of closed multiple-choice questions asking the reality of situations and conditions at the time of achieving success after completing each story (following Anne's story in medical school) (Spence, 1974). The results of the conclusions of his research state that using these measurements, it turns out that FOS can be assessed objectively and easily to determine which negative consequences affect the success of the subject and the factors that influence it can be measured.

Several years later, after his first research, Horner conducted another study with his friends to measure FOS using Horner's Empirically Derived Measurement method. Horner et al (1973) used a less specific multi-item projective measure to test their research subjects, on this occasion the test was used to measure performance in multiple regression analysis scores. The results of the conclusions may only be suitable for female subjects, have not been cross-validated and some of the categories appear arbitrary (Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975). The old and new instruments used by Horner likely used slightly different constructs (Shaver, 1976). Pappo's Questionnaire Measurement in his research uses a closed questionnaire measurement, and material related to sex roles is deliberately avoided. Basic questions for the questionnaire given to research subjects based on clinical writing and intuition. The conclusion is that FOS is an unconscious fear that is formed since childhood, in this case, the cause of FOS is not necessarily due to the negative objectivity of success, such as jealous friends, social rejection, or loss of femininity.

Then based on Zuckerman and Allison's Questionnaire Measurement, the conclusions stated that Zuckerman and Allison (in press) had designed an objectively assessed questionnaire measure about FOS and agreed with most of Horner's concepts unlike the FOS measurements made by Pappo and Cohen. Thus, in this case, the use of FOS measures for future research is expected to solve the inconsistency of the instrument because the factors affecting it are wide and difficult to understand, as implied in previous studies. so it is necessary to make prior

observations of the research subject both from an intrapersonal and interpersonal point of view which will influence it before establishing an appropriate basis for FOS measurement. Better measurement and a broader view of FOS is a good thing and needs to be developed towards the conceptualization of the problems involved, it doesn't mean that FOS problems are trivial and worthless because their negative effects can erode success even after achieving them.

3. Discussion and Result

The two lines of thought seen in FOS research are also sources that influence the emergence of FOS, the first of which is known as neurotic FOS. This syndrome is unconscious and irrational, so the consequences are strong and quite predictable. The second line of research is FOS which is influenced by interpersonal factors or simply it will be called FOS only. This research was initiated in the field of social psychology by Horner in 1968 (Canavan, 1989).

Basically, people who identify with the FOS focus more on the sacrifices and costs to achieve success than on rewards for success. In Donnah Canavan's (1989) self-defeating behavior literature there are two main sources of fear of success. The first is called neurotic fear of success, first recorded in the psychoanalytic literature by Freud (1915/1959). The formation of a neurotic fear of success is in the subconscious state of the human brain, while for the socio-psychological understanding it is more directed to the motive of the conscious mind condition between competing contemporary motives.

Neurotic fear of success can be seen from its formation in early childhood where the critical factor in the human brain has not yet been formed, that is, it only receives information from the surrounding environment to be used as a program in its mind. The difference is that people who are not identified are afraid of being successful, believe in themselves, because what they believe in will come true, and become a program in their subconscious mind. They may be the same person but the fear is not the same. Then in a social psychological perspective, it emerges through learning or experience which is the main cause of FOS.

A research program related to neurotic FOS was initiated and can be seen in more detail in the research work of Pappo (1972) and Cohen (1974). The empirical study of a neurotic fear of success began when Pappo created a questionnaire containing 83 items in the form of yes or no to measure fear of success. Pappo explained that they have characteristics such as low self-esteem, preoccupation with evaluations, preoccupation with the competition, denial of self-competence, tendency to sabotage success.

From a social psychological perspective, Horner revealed that fear of success, especially in women, consists of three dimensions, the first, Loss of femininity, which is fear that comes from their perception of the achievements they will get in the traditionally male domain. Women experience many conflicts when their competence conflicts with gender roles that are internalized to stereotypes. They believe that women who succeed in traditionally masculine fields will face many difficulties, but it is not impossible. Second, loss of social self-esteem is a society's point of view that a successful woman's self-esteem will decrease or even disappear because it does not display feminine traits. Third, social rejection is the lack of participation of women in group success and less favored by their friends, both men, and women, so that overall they get social rejection.

Horner's idea was very precise at that time so that it resulted in many researchers researching the same matter including controversial research such as Canavan-Gumpert, Garner, and Gumpert (1978) stating that men were as afraid as women and it was not a typical feminine trait. As quoted in the journal Ray, Burt (1987), although men and women are different psychologically, the difference is not too much. Harlock (1994: 231) argues that achievement and fear of being successful are not characteristics of men. If a man develops a fear of success

then this is due to repeated failures in his past activities, thereby reducing his confidence and giving rise to the notion that he does not have a certain ability to succeed.

Quoted in the literature of self-defeating behaviors Donnah Canavan (1989), Leonardo Da Vinci, Beethoven, current celebrity figures to Prophet Musa A. S. The fear of success is a real thing and is everywhere. Although the dilemma is difficult to describe, as some people claim that they have been crushed by success. Everything that happens is sometimes not what we think, in the end, there is stimulation to repeat past events and become a clue as to a principle in him.

The human soul has various uniqueness, one of which is the ambivalence assumption about success in the maximum satisfaction they want to get. Furthermore, a person's needs must exceed their grasp, when we understand everyone's subconscious assumptions, their behavior is not only reasonable but we can direct and stimulate his happiness and hopes of success. In *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, Horney (1937) describes FOS from an American cultural perspective and an early childhood experience point of view. Three strong assumptions describe the American capital personality suffering from the neurotic fear of FOS. First, it explains that there are two categories of people who are winners and losers. Then the second is to determine a person's fate then that person must compete to find out where they fall in success or failure. The third is that people should be humble, self-denying, and kind to others. Those with an identified fear of success are not only less capable, less hardworking, on the other hand, but they are also more likely to be jealous and vindictive of winners. So they have to be clever and find out where and in what areas they will be the winners and where they will fall in the losers series. Rothman (1996), who showed that female managers facing more fear of success than male, because of the impacts of gender role stereotypes. They include people who fear success from a situational perspective into people who fail. Thus, people who identify with a fear of success are ambivalently associated with failure and, without realizing it, seem to move away from failure but are drifting towards success. In the same way, like a hungry mouse in a laboratory, stay away from cheese because there is an electric shock only at some point where it then suppresses its success.

Horney says that an individual who is struggling to find a self-concept that is socially valued is highly dependent on changing competitive achievement at both the cultural and family level. As a result, some people turned to avoid him while others approached him but with caution. The main difference is that success symbolizes independence whereas fear of success sabotages oneself intending to lose success in the interests of avoiding neglect and restoring security. Fearers of success like most other people who have a strong desire to succeed, anticipate that success even though they know that success will be satisfying but when they get closer they are now under the influence of their subconscious to avoid success. Usually, they experience anxiety, impaired concentration, and often sabotage their success.

The goals of the cowards of success are usually conventional sabotage such as those of scholasticism, work, and romance. Apart from that, they can also include athletic, artistic, hedonistic, or acquisition goals. Thus these timid successes can be found anywhere, such as football matches, singing contests, gambling, politics, and even in love. They must have chosen the goal they wanted and wanted to have but suddenly sabotaged it all the closer they got. It is true that in reality success is preceded by other people, criticized, and sometimes even prevented. This disturbing behavior is seen as competition and a test of merit in gaining success, without it all the weak and lazy people can be successful. Here we see that while the cowardly success feels anxious in evaluation, energy is used for very different uses depending on when it implies success or otherwise failure is a threat to him.

Canavan (1989) managed to find conditions in which cowardly success can succeed without sabotaging his success. Since competition and evaluation are so prominent in the dynamics of the cowardice of success, active manipulation is needed to counter their fears. People who fear their success lead quite complex intrapersonal emotional lives. However, in the cooperative condition, the team turns out to be the better the performance of the timid success, because in the cooperative condition the fear of being successful is neutralized by the structure of the cooperation so that the motive for performing well is not burdened by fear.

Schmid (1987) states "What is the active ingredient in the collaboration that enables cowardly successes to do well?" There are two possibilities the first is the success of each member in contributing to the success of the group so that members have no reason to react negatively with rejection or retaliation to the success achieved. Thus the fear of success is not activated, the more cooperative the group, the more it will be. The second possibility is in cooperative cooperation the members like each other whereas in a competitive group the members do not like or envy each other so that it is proportional to the success rate of the offender.

What Schmid found as a whole was that the cowardly success had a good performance as the main effect of the like variable and the cooperation variable, but the like variable was stronger than the cooperation variable and the strongest was the combination of the two, the like variable plus the cooperation variable. Besides, the Schmid study leads to another speculation that cowards of success seek the right level of success, such as a good mother is not just an end in itself but rather a prerequisite for the independence of her child. Ivers and Downes (2011) considered that children perceive achieved success as a phenomenon whose direct consequences are alienation and isolation. Being successful signifies, in fact, the possibility of being the target for hostile and envious peers. Sense of belonging is threatened by the expectation of a loss of connection. People who are identified as not cowardly of success carry a sense of security and liking by not being influenced by the variables of liking or cooperation, they are motivated to perform better by manipulating success.

The next important question is whether the variable like and cooperation is the goal itself for the timid of success with the assumption that they do it all to be liked? Is it a protective step along the way to further attainment of success? Like the question, does it preferably provide some kind of protection against retaliation and rejection which in turn provides room for the emergence of independent and perhaps even competitive achievement motivation? The cowards of success do not crave affiliation but are quite afraid of rejection, they think more about their own performance than the performance of group members. It seems very likely that in liking and co-operation, the cowardly success finds permission and protection to develop further independence rather than the goal of affiliation for his own sake.

The cowards of success don't realize that they have control over them and have made an investment worthwhile in achieving success. Their problems revolve around feelings of low self-esteem and unstable self-esteem, a strong need for achievement as opposed to an unstable motivation for achievement (Canavan, 1989). That a measure cannot predict fear of success and fear of failure puts research requirements on how people can be, rather than asking how it is that they are.

Makosky (1972) found that high FOS women considered themselves more feminine than low FOS women and considered family life more important than careers. Their problems revolve around feelings of inferiority and unstable self-esteem, a strong need for achievement and an unstable conflicting motivation for achievement. (Canavan-Gumpert et al., 1978). That a measure cannot predict fear of success and fear of failure puts research requirements on how people can be, rather than asking how it is that they are. (Gumpert et al., 1978)

The cowards of success always hesitate and conflict with their motives, wavering in their behavior towards and then away from success. Where the avoidance of success can only be achieved by failure. Confusion swings between failure and success without being able to accept both. So the reward strategy characteristic of success has the opposite effect for the timid of success.

4. Conclusion

Based on various previous studies on fear of success, it can be concluded that from children to adults, both men and women who have identified a fear of success, sabotage their own success that will happen. In various applied fields such as schools, universities, athletics, female police officers, civil servants, they show anxiety, doubt, and indecisive behavior. A supportive environment and culture seem to be able to reduce the fear of success, allowing them to perform well and perform well. In addition, cooperation and group acceptance of the point of view of success itself are important factors in the psychological condition and motivation of the person to achieve success.

The most important part of the fear of success lies in the achievement motivation of each individual. Sometimes the fear they experience is much bigger than what actually happened. Doing so directly overcomes insecurity, loss of self-esteem, and underlying anxiety. Ambivalence about achieving success should be reflected through achievement motivation which is the basic form of the conceptualization of true success so as to obtain a stable and positive sense of self.

Suggestion, Managerial Implication and Future Agenda

The suggestion from this research is how the surrounding environment and culture can provide a sense of security and respect for the success of each individual and a trusted identity so that they can use their abilities productively and optimally. Thus each individual will not avoid success but rather approach it but with caution, they will not feel afraid when they achieve success because they can maintain good internal balance and social relationships. Policymakers in the organization should be able to build a culture of achievement and create opportunities for individual talents by facilitating and building infrastructure so that they have goals and achievements.

The future agenda in this research may be useful if it examines the basic needs and affiliations of individuals to address the fear of success factors in their environment. Other phenomena of fear of success include spouse, seniority, leadership, income, and family. Besides, the costs of achieving success both in achieving it and other things such as intrinsic motivation, self-evaluation, and a sense of independence can be clearly defined. Besides, it is necessary to conduct quantitative research in various organizations to measure with certainty the level of fear that occurs and to enrich the FOS research results from various possible findings that are unique which can be material for deeper study on this topic.

References

- [1] Burt, J. S. (1987). Notes And Shorter Sex roles and fear of success: 8(3), 431–432.
- [2] Canavan, D. (1989). Self-Defeating Behaviors: Experimental Research, Clinical Impressions, And Practical Implications. In R. C. Curtis (Ed.), *Self-Defeating Behaviors: Experimental Research, Clinical Impressions, And Practical Implications* (pp. 159–188). Plenum Press.
- [3] Canavan-Gumpert, D., Garner, K., & Gumpert, P. (1978). *The success-fearing personality: Theory and research*. Lexington, MA: Lexington

Books.

- [4] Condry, J., & Dyer, S. (1976). Fear of Success: Attribution of Cause to the Victim. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32(3), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1976.tb02597.x>
- [5] Daniels, J. L., Alcorn, J. D., & Kazelskis, R. (1981). Factor Analysis of the Cohen Fear of Success Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 49(3), 839–842. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1981.49.3.839>
- [6] Engle, J. (2003). “Fear of success” Revisited: A Replication of Matina Horner’s Study 30 Years later. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED479387.pdf>
- [7] Freud, S. (1959). Some character-types met with in psychoanalytic work. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Sigmund Freud: Collected papers*, (Vol. IV, pp. 318-344). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1915)
- [8] Fried-Buchalter Boca Raton, S. I. (1997). Fear of Success, Fear of Failure, and the Imposter Phenomenon Among Male and Female Marketing Managers. *Sex Roles*, 37(11), 847–859.
- [9] Goh, S. C., & Mealiea, L. W. (1984). Fear of success and its relationship to the job performance, tenure, and desired job outcomes of women. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 16(1), 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080779>
- [10] Griffore, R. J. (1977). Validation of Three Measures of Fear of Success. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41(4), 417–421. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4104_15
- [11] Gumpert, P., Canavan-Gumpert, D., & Garner, K. (1978). Fear of Success and Family Dynamics. Paper Presented at the 86th Annual Connection of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- [12] Gumpert, P., Garner, K., Canavan-Gumpert, D., & Schmid, C. E. (1978, August). *MMPI profiles of success-fearers*. Paper presented at the 86th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- [13] Haimowitz, M. L., & Haimowitz, N. R. The evil eye: Fear of success. In M. L. Haimowitz & N. R. Haimowitz (Eds.), *Human development* (2nd ed.). New York: Crowell, 1966.
- [14] Hoffman, L. W. (1977). Fear of success in 1965 and 1974: A follow-up study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45(2), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.45.2.310>
- [15] Homer, M. S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.
- [16] Horner, M. S. (1970). *Femininity and Successful Achievement: A Basic inconsistency*. Belmont, CA: Brooks / Cole., 1972. Toward an Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28 (2) Pp. 157- 175.
- [17] Horner, M. S., Tresemer, D. W., Berens, A. E., & Watson, R. I., Jr. *Scoring manual for an empirically derived scoring system for motive to avoid success*. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1973.
- [18] Hyland, M. E., Curtis, C., & Mason, D. (1985). Fear of Success. Motive and Cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(6), 1669–1677.



- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.6.1669>
- [19] Illfelder, J. K. (1980). Fear of success, sex role attitudes, and career salience and anxiety levels of college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16(1), 7–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(80\)90033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90033-0)
- [20] Ivers, J. H., & Downes, P. (2011). A phenomenological reinterpretation of Horner's fear of success in terms of social class. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 27(3), 369–388. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0076-3>
- [21] Komalasari, Y ; Supartha, WG ; Rahyuda, AG ; Dewi, I. (2017). Fear of Success on Women's Career Development: A Research and Future Agenda. *Article in European Journal of International Management*, 9(August), 60–65. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318981196>
- [22] Konstam, V. (1978). Performance In Differing Experimental Conditions. 519–528.
- [23] Larkin, L. (1987). Identity and Fear of Success. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34(1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.1.38>
- [24] Leder, G. C. (1988). Fear of success imagery in the print media. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 122(3), 305–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1988.9915518>
- [25] Lew, A. S., Allen, R., Papouchis, N., & Ritzler, B. (1998). Achievement orientation and fear of success in Asian American college students. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 54(1), 97–108. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4679\(199801\)54:1<97::AID-JCLP11>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(199801)54:1<97::AID-JCLP11>3.0.CO;2-F)
- [26] Macdonald, N. E., & Hyde, J. S. (1980). Fear of Success, Need Achievement, and Fear of Failure: A factor analytic study. *Sex Roles*, 6(5), 695–711. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287490>
- [27] Metzler, J. N., & Conroy, D. E. (2009). Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science Structural Validity of the Fear of Success Scale. October 2014, 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327841mpee0802>
- [28] Monahan, L., Kuhn, D., & Shaver, P. (1974). Intrapsychic versus cultural explanations of the “fear of success” motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 60–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0035708>
- [29] Olsen, N. J., & Willemssen, E. W. (1978). Fear of success—fact or artifact? *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 98(1), 65–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1978.9915947>
- [30] Orlofsky, J. L. (1978). Identity formation, Achievement, and fear of success in college men and women. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 7(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01538686>
- [31] Orpen, C. (1989). Predictors of fear of academic success among university students. *Psychological Reports*, 65(2), 439–442. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1989.65.2.439>
- [32] Paludi, M. A. (1984). Psychometric properties and underlying assumptions of four objective measures of fear of success. *Sex Roles*, 10(9–10), 765–781. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287387>
- [33] Pappo, M. (1983). Fear of Success: The Construction and Validation of a Measuring Instrument. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 47(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4701_4
- [34] Peplau, L. A. (1976). Impact of fear of success and sex-role attitudes on women's competitive achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(4), 561–568. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.561>

- [35] Piedmont, R. L. (1988). An interactional model of achievement motivation and fear of success. *Sex Roles, 19*(7–8), 467–490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289719>
- [36] Ramadhani, R. A., & Fakhurrozi. (2019). Social support and how it affects Fear of Success among female Police Officers in Jakarta. *International Journal of Research Publications, 23*(1), 1–7. <http://ijrp.org/paper-detail/525%0A>
- [37] Ray, J. J. (1985). Fear of success and level of aspiration. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(3), 395–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1985.9922903>
- [38] Rothman, M. (1996). Fear of success among business students. *Psychological Reports, 78*(3 PART 1), 863–869. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1996.78.3.863>
- [39] Santucci, R., Terzian, D., & Kayson, W. A. (1989). Fear Of Success : Influence Of Sex , Year , And Program In College '. 1976, 551–555.
- [40] Schmid, C. E. (1987). The effects of performance feedback, social acceptance and cooperative- competitive group situations on the performance of success-fearing persons. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College, Chestnut Hill.
- [41] Shaver, P. (1976). Questions concerning fear of success and its conceptual relatives. *Sex Roles, 2*(3), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287658>
- [42] Spence, J. T. The thematic apperception test and attitudes toward achievement in women: A new look at the motive to avoid success and a new method of measurement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42*, 427–437.
- [43] Stanculescu, E. (2013). University Students' Fear of Success from the Perspective of Positive Psychology. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 78*, 728–732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.384>
- [44] Triyani, D., Lulus, R., & Surjanti, P. N. S. (2017). Analysis On Factors Influencing Career Women's Fear Of Success And Its Effect On Work Performance (A Study in Semarang City). *Economics & Business Solutions Journal, 1*(1), 57–63.
- [45] Webb Collins, R., & Eggleton, R. (1980). Fear of success theory and librarians. *International Library Review, 12*(1), 49–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7837\(80\)90009-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7837(80)90009-6)
- [46] Wood, M. M., & Greenfeld, S. T. (1976). Women managers and fear of success: A study in the field. *Sex Roles, 2*(4), 375–387. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00302806>
- [47] Zuckerman, M., & Allison, S. N. (1976). An Objective Measure of Fear of Success: Construction and Validation. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 40*(4), 422–430. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4004_12a
- [48] Zuckerman, M., Larrance, D. T., Porac, J. F., & Blanck, P. D. (1980). Effects of fear of success on intrinsic motivation, causal attribution, and choice behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(3), 503–513. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.3.503>
- [49] Zuckerman, M., & Wheeler, L. (1975). To dispel fantasies about the fantasy-based measure of fear of success. *Psychological Bulletin, 82*(6), 932–946. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.82.6.932>