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Background. Two main approaches to studying have been distinguished by several researchers, the deep approach and the surface approach. In addition, an achieving or strategic approach employs either deep or surface strategies, depending on the demands of the task.

Aims. The present study investigated factors contributing to the choice of preferred study approach at university and relations between these factors and academic performance.

Method. A questionnaire was mailed to a complete cohort of entrants in a college of London University in the UK. A further questionnaire was sent part way through the second year of the course.

Results. Consistent relations were found between general life goals and approaches to study, with the deep approach being associated with altruistic life goals and the surface approach being associated with wealth and status life goals. The achieving approach was related to both types of life goal, but more strongly to wealth and status life goals. Older students, those with superior results in Advanced Level examinations, those reporting more use of the achieving approach, and those with less interest in wealth and status life goals, produced better academic results. Study approaches became more surface-oriented and less deep and achieving-oriented over the first year of study, but these changes were unrelated to academic performance.

Conclusions. Approaches to study form part of a wider approach to life in general. Students adopting the achieving approach to study performed better. Though the achieving approach tended to weaken as the course proceeded, this change was unrelated to performance.
while surface processing focuses on the discourse itself (the sign). Deep processors in their summary demonstrated a fuller understanding and memory for what they had read than surface processors.

In Australia, Biggs (1970, 1976, 1979, 1987) developed the Study Process Questionnaire (SPQ) for tertiary students, and argued that different motivations are associated with the different strategies, the two together forming a study approach. The surface motive was characterized by ‘pass only’ aspirations, so a student with such a strategy adopts minimal effort, while a student with deep motivation tries to find out as much as possible about a topic and work out what it means. Biggs also identified an achieving motive, characterized by competition and ego enhancement, which attempts to maximize success with a flexible approach employing deep or surface strategies, as each is more appropriate to the task demands. He named this the achieving (often referred to as the strategic) approach. Biggs found that the surface approach correlated negatively with academic performance and the achieving approach positively. Results for the deep approach were more complex, correlating positively with performance only in the students’ favourite subject.

In the 1970s, Entwistle, Hanley, and Hounsell (1979) developed the Approaches to Studying Inventory, which incorporates the findings of many other researchers to develop measures of three broad orientations: meaning, reproducing and achieving, clearly parallel to Biggs’ three approaches.

McManus devised a shortened version of Biggs’ questionnaire and Fox, McManus, and Winder (2001) reviewed studies using the full and the shortened versions and reported that this shortened version has the same factor structure as the original and is suitable for repeated administration. Wilding and Valentine (1994), using the shortened version of Biggs’ questionnaire plus a variety of other measures, found that medical students’ success in first-year exams was significantly related to their self-reported use of Biggs’ achieving approach.

The emphasis in these typographies has been on study approach as a relatively unchanging individual characteristic, tied closely to dominant motives and minimally affected by changes in context or task demands. Biggs (1985) assumed that the motives underlying his three study approaches arose from ‘fairly stable’ personality characteristics and discusses some relations between locus of control and the different strategies. Zhang (2003) has shown a relation between conscientiousness and both deep and achieving approaches and between neuroticism and the surface approach. There is, however, little research on relations between the learning strategies and other factors specific to the individual, which might throw light on the way in which the strategies evolve. In this study, we investigated the possibility that approaches to studying may be related to more general attitudes to life. We therefore incorporated an index of general life goals in order to test this possibility.

There is some evidence that approaches to learning are, at least to some extent, modified according to task demands and other contextual factors. Pask (1976; Pask & Scott, 1972) contrasted the semi-permanent concept of learning style with the more variable notion of strategy; and several researchers, using cross-sectional studies, have shown differences in approach due to a variety of factors, such as task, teaching and assessment method and perceived excellence of the teaching (see Tickle, 2000, for a review). Fox et al. (2001) found that approaches were partly stable and partly modifiable under the influence of the immediate environment.

There is contrasting evidence on the nature of change, which may occur over the longer time period of attendance at a university institution. Perry (1970), using
interview data, argued that thinking changes from naïve acceptance of ‘facts’ to questioning of accepted views over this period. However, a number of researchers have reported an increase in use of the surface approach as measured by Biggs’ questionnaire (Biggs, 1987; Gow & Kember, 1990; Stokes, Balla, & Stafford, 1989; Watkins & Hattie, 1985). The bulk of the literature seems to support the view that the influence of institutions is surface-biased. The commonly stated aims of academic study, stressing critical thinking and evaluation of material, appear to be in conflict with the messages actually given to the students in their daily experience. Institutions seem to encourage the surface approach at the expense of the deep. Entwistle (1984) affirms, ‘Much of current teaching and assessment seems to induce a passive reproductive form of learning which is contrary to the aims of the teachers themselves’. Marton and Saljo (1976b) found in the laboratory that factual questions led their participants to adopt a surface approach and they concluded that, ‘While many students are apparently capable of using “deep” or “surface” strategies, it may be that the current demands of the examination system at school level are interpreted by them as requiring mainly the recall of factual information to the detriment of a deeper level of understanding’. This contention was supported by Svensson (1977). In a similar vein, Miller and Parlett (1974) identified a successful group named ‘cue seekers’ who were on the look-out for what their lecturers wanted them to do, and it was reported that these students went out of their way to create a good impression at the expense of actually understanding the work. Ausubel (1968) explains that rote learning occurs because it is required of students by the educational institution, and also because students are anxious and lack the confidence to learn meaningfully. Some responsibility for the presence of anxiety and lack of confidence must also be taken by institutions in the sense that the latter may well be inducing these traits by their methods, especially the examination system. Tooth, Tonge, and McManus (1989) found that in medical students, surface learning increased in the first year and that poor mid-session examination performance induced greater reliance on surface processing.

Assuming that educational institutions are guilty of encouraging the surface approach, is this influence purely negative? It obviously depends on the goal. If one is aiming for understanding of an academic area, then the deep approach is appropriate and the surface inappropriate. On the other hand, if one is more interested in high academic performance, then the answer is more complicated. The result of using the surface approach in terms of course assessment can be positive or negative depending on how it is applied. The key to success, as exemplified in the achieving approach (Biggs, 1985), is to use the appropriate strategy in the right context for optimum results. Surface-approach methods are included in the repertoire of the achieving student precisely because they are useful for certain tasks. One can imagine that for short-answer, multiple-choice type tests and vocabulary learning, for example, this type of learning may suffice, or even be preferable. Rote learning does not preclude the use of mnemonics. Dyne, Taylor, and Boulton-Lewis (1994) maintain that the current perspective on student approaches to learning sees the surface approach as a learning difficulty, and believes that teachers should encourage the deep strategies. In contrast, the information processing perspective takes the achieving approach as the ideal, and advocates that the student should learn to discriminate which approach is appropriate at a given time. Presumably one form of change over the college course might be learning to achieve this discrimination successfully.

Measurement of consistency or change in individual approaches, whatever the overall direction of changes may be, is difficult to address. Correlations of measures over
time reflect the reliability of the instruments as well as the degree of individual consistency. Murray-Harvey (1994) reports that there are no test-retest reliability data for the SPQ, but Biggs (1987) argues that it is not appropriate to measure reliability of the instrument as change can be due to a changed approach to learning. This would appear to conflict with his claim that students’ approaches are relatively stable over time and across situations. On the other hand, repetition of the questionnaire within a short interval encounters the problem that memory for the first completion may affect the second.

These findings imply that approaches to study are partly flexible and, to some extent, may be modified according to the perceived task demands. This study, therefore, measured self-reported approaches before students entered university and during the second year of study, with a view to detecting changes over this period, plus factors which might affect such changes and consequences of such changes. The study involved a volunteer sample drawn from a complete cohort of students. The questions addressed were as follows:

1. What are the different general life goals with which students enter university and how do these relate to the approaches to study that they adopt (this pursues the issue of the extent to which approaches to study relate to wider aspects of personality)?
2. How do the life goals and approaches to study relate to academic performance, measured by marks obtained?
3. How do approaches to study change over the first 2 years of the course and what factors affect such changes as do occur?
4. Are such changes as occur related to academic performance?

**Method and procedure**

**Participants and design**

A longitudinal design was employed, surveying undergraduate students in the month before entry to a university college in the London area in the year 2000, and in the middle of the second year in 2002. Ethical permission was obtained from the university and students were fully briefed about the research with assurance of anonymity and confidentiality. All UK-domiciled students who had a place confirmed on the full-time undergraduate degree course by the end of August 2000 were mailed a questionnaire and information sheet with a reply-paid envelope to their home address. Of the 890 students surveyed, 76% (N = 676) responded. At the beginning of the second term in their second year, the original respondents who had registered in that year were surveyed again via internal college mail. Of the 585 eligible students (i.e. had not previously withdrawn, suspended studies, or followed study periods abroad), 60% (N = 351) returned questionnaires.

Of the 351 students who responded at both time periods, 75% were women, 97% were under age 21, and 87% were White. The rates for the 890 students in the original eligible sample in 2000 were 66% women, 97% under 21, and 89% White. Table 1 shows that responders did not differ significantly by age or ethnicity from non-responders at either time point. However, as in similar previous research (Surtees, Wainwright, & Pharoah, 2002; Stewart-Brown et al., 2000), women were more likely than men to respond at both time points (p < .001; p < .01), and all non-responders and male non-responders in particular, were academically weaker, particularly in the first year
(male responders had an average Year 1 mark of 58.14 [SD = 12.37] and non-responders' average mark was 54.01 [12.49]). For females, the corresponding marks were 58.18 [9.07] and 56.54 [9.96]. As a result, while females performed better over the whole entry, as in other studies, many of the weaker male students were missing from the questionnaire sample and there were no gender differences. Students responding at both time periods were fairly evenly divided between Arts and Science faculties, 40% and 39%, respectively, and 21% were in the faculty of History and Social Science. In the original eligible sample in 2000, 37% of students were in the Arts faculty, 36% in Science, and 28% in History and Social Science.

**Measures**

Background factors and examination results were supplied by the university’s registry with the students’ knowledge. The extensive survey covered a range of different life and study issues. Only those used in the current analysis are described here.

**Life goals**

A 13-item 5-point scale to assess general life goals (Appendix) was adapted from scales used in the Self-Evaluation and Social Support interview (SESS; Andrews & Brown, 1993). It was piloted on students and amended according to feedback and further focus group discussion before administration.

**Study Process Questionnaire**

A shortened version of Biggs’ Study Process Questionnaire devised by McManus, with three questions for each of the three motivation components, and three questions for each of the three strategy components was employed (see Fox et al., 2001, for details).

The questionnaires produced a large number of measures, of which the following are considered here in addition to a number of demographic variables and performance at the Advanced Level General Certificate of Education, the British university entrance qualification: life goals, study approaches (Biggs), first year academic performance (average mark), second year academic performance (average mark) and third year academic performance (average mark).

**Results**

Table 1 gives response rates by demographic characteristics. There were 668 students who provided adequate data in the first year, of whom 539 provided adequate data in the
second year also. In 20 of these cases, missing points (a single point in most cases) on individual questions in the life goals or approaches to study questionnaire were replaced with the mean from the other items on the same scale. Where two or more data points were missing on individual points for any scale, no replacements were made and data for that case were treated as missing. Numbers for some of the analyses were reduced by missing data points on some variables, notably A-Level marks (some entrants had not taken this exam), and end of year marks at university. In such cases the numbers available will be indicated.

Life goals
Replies to the 13 questions relating to life goals collected in Year 1 and Year 2 were, after preliminary exploration, subjected to two maximum likelihood factor analyses with varimax rotation, specifying three factors. The first component represented a financial and status orientation (for both years, Items 4, 5, 8, 10, and 13 all had weightings of .4 or greater), the second component reflected an altruistic focus (Items 3, 7, and 12 had weightings above .4 in both years, except Item 7 in Year 1, which had a weighting of .3), and the third component reflected an orientation focussing on relationships (Items 6, 9, and 11 had weightings above .4 in both years). After rotation, these accounted for 17%, 12%, and 10% of the variance, respectively, in Year 1, and 19%, 11%, and 11% in Year 2.

In the light of these results, three combined scores were calculated in each year: wealth and status life goals (Items 4, 5, 8, 10, and 13); altruistic life goals (Items 3, 7, and 12); relationships life goals (Items 6, 9, and 11). (Items 1 and 2 were not included as they did not consistently and highly load on any single component.) Means and standard deviations are in Table 2. Consistency from Year 1 to Year 2 in these measures was examined through correlations. These were significant, though accounting for less than half the variance ($r = .69$, $.70$, and $.63$).

| Table 2. Correlations between life goals and approaches to study and mean and SD for each score ($N = 672$ for Year 1 and $N = 350$ for Year 2) |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                               | Deep approach | Surface approach | Achieving approach |
| **Year 1**                    |                             |                             |                             |
| Wealth/status life goals      | .07             | .34***                 | .46***                 | 18.31 (3.65)   |
| Altruistic life goals         | .32***          | -.05                   | .13***                 | 10.32 (2.51)   |
| Relationship life goals       | .03             | .15**                  | .16**                  | 12.84 (2.12)   |
| Mean and SD                   | 20.91 (3.92)    | 14.22 (3.87)          | 20.97 (4.30)            |
| **Year 2**                    |                             |                             |                             |
| Wealth/status life goals      | .13             | .33***                 | .43***                 | 17.92 (3.78)   |
| Altruistic life goals         | .27***          | -.04                   | .15***                 | 10.04 (2.49)   |
| Relationship life goals       | -.01            | .11                    | .07                    | 13.02 (2.64)   |
| Mean and SD                   | 19.38 (4.14)    | 15.50 (3.76)          | 19.48 (4.62)            |

***p < .001; ***p < .01.

Approaches to study
Scores were computed from the Biggs’ questionnaire by adding ratings for the six questions for each approach. Means and standard deviations are in Table 2. It is
noticeable that means are very much lower for the surface approach than the other two approaches, as might be expected in a university sample. Fox et al. (2001) report a very similar pattern of results from medical students.

Relations of life goals to study approaches

Table 2 gives the correlations between the life goals identified above and the study approaches. The size of the correlations is more important than their significance, since rather small correlations achieved significance due to the large number of observations. The pattern of results was consistent across both years; wealth and status life goals were related to the achieving and also to the surface approach, while altruistic life goals were related to the deep approach and, rather weakly, to the achieving approach. Relationship life goals were weakly related to the surface and achieving approaches, but only in Year 1. Thus, the study approaches were related to a more general approach to life, the main contrast being between the wealth and status life goals and altruistic life goals.

Relations between life goals, approaches to study and academic performance

Average marks

The mean average mark in Year 1 was 58.47 ($SD = 9.99$) and in Year 2 the corresponding figures were 60.96 ($SD = 8.06$).

To determine factors affecting academic performance as assessed by average mark at the end of the first year, stepwise multiple regression was first carried out with average mark as the dependent variable to discover which variables were related to academic performance. The following independent variables were entered: age category at entry (under 21, 21 to 25, over 25), gender, socio-economic class, A-Level points, father with/without degree, mother with/without degree, three life goal scores, three study approaches. This identified four variables significantly related to academic performance and the analysis was rerun as a forced-entry regression including only these four variables. Results are shown in Table 3. These four variables explained 16% of the variance (measured by adjusted $r^2$) and were all significantly related to first year average mark at $p < .001$ or beyond. Thus, a higher age, higher A-Level score, a more achieving approach and less stress on wealth and status life goals led to higher marks.

Table 3. Predictors of first and second year average marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First year ($N = 612$)</th>
<th>Second year ($N = 332$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age category</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Level score</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth/status life goals 1</td>
<td>$-0.156$</td>
<td>$-3.69$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving approach 1</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same variables with second year equivalents for life goals and study approaches were entered into a stepwise regression analysis in order to predict second-year marks. Then the analysis was rerun as a forced-entry regression entering only significant independent variables from the stepwise regression. The same four variables (with equivalents from the second year questionnaire in the case of the achieving approach and wealth and status life goals) explained 18% of the variance and results are shown in Table 3. Again higher age, higher A-Level score, more use of the achieving approach and less stress on wealth and status life goals were related positively to performance. A-Level and the achieving approach were the most significant predictors.

### Strategy change from Year 1 to Year 2

Table 4 shows the means for Biggs’ three study approaches for Year 1 and Year 2, with correlations between the two years and related t values for the differences between the two years (N = 332). The correlations demonstrate substantial, but not dramatic, consistency across the two years, suggesting that considerable changes do occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Year 1 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Year 2 Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>t value for difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep study approach</td>
<td>21.18 (3.91)</td>
<td>19.38 (4.14)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>7.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface study approach</td>
<td>14.24 (3.82)</td>
<td>15.50 (3.76)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving study approach</td>
<td>21.55 (4.11)</td>
<td>19.48 (4.62)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>9.48***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.

There was a clear pattern of decrease in both deep and achieving approaches to study and an increase in the surface approach, as has been found by a number of previous investigators (see above). The decreases in the deep and achieving approaches were significantly correlated (r = .37, p < .001), and there was also a weak positive relation between the surface and achieving changes (r = .14, p = .01). However, none of these changes was significantly related to academic performance in Year 2, or to the change in academic performance from Year 1 to Year 2.

To discover any factors related to these changes, stepwise multiple regressions were carried out with the change measure as the dependent variable and the same independent variables as employed in the earlier analyses of average marks, taken from the Year 1 questionnaire. Year 1 average mark was included as an additional independent variable, the main objective being to discover whether change in approach to study was related to examination performance.

A higher initial score on the deep or achieving approach led to a greater decrease in the equivalent score in Year 2, and a lower initial score on the surface approach led to a greater increase in the surface score in Year 2 (p < .001 in all cases). These results may simply reflect regression to the mean. There was one other finding: a lower mark in the Year 1 examination induced greater reduction in the achieving score in Year 2 (though such a change would probably reduce performance further).

Changes in life goals were also explored. Wealth and status life goals decreased and relationship life goals increased at a marginally significant level (t = 1.90, p = .06 and t = 1.96, p = .05), but altruistic life goals did not change significantly. Decrease in the
deep approach was significantly related to decrease in altruistic life goals ($r = .32$, $p < .001$), increase in the surface approach was significantly related to increase in wealth and status life goals ($r = .19$, $p < .01$), and decrease in the strategic approach was related to decrease in both these life goals ($r = .25$ and .19, $p < .001$ and .01, respectively). We, thus, find further confirmation that attitudes to life are related to particular approaches to studying.

Discussion
This study has shown that approaches to study are related to wider attitudes to life, with those who hope for wealth and success tending to adopt a surface or achieving approach, measured by Biggs’ questionnaire, and those with altruistic values more likely to adopt the deep approach (and also the achieving approach). The two types of life goal bear some resemblance to the achievement and affiliation motivations distinguished by Atkinson and others in the 1950s (e.g. McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1953; Atkinson, 1958), suggesting that some basic underlying individual difference in goals and motivation is being tapped by these different measures.

Consistent relations between a number of variables and performance over the degree course have emerged. A-Level examination performance was strongly related to degree performance. Older students also performed better. The other two variables associated with better performance were a self-reported achieving approach to learning, reflecting good organization and a systematic programme of study, and a lower emphasis on wealth and status achievement in life. In other words, the successful students would seem to apply themselves more (or more effectively) to the immediate task, rather than wider ambitions. The results were highly consistent over the two years studied, with $\beta$ values in the regression equations very similar from year to year.

One point to note is that wealth and status life goals were positively correlated with the achieving approach to study ($r = .46$ in Year 1, and .43 in Year 2), while their direct relation to performance was negative. The achieving approach was, of course, positively related to performance. Thus, the direct adverse influence of a focus on wealth and status may be mitigated by a tendency to adopt a well-organized approach to study. Performance will depend on the balance between these two influences.

Why should a desire for wealth and status affect academic performance adversely? One might speculate that too strong an emphasis on such achievement encourages neglect of the immediate tasks of studying, either because these tasks produce no immediate rewards of the desired kind, or because students with these motivations neglect their studies while pursuing other activities which they believe are more likely to lead to the types of reward they desire.

Although the ideal of a university education may be to encourage deep learning, that is, the attempt to think through the material and master its intricacies, our results suggest that, in practice, good results come to those who adapt to the actual demands of the situation, which are to keep effective records, master the key material adequately, produce appropriate essays and so forth, as required. It may be argued that in fact, while this in not primarily rewarding originality and depth of thought, it is rewarding ability to ‘do the job’ which is what society will require of the majority of graduates, rather than dazzling new ideas.

The changes in life goals and study approaches over 2 years, though apparently in a direction less conducive to good academic performance, had no significant relation
to that performance. This is puzzling in the light of the consistent relations obtained between the achieving approach and academic performance. Some possible explanations are that the changes were too small to have a marked effect on academic performance, or were compensated for by other factors, or that the relative advantage of a greater use of the achieving approach is maintained. It is also impossible on the basis of the self-report data to decide whether the reported changes accurately reflected changes in behaviour, or whether they were the result of changes in report criteria with growing maturity. For example, students may become more critical of their patterns of work organization and rate these less favourably than they did on entering the university. What they once considered exploration of a topic in depth, or keeping effective notes, may, in the light of experience, be rated less positively. Likewise, they may appreciate that statements about their wish to work for the good of others are less easy to maintain and fulfil in the face of the demands of life. This difficulty in distinguishing real change from change in rating criteria is the basic weakness in all attempts to assess study methods by self-report. The alternative of direct observation is, however, unlikely to be readily undertaken in the face of the ethical, practical, and logistical difficulties it presents. One less demanding possibility would be to ask students whether they considered that their judgment criteria in these cases had changed over the study period, but this is by no means an ideal solution to the problem.

Returning to the four questions addressed by this study, we can conclude:

1. Three broad emphases have been detected in the reported life goals of students before entering the university, either on financial success and status, or on helping others or enjoying relationships with others. These relate to the approach to studying which students adopt, with the first type of goal being associated with less interest in the study material for its own sake and more stress on doing either the minimum necessary or what is necessary for the primary task of obtaining good marks, and the second type of goal associated with a concern to understand the details and inter-relations of the material.

2. Biggs’ achieving approach to learning has consistently been shown to be positively related to academic performance, but neither the surface approach nor the deep approach has shown any such consistent relation. As indicated above, the achieving approach is likely to be stronger in those with a stronger motivation for success and status, and such motivation can therefore improve academic performance in this way. However, such motivation also has a direct negative influence on academic success, presumably because the two are seen as conflicting, and in the absence of a strong achieving approach, its consequences will be entirely negative.

3. During the first 2 years of the degree course, there was a tendency for the reported deep and achieving approaches to decline and for the surface approach to increase. These changes were affected by the initial levels on each measure, with bigger changes in cases where the scope for change in the prevailing direction was greater. The changes were related to parallel changes in the associated life goals, but no attempt was made to uncover factors in the college environment which may affect the nature and direction of the changes.

4. Though the observed changes in approaches to study would seem to be maladaptive, in fact they had no relation to academic performance. A number of possible reasons for this have been suggested.
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Appendix

The Life Goals Questionnaire

These statements are about general life ambitions. To what extent are the following important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a fulfilling career</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a good social life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a worthwhile contribution to society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being financially secure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining a prominent position in society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a good relationship with my family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a religious/spiritual commitment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being recognized for my achievements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising a family of my own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to the top of my chosen career</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing/maintaining a committed love relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the well-being of other people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being very wealthy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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