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INTRODUCTION

One of the major contributions of the symbolic interactionists is the proposition that the "self" emerges only in the process of social experience due to the "individual's taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself." Others are thus powerful influences on both self conceptions and individual behavior. Conceptually, these influential others have been variously designated as socializing agents, significant others, reference groups or reference individuals. Nevertheless, the concepts are similar;

1 George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self and Society, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1934).
they all perform the function of transmitting a "frame of reference" toward a certain range of behavior. This "frame" consists of both attitudes and actions, and is reflected in the given individual's behavior.

When reading the classic theorists of the "other," one notes the sweeping generality of theory; for example, expectations of others become internalized in a "generalized other" which incorporates "the whole society." The theory assumes a high degree of congruence between a given individual's others, the values, held by these others and societal values. The assumption would seem untenable; not only does the individual develop a more or less autonomous self over time, but once past early childhood he interacts with a wide range of others who often have conflicting expectations of his behavior. Reference group theory presented a solution to the above difficulty: multiple reference groups were possible, the individual did not have to be a member in such groups, and

---

5 Merton, "Contributions," op. cit.; Hyman, "Reflections," op. cit.; Eisenstadt, op. cit.; Kemper, op. cit.
6 Kemper, op. cit., p. 32.
7 Mead, op. cit., p. 154. For a refutation of Mead's conceptualization, see Gerth and Mills, op. cit., pp. 95-98.
8 This has been referred to as the development of a degree of "individuation," of a detachment from roles, of a distance from the expectations that others exact. See Gerth and Mills, op. cit., p. 100. The process has also been referred to as "taking the standpoint of a third party" by Ralph H. Turner, "Role taking, Role standpoint and Reference Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (1956), 316-328.
the referents could be applicable in segmental areas of behavior.\textsuperscript{9}

One of the basic considerations of reference group theorists has been the process of "anticipatory socialization." According to this conceptualization, an aspiring individual selects a group to which he desires to belong, and adopts the values of that group before he actually becomes a member of it. This enables him to rise to membership status more easily and facilitates his adjustment at a later time when he actually becomes a member of the chosen group.

Great effort has been expended in classifying reference groups according to the function they serve in this anticipatory socialization process. The comparison group\textsuperscript{10} consistently appears in categorization efforts; this type of group provides the individual with standards by which to evaluate his behavior. Another type of group is the normative group,\textsuperscript{11} which sets the norms and values by which the individual is expected to comply. An additional category, the audience group, was added by Turner, and recurs in Kemper's classificatory scheme. The audience group serves both a comparative and normative function, although the

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{9} Kuhn, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{10} Hyman, \textit{Psychology of Status, op. cit.}; Merton, \textit{op. cit.}


\end{footnotesize}
normative component, in this case, is not that the group has expectations of the actor and employs direct sanctioning power over him; instead, expectations and values are imputed to the audience by the actor.12

Definitions of these types of reference groups are far from precise. Moreover, the familiar problem of multiple reference groups with conflicting expectations of the actor13 in combination with the segmental nature of referents14 further complicates the operationalization of analytically clear categories. None of the theorists, except Kemper, has gone beyond a taxonomical approach; there is no clear exposition of what impact these various types of groups would have in determining behavioral outcome.

Kemper, after classifying reference groups by the function they serve for the actors, attempts to handle the problem of the degree of "coincidence of reference group functions"15 and its probable impact on achievement orientations. However, his discussion of behavioral outcomes is, at best, only suggestive. There are complex problems involved in specifying the degree of conflicting content in each of the functional reference groups, in assessing the

12 Kemper, op. cit.
15 Kemper, op. cit., pp. 40-42
quantity and quality of rewards available from various reference
groups for particular behaviors, and in determining which reference
groups will be selected. These problems have been persistent ones,
early recognized by Merton as critical areas for further considera-
tion. 16

Although Kuhn 17 recognized that the concept of the reference
group offered both a specification of the concept of the other
and a clearer form of operationalization, he asserted that much
research work using the reference group framework assumed that
certain social categories are salient to individuals when in fact
they may not be. Kuhn stressed that links to social categories
are made through interaction with significant others, or "orienta-
tional others." 18 It is the interaction with these particular
others which is the critical arena to investigate, and only then
can the reference group categories relevant for a given individual
be determined.

This same point of view has been articulated frequently. For
instance, Merton poses the following hypothesis for investigation:
"Identification with a reference group may be necessarily mediated
by identification with individual members of that group." 19 Hyman,

16 Merton, op. cit., pp. 239-250.
17 Kuhn, op. cit.
18 Ibid., p. 18.
19 Merton, op. cit., p. 304.
in an evaluative essay on reference group research, stresses that more focus should be directed to reference individuals and the influence of referents on the self image in contrast to the influence of referents as a source of attitudes. Moreover, he states that critical variables for research are the degree of identification, closeness, and interest individuals feel toward their referents. 20

Once salient referents or significant others are located, the next step is to identify functions performed by them and the consequences of these functions for acquiring attitudes and behavioral patterns. At this point the socialization model presented by Parsons may have relevance. 21 The model describes the process by which orientations are learned through socializing agents. These agents are highly salient for a given individual, and thus control psychologically meaningful rewards and sanctions; in addition, agents occupy a high status position and possess a wider range of information than the socializee. It is exactly these others who have the most influence in developing an individual's frame of reference. The model points to two important functional dimensions in learning new roles: the acquisition of information and the salience of the socializing agent. These dimensions can be incorporated in a model predicting the probability of acquisition of a

21 Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales, op. cit. Particularly see Chapters Two and Four.
particular orientation, or of skills and techniques. This framework will be developed in more detail in the following chapter.

Turning from relevant theoretical approaches, focus will be directed to a specific problem, explaining variations in levels of educational achievement. Present research literature will be reviewed to locate important variables. Literature concerning the explanation of either educational aspiration or educational achievement will be considered, since the two variables are related to one another.

Social class background has been used as a classic variable to explain differences in levels of educational aspiration and achievement. However, the data indicate that the variable explains a small proportion of the variance in educational attainment.22

These results should not be surprising. Individual ability is certainly an additional variable to be considered. Ability measures are slightly correlated with social class background.23

---


Nevertheless, ability measures do account for variation in educational achievement independent of social class origins. Interpersonal influences--within the family, from peers, relatives, high school teachers, etc.--have been used increasingly to explain additional variation in educational aspiration and achievement. The rationale for this is clear, although it is often not made explicit. First, sources of educational aspiration and belief in one's educational talents are structured by one's social class status. However, in a moderately open society, these interactions are not determinately confined within a given status position. One would expect individuals in extreme positions to be more restricted in their interactions with individuals of differing status levels, while there would be higher probabilities of cross-cutting interactions in middle status positions. Laumann's study of status

---

Sewell and Shah (1968) report that IQ accounts independently for ten percent of the variation in college plans. Furthermore, the path analysis used by Sewell and Shah (1967) indicates that both social class background and intelligence contribute independent effects on college graduation; when these factors are considered only for those who did go on to college, intelligence becomes the stronger explanatory variable. This latter statement is also confirmed in Eckland's data (1965), although he uses high school rank as his indicator of ability rather than IQ scores. Elder's study (1961), which also uses path analysis, indicates that intelligence has a strong independent effect, much stronger than social class background; it is interesting to note that measured intelligence has a stronger effect on later educational achievement for those from middle class origins as contrasted with those from working class origins. See William Sewell and Vimal P. Shah, "Social Class, Parental Encouragement, and Educational Aspiration," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1968), 550-572; Sewell and Shah, "Socioeconomic Status," op. cit.; and Elder, op. cit.
interactions clearly demonstrates this phenomenon. Hence, it is probable that individuals from lower and lower middle class backgrounds will locate compensatory supports for educational aspiration. This would diminish the value of social class background as a predictor variable; on the other hand, compensatory supports can be introduced as important mediating variables explaining variation in aspiration and achievement levels.

At the outset, it should be noted that evidence establishes the fact that education is valued by lower class parents as well as by middle class parents. The difference apparently lies in the fact that lower class parents lower their actual expectations for their children's achievement in accordance with reality as they perceive it. However, in homes where parents do stress the importance of college, motivations similar to those supplied for middle class children should be reflected in plans to attend college. This has been clearly supported by Kahl, Bordua, Simpson, and by Sewell

If sources of support cannot be found within the family, they may be located in other interactions—with peers, teachers, friends of the family and other adults. If support is forthcoming from a number of sources, the individual will be more likely to aspire to go to college. Simpson's analysis of peer and parental support combinations clearly demonstrates this.

Recently, researchers have moved from a non-conceptual search for various loci of interpersonal influences to using, at least nominally, the conceptual formulations of the reference group or

34 Krauss, op. cit.; Ellis and Lane, op. cit.
35 Simpson, op. cit.
the significant other. Bell was one of the first to hint at using interaction with higher status reference groups as an explanatory variable for higher educational aspirations among high school students. 36 More explicit conceptual formulations and operationalizations of significant other influence have been used to explain variations in occupational and educational aspirations among high school seniors by Sewell, Haller and Portes. 37 Their reported correlations indicate how powerful this conceptualization is; significant other influence accounts for thirty-two percent of the variation in educational aspirations, far greater than the sixteen percent explained by IQ and the five percent explained by social class background. In fact, significant other influence might have been found even more powerful if salience of these others, assumed to be significant, had been determined.

Herriott, also utilizing a high school sample, found a high degree of congruence between the expectations of significant others and the level of educational aspiration (Multiple R = .894). 38 In addition, he introduced a range of self-assessment variables, as well as a variable tapping the salience of various expectations. The self-assessment variables clearly account for the same variance accounted

---

36 Bell, op. cit.
37 Sewell, Haller, and Portes, op. cit.
for by expectations from others, and hence do not provide much additional information. Salience of expectations has a direct linear relationship with the aspiration level of a given set of individuals; as would be expected, the most valued expectation has the highest correlation with aspirational level. However, Herriott does not consistently determine the salience of individuals for his respondents. He assumes that a number of social positions—mother, father, sibling, teacher, guidance counselor—are significant. Other researchers have made the same assumption. The consequence of the assumption is that estimates of the strength of significant other influences are conservative.

Research done within the college or university context seems to have focused more explicitly on the role of reference groups or reference individuals in a socialization process. Davis' study

39 The multiple correlation of expectation and self assessment variables with educational aspiration is .901. The correlations of educational aspiration with expectation variables and self-assessment variables are, respectively, .894 and .786. Thus, self assessment variables increase the correlation by only .007 after the expectation variables have been included.


41 Denzin's study of significant others in a college population is a clear exception. His work is purely taxonomic. He has determined which individuals, by social position, are more likely to serve as role-specific others and which are more likely to be "orientational others" in Kuhn's terminology. See Norman Denzin, "The Significant Others of a College Population," Sociological Quarterly, 7 (1966), 298-310; Kuhn, op. cit.
of career decisions of college males indicates that grade point
averages have greater impact on the level of occupational aspiration
than does the quality of the school being attended. This implies
that the evaluation provided in the immediate environment has greater
effect on an individual's perception of his ability, regardless of
how he might place in a nation-wide ranking of his ability.

Other studies, particularly those of Ellis and Lane and of
Wallace, clearly establish that a socialization process does occur
in college years. Ellis and Lane point out that the socialization
process for students from lower social class backgrounds is incom-
plete in comparison with students from middle class backgrounds, at
least in relation to occupational goals; nevertheless, by senior
year, there is a clear shift in role models to teachers and friends
within the college community.

Data analyzed by Wallace establish the fact that a socialization
process occurs within a student body, particularly in the evaluation
and importance of grades as well as graduate school aspirations.

42 James A. Davis, "The Campus as a Frog Pond: An Application
of the Theory of Relative Deprivation to Career Decisions of College

43 Robert A. Ellis and W. Clayton Lane, "Social Mobility and
Career Orientations," Sociology and Social Research, 50 (1966), 280-
296, and "Social Mobility and Social Isolation: A Test of Sorokin's
Dissociative Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967),
237-253; Walter W. Wallace, "Institutional and Life Cycle Socializa-
tion of College Freshmen," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964),
303-318, and "Peer Influences and Undergraduates' Aspirations for
Wallace uses a panel design and finds that changes in attitudes are associated with the proportion of upperclassmen known. This association increases with the specification of the directional "bias" in the attitudes of a given group of upperclassmen; furthermore, frequent interaction and a sense of closeness further increase their influence, specifically with reference to graduate school aspirations. The notion that a socializing agent is of higher status and possesses a wider range of information than the socializee is clearly documented here, as is the effect of salience.

In conclusion, both theoretical and empirical considerations direct attention to the explanatory potential of variables which tap interpersonal influences on attitudes and behavior, particularly when structured in a socialization framework. In this paper, the specific focus will be that of predicting educational performance within a college population, using a model which summarizes available significant other supports for educational achievement.
 CHAPTER II
DEFINITION OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM:
Analytical Framework and Hypotheses

The model tested in this paper considers the effects of socioeconomic background and the significant other support structure on educational performance. It is proposed that the significant other support structure is a variable affected by social class background as well as mediating its effects.

An assumption made throughout this discussion is that talent is a constant factor. In a number of populations this assumption might not be warranted, and talent would have to be built into the above model as an additional independent variable. The effect of the variable will be tested in a later chapter.

"Significant others" is a concept that is appearing in the literature with increasing frequency. It has been defined most often in terms of individuals occupying particular positions—parents, teachers, ministers, etc.; the assumption is that these individuals are "significant" for the given individual. However,

44

The validity of this assumption is challenged in other studies. Sewell and Shah (1967) report that, for those individuals attending college, ability measures have a stronger influence on college graduation than does social class background. Eckland (1965) finds the same relationship in his University of Illinois sample. Sewell and Shah use IQ scores as a measure of ability, where Eckland relies on high school rank. See Sewell and Shah, "Socioeconomic Status," op. cit.; Bruce K. Eckland, "Academic Ability, Higher Education and Occupational Mobility," American Sociological Review, 30 (1965), 735-746.
in this model, significant others will be defined as individuals who are perceived to be "important" because they are "close" in an affective sense, are perceived to be an important source of advice, or are admired and emulated.

Using the above definitions, significant others can be classified according to the type of functional support they provide. The rationale for the typology is presented in Parsons' discussion of the various functions performed by the socializing agent in the socialization process.\(^45\)

In Parsons' discussion, it is assumed that the socializing agent has higher status than the socializee; not only does he possess more information, but he also has control over rewards and sanctions. Both instrumental and expressive functions are performed by the socializing agent in a sequence that leads to an "orientation" to a new set of objects. The process occurs as follows:

1) The socializing agent is someone whom the socializee desires to please. This desire is based on affective attachment.

2) The socializing agent supplies new information to the socializee and withdraws rewards for behavior inconsistent with the new information.

3) The initially tolerant and permissive attitude by the socializing agent is replaced by increasing manipulations of rewards according to the degree to which the socializee orients himself to meeting the new performance standards.

\(^{45}\) See Parsons and Bales, *op. cit.*, Chapter Four, especially pp. 234-243.
The above discussion focuses on the socialization process for the young child, who has few socializing agents. However, as the realm of influence impinging on the child extends beyond the immediate family, it is more likely that socializing functions are performed discontinuously and by an increasing range of individuals.\footnote{46} The typology proposed here extends Parsons' analysis by logically combining functions that significant others perform. These combinations can be ranked according to their potential efficacy in a socialization process. The support for socialization in a particular direction can be assessed by looking at the total configuration of the functions performed by significant others in a given individual's interaction network.

Parsons defines an instrumental function as one that induces positive adaptation; in other words, the instrumental function involves supplying information which leads to greater control over environment.\footnote{47} However, information can be supplied in diverse ways. Information can be transmitted by giving advice; it can also be transmitted by role models, i.e., individuals who are admired and emulated.\footnote{48} This mode of information transmittal should

\footnote{46}{For supporting evidence, see the previously cited references: Turner (1955), Ellis and Lane (1963), Wallace (1965), Denzin (1966), Ellis and Lane (1966). In addition, see Fred E. Katz and Harry W. Martin, "Career Choice Processes," Social Forces, 41 (1962), 149-153.}

\footnote{47}{For Parsons and Bales, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 47.}

\footnote{48}{See Rosen and Bates, \textit{op. cit.}, for a discussion of socializing agents serving dual functions of information transmittal and or role modeling.}
be separated from that of giving advice because the two modes may have qualitatively different forms of influence in the socialization process.

In the model adopted here, the two may differ in the following ways. First, the role model supplies more generalized information than the individual who gives advice. Advice is usually specific and relatively circumscribed information; observing a role model as he performs an array of behaviors can provide more generalized information.49 Second, observation of a role model and subsequent transmittal of information may occur without any direct interaction. Third, observation of a role model can demonstrate future rewards available for following a particular course of behavior.50

However, this is not to suggest that the role model is a more efficacious socializing agent than the individual who gives advice. In the typology adopted here, the role modeling dimension of support is considered second in importance to the advice-giving dimension, because the role model often is a figure relatively "distant" in an affective sense and with whom interaction is minimal. This

49 Merton suggests that the reference individual is even more powerful than the role model. The increased power is a function of the number of roles the observing individual "identifies" with. See R. K. Merton, op. cit., pp. 302ff.
50 This is similar to Kemper's conception of the function performed by the audience reference group, which provides anticipation of rewards for outstanding participation in a role. See Kemper, op. cit., pp. 37-38.
means that information relevant to the socializee's present position in the socialization cycle may not be visible nor readily inferred from the role model's behavior. In sum, although role models may be information transmitters, they may be inefficient and even inaccurate.

Moreover, the efficacy of the role model in the socialization process may be contingent on the level of information the socializee possesses at a given point in the cycle. If the socializee has little information available, specific information applicable to present performance requirements may be more powerful. On the other hand, when the socializee already has a certain level of information available, specific information is likely to be redundant, and, therefore, less influential than the generalized information imparted by a role model.

Using three dimensions of support--giving advice, serving as a role model, and providing affective support--a typology of significant others can be developed by logical combination. The ranking of these types of support according to their efficacy in the socialization process will be contingent on the amount of information previously possessed by the socializee. Moreover, higher status significant others should have greater efficacy in the socialization process. Hence, it is expected that adult significant others would be

---

51 Rosen and Bates, op. cit., p. 74.
more powerful, and that older peers would be more influential than would cohort peers.

The total configuration of supports provided by significant others represents the force toward learning an orientation. The specific orientation being investigated in this paper is that of academic achievement. However, it is not proposed that increases in the availability of support will produce corresponding increases in the level of academic achievement. Instead, the relationship is probably curvilinear; in other words, greater frequencies of individuals supplying support will produce little additional effect on academic performance beyond a certain limiting point.

It is assumed here that social class origins affect the amount of information available to an individual. Since parents who have lower educational achievements lack the skills and information obtained through more advanced training, they will be unable to act in an instrumental capacity as advisors or as role models, specifically with reference to academic performance. Individuals who compensate for the initial lack of information may be located at later points in the life cycle—for example, teachers, a family friend, peers intending to go on to college. Hence, a significant other who provides specific information in combination with affective support, the classic socializing agent, will be particularly critical for successful academic performance.

On the other hand, for an individual raised in a home where parents have had college experience, specific information relevant to academic achievement has been continuously available from an
early point in his life. Hence, it is probable that the supports available from significant others in the college years will not be as influential for academic performance. Moreover, the admired individual may be a more important support than in the above case. He can provide generalized information for future role requirements as was previously argued.

The discussion is summarized in the following set of hypotheses, which will be used to examine the data:

1) Presence of significant other supports will be associated with higher levels of academic performance.

2) For individuals from lower social class origins, the presence of significant other supports will be more strongly associated with the level of academic performance than for individuals from middle and upper class origins.

3) The presence of adult significant other supports will be more strongly associated with academic performance than the presence of peer significant other supports.

4) Specific types of significant other supports will be more powerful in their association with academic performance. For individuals who have had low levels of information available to them, significant others providing a combination of advice and affective support will be more powerful; for individuals who have had higher levels of information available to them, significant others who serve as role models will be more powerful predictors.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The data for this paper were collected from a sample of 526 students at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, in the spring of 1967. The sample included the universe of students on scholarship or loan and the universe of students with low grade point averages or a record of probationary status. This procedure was employed to maximize the number of students of lower socioeconomic origins and the number of students with low performance records. Both of these groups might have been underrepresented if random sampling procedure had been used. The rest of the sample was obtained by stratified random sampling within levels of GPA. The return rate was 48.5%. It is assumed that returns were not biased in a particular direction. Response from the black students in the sample was minimal, and, since this group was of particular interest, interviews were scheduled with as many students as could be contacted; the questionnaire format was also used for interviewing.

A questionnaire was designed to tap the following selected variables.

Academic performance is the primary dependent variable. It has been measured by the respondent’s cumulative grade point average

---

52 A low GPA was designated as an average below 2.00, i.e., a C.
53 Returns should be analyzed for bias; since information from college records was available, a relatively intensive comparative analysis could be done.
54 See Appendix A for the questionnaire which was used.
(GPA), obtained from transcripts in the Academic Records Office, and has been used as a continuous variable in the statistical analysis.

Social class background has been measured by ranking father's formal educational training on a seven-point scale, ranging from a low value of eighth grade or less to a high value of a Ph.D. or its equivalent. This indicator was used rather than a composite measure based on occupational prestige and income. The rationale was that educational training would reflect the potential level of instrumental support for college attendance and educational achievement available within the family more accurately than a composite measure. A combination of both parents' formal educational attainment would have been a better index than the one employed. However, the statistical problems involved in using a large number of categories in a small sample prevented its adoption.

Ability was measured by two indices: the score obtained on the verbal SAT test and rank in high school class. Both were available on student records. High school rank was corrected for the size of the high school class.

Level of educational aspiration has been measured by asking respondents how far they intended to continue their education. Responses were coded on a four-point scale: no intention of finishing undergraduate work, obtaining a B.A. degree, obtaining an M.A. or M.A.T., or obtaining a Ph.D. or its equivalent.

Intellectual self-image has been measured by a nine-point scale
on which respondents rated their intellectual ability, disregarding their grades, in comparison with the average Oberlin student.

_Pre-college support for college attendance_ has been measured by two separate items. One item determines the expectations of others; the other locates who provided instrumental support. The items are as follows:

"Who among those close to you has felt that college education is absolutely essential for you?"

"Did anyone give you active help and guidance in encouraging you to go to college—among teachers and guidance staff? among high school friends? in your family? among other adults?... Who was most helpful among these individuals?"

Responses were coded by the relationship of the mentioned individual to the respondent: parents, older siblings, relatives, high school teachers and counselors, other adults, high school peers. Each category was treated as a dichotomous variable, with the exception of parents. The parental category was coded according to the provision of the support by both parents, only the father, only the mother or by neither parent.

Perceived significant other supports were determined by a series of items. These were:

"Who has been helpful to you in—

a) selecting courses?

b) giving information about a summer job?"
c) advising you on your grades and work?

d) choosing a major?

e) giving advice about paying for your college education?

f) stimulating your ideas on career possibilities"

"List those individuals you admire and look up to whether they
are close to you or not."

"List those individuals you feel close to."

All individuals were listed by relationship to the respondent.
Each mentioned individual was cross-referenced on the three sets
of items, and assigned a category according to the types of support
provided. See Figure 1 for the classification schema.

Adult supports were coded separately from peer supports. If
individuals mentioned were peers within the college interactional
network, they were coded as "peers." However, if friends who had
gone on to graduate work were mentioned, they were coded as "adults."

Frequencies of individuals in each adult and peer support category
were then totaled. Hence, each type of support became a separate
variable.

These variables were dichotomized for statistical analysis because
of the extreme skewness of the distributions; the mean for each item
was used as the dividing point. Moreover, the dichotomization pro-
cedure was congruent with an earlier speculation that the frequency
of supports available to an individual would not be linearly related
to academic achievement; instead, the influence of the available
supports would level off once a specified amount of support was
present. Sample means were assumed to approximate this limiting
### FIGURE I

Classification of Others by Support Provided according to responses on three sets of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Item 1 Advice</th>
<th>Item 2 Admired</th>
<th>Item 3 Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Advice and affective support</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Advice and role model</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Advice only</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Role model and affective support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Role model only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Affective support only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) indicate that response is optional

+ indicates that individual mentioned in this item

- indicates that individual was not mentioned in this item
point. For convenience in discussion, the dichotomy is referred
to as the "presence" or "absence" of support.

A number of statistical techniques have been used in the ana-
lysis. Simple cross-tabulations have been presented when relating
pre-college supports to social class background; chi square values
and a chi-square based measure of association, Cramer's statistic,\(^{55}\)
are reported. Both zero order correlations and regression analysis
have been used in assessing the influence of significant other sup-
ports on GFA. In addition, father's education has been introduced
into certain regression equations as a dummy variable; the technique
locates interaction effects, thus permitting greater analytical
sophistication.\(^{56}\)

\(^{55}\) The statistic corrects for the degrees of freedom and
varies between 0 and 1. See William J.ays, Statistics for Psychologists,

\(^{56}\) For discussions of this technique see James Fennessey,
"The General Linear Model: A New Perspective on Some Familiar Topics,"
American Journal of Sociology, 74 (1968), 1-27; and Jacob Cohen,
"Multiple Regression as a General Data Analytic System," Psychological
Bulletin, 70 (1968), 426-443.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Before testing the proposed hypotheses concerning academic performance in college, the extent to which social class origins structure pre-college interpersonal supports is determined.

Significant others who view college to be essential for an individual provide support in two ways: they value college attendance and they expect the individual to attend college. The data clearly indicate that this support is not as available within the immediate family for individuals from lower class origins (Table I). A third of those individuals from lower social class origins report that neither parent perceived college to be essential for them; where support was present, it came from the mother.57 The location of this type of support is reported by individuals from lower social class origins disproportionately, although not significantly so, among teachers and peers.58 Hence, some "compensatory" support is located in nonfamilial interactions; this finding also parallels that of Ellis and Lane.59

The perception that both parents have given guidance and help is somewhat weaker than the perception of parental regard for college

57 This finding has been supported in the literature by Ellis and Lane (1963), Bennett and Gist (1964), Gurin and Epps (1966); all references have been previously cited.
58 See Tables I and II in Appendix B.
59 Ellis and Lane, "Structural Supports," op. cit.
TABLE I
Perceptions of Parental Regard that College is Essential, by father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Formal Education</th>
<th>HS not complete</th>
<th>HS complete</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither parent regards college as essential</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father only</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents regard college as essential</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 27.12^* \]

Cramer's statistic = .20

*Significant at the .05 level.

Percentages do not always total to 100.0% due to rounding.
Neither parent has given advice | Father's formal education
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| HS not complete | HS complete | some college | BA | MA | PhD |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
Neither parent has given advice | 52.6 | 20.0 | 19.2 | 22.4 | 21.4 | 22.0 |
Mother only | 10.5 | 30.0 | 11.5 | 5.2 | 11.9 | 5.1 |
Father only | 5.3 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 10.3 | 2.4 | 13.6 |
Both parents have given advice | 31.6 | 40.0 | 65.4 | 62.1 | 64.3 | 59.3 |

\( x^2 = 27.26 * \)

Cramer's statistic = 0.20

* Significant at the .05 level.

Percentages do not always total to 100.0% due to rounding.
attendance (Table II). The sharpest differential is noted where the father has not completed high school; although neither parent was perceived to highly value the individual attending college in thirty percent of the cases, fifty-two percent of the individuals perceived no instrumental help from either parent. Perception of both parents offering help increases remarkably when the father's education includes some college experience. In cases where the father has completed only high school, the mother is perceived to play a stronger role in providing help. Again, "compensatory" guidance and advice for individuals of lower social class origins is often located among older siblings, high school teachers, and peers.60

The differential locations of instrumental support can be seen most clearly in the designation of the individuals who have been most helpful in providing guidance for college attendance (Table III). In the upper range of the social class ranking, both parents or the father are reported to have been the most helpful. There is a sharp difference between those students whose fathers have completed college and those whose fathers have not. The mother is disproportionately more important than the father when he has either completed high school or has had some college experience; in cases where the father has not completed high school, neither parent is perceived to be an important source of help. Instead, high school teachers and older siblings are important. Overall, differences by social class background are quite sharp and are statistically significant.

The data indicate that parental influence among individuals from

60 See Tables III, IV, X and V in Appendix B.
**TABLE III**

Individuals perceived to Have Been Most Helpful in Providing Guidance for College Attendance, by father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not complete</th>
<th>HS complete</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father only</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older sibling</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS teacher</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adult</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 52.6^{*} \]

Cramer's statistic = .22

*Significant at the .05 level.
lower social class origins is weaker than that reported by Ellis and Lane. However, there are distinct parallels in that the mother is consistently more influential than the father, and guidance from high school teachers is a critical source of influence. Ellis and Lane included relatives and siblings in the same category, and, therefore, it is impossible to compare findings on the influence of older siblings. Furthermore, some of the differences between this data and that of Ellis and Lane might be attributed to the greater generality of their term "influences," which includes both expectations and instrumental help; the data in this analysis refer specifically to perceived help and guidance.

The conclusions drawn from this data concerning pre-college interpersonal supports are twofold. First, social class does operate differentially in providing potential sources of instrumental help and guidance in the immediate family. Second, individuals of lower social class background who attend college often gain "compensatory" support in nonfamilial circles. 61

The following hypotheses were tested to determine the influence of significant other supports on academic performance.

61 For similar findings, refer to Ellis and Lane, "Structural Supports," op. cit.; Krauss, op. cit.; Gurin and Epps, op. cit.
Hypothesis: The presence of significant other support will be associated with higher levels of academic performance.

The significant other support variables were introduced as independent variables in two separate regression equations, one using adult supports, the other using peer supports. Results are listed in Table IV. It is evident that both equations explain only a small proportion of the variance in academic performance. The multiple correlation is not significant in either equation. Thus, initial analysis indicates that the supports provided by significant others do not have much power in predicting academic performance.

Hypothesis: For individuals from lower social class origins, the presence of significant other supports will be more strongly associated with the level of academic performance than for individuals from middle and upper class origins.

Social class origins were measured by the level of formal education obtained by the father. To test the hypothesis, father's education was introduced as a dummy variable in the regression equation. In other words, each category became a separate independent variable. The procedure permits a test for interaction effects of the father's education with each type of support in predicting academic performance. The results, similar to an analysis of variance, are presented in Table V.
TABLE IV
Regression Equations of Adult and Peer Significant Other Supports Predicting GPA
(Entire Sample, n=226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Other Items</th>
<th>Adult equation</th>
<th>Peer Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and affective support</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and role model</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model and affective support</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model only</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support only</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple R** =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult equation</th>
<th>Peer Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of variance explained by support items ($R^2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult equation</th>
<th>Peer Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level*
TABLE V

F-Tests for Interaction of Father's Education and Adult Interpersonal Support Items in Predicting GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Amount of variance explained</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All support variables</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: all support items with all categories of father's education</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although none of the sets of variables is significant,\textsuperscript{62} the interaction of father's education with all the support items accounts for an overwhelmingly greater proportion of the variance in GPA. Moreover, when interaction affects are examined by using each support item in a separate regression equation, certain types of interpersonal support are highly interactive with the level of father's education.\textsuperscript{63} The results are reported in Table VI.

The analysis indicates that father's educational background and two types of support—the combination of providing advice and affective support and the combination of providing advice and being a role model—produce significantly unique effects. These results justify the division of the sample into groups by father's educational

\textsuperscript{62} Since the sample size is small, failure to obtain a given level of significance is not sufficient to dismiss the finding as negligible. Instead, looking at variances accounted for is more likely to point to substantively important findings. See Hanan C. Selvin, "A Critique of Tests of Significance in Survey Research," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), 519-527. Of course, as Gold has pointed out in reference to Selvin's argument, the substantive differences located in small samples should be replicated in a larger sample to determine whether the differences were due to the greater probability that statistics deviate more widely from population parameters in smaller samples. See David Gold, "Comment on 'A Critique of Tests of Significance,'" American Sociological Review, 23 (1958), 85-86.

\textsuperscript{63} If enough cases had been available in each interaction category, analysis could have proceeded using the general model that included all variables. However, the large number of independent variables resulted in this equation becoming overdetermined; hence, regression analysis could not be employed. It was necessary to resort to using simpler sets of equations that handled each support item and its relevant interaction terms separately.
### TABLE VI

Tests for Interaction of Father's Education and Separate Adult Significant Other Supports In Predicting GPA
(Each support item introduced in a separate equation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction of father's education and following types of adult interpersonal support</th>
<th>Amount of variance explained</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice and affective support</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and role model</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>2.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice only</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model and affective support</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model only</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support only</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.*
## TABLE VII

Amount of Variance in GPA Accounted for by Adult Significant Other Supports in Contrast with Peer Significant Other Supports, by Father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's education</th>
<th>Amount of variance accounted for by adult supports</th>
<th>Amount of variance accounted for by peer supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college education</td>
<td>30.6 *</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college education</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained BA</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained MA</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained PhD, MD, etc.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple $R^2$ significant at the .05 level.
background for further analysis. Results are listed in Table VII.

The hypothesis is supported. The higher the social class background, the more adult support variables diminish in their power to predict academic performance. The group whose fathers have a master's degree is an anomaly in the pattern, but even in this group, the predictive power of significant other support variables is not as great as it is in the two lowest social class categories.

Hypothesis: The presence of adult significant other supports will be more strongly associated with academic performance than the presence of peer significant other supports.

Evidence for this hypothesis can be examined in Table VII. It is most strongly upheld for individuals from families where the father did not have a college degree. Adult and peer supports account for a similar amount of variance in the group whose fathers have a bachelor's degree. For those whose fathers have higher graduate degrees, the balance shifts; peer supports are more powerful predictors.

Division of the sample into groups is likely to inflate the amount of variance being accounted for since the number of cases is smaller than previously. The danger is particularly great when using dichotomous variables. Inflation was checked by using a weighted average of the group multiple correlations and comparing this average with total sample multiple correlation. The weighted average multiple correlation for the adult equations is .251 (R²=.063); thus, dividing the sample into groups inflated the amount of variance accounted for by only one percent more than the variance accounted for in the entire sample. There is more inflation involved when dividing the peer equation into groups. The weighted multiple correlation is .318 (R²=.101), accounting for seven percent more variance than was determined using the entire sample as a base.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's education</th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
<th>TYPE VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college education</td>
<td>18.8*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college education</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16.4*</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained BA degree</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained MA degree</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained PhD or equivalent</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regression coefficients for this variable are significant at the .05 level

+Multiple correlation significant at the .05 level

TABLE VIII.
Amount of Variance in GPA Accounted for by Specific Types of Adult Significant Other Support, by father's education (in percentages)
Nevertheless, poor supports account for less of the variance in those groups than in groups where fathers do not have a higher degree. In sum, the hypothesis is strongly supported for those from families with little previous college experience, while it is not supported for those from families who have had the experience.

**Hypothesis:** Specific types of significant other support will be more powerful in their association with academic performance. For individuals who have had lower levels of information available to them, significant others providing a combination of specific information and affective support will be more powerful; for individuals who have had higher levels of information available to them, significant others who serve as role models will be more powerful.

It is assumed in this hypothesis that the level of father's education is an indicator of the amount of information available to an individual prior to college attendance.

In the group whose fathers have had no college training, it is clear that individuals who provide a combination of advice and affective support are powerful predictors of academic performance, accounting for nineteen percent of the variance in GPA (Table VIII). In addition, this type of support is highly correlated with other types of support and masks the effect of other types of support which are also operative. The effect of these other variables can be determined by removing the primary predictor from the regression equation. Remaining supports account for a total of twelve percent of the variance.
those who provide affective support account for seven percent and those who give advice for two percent. Those who are both role models and provide affective support account for an additional three percent; however, the relationship with GPA is inverse. This could probably be accounted for by locating which specific individuals offer the support. More specifically, the speculation is that parents or other adults from lower social class origins would provide little information through their advice and behavior that would be relevant to academic performance. In sum, this group supports the hypothesis; the presence of others who provide a combination of advice and affective support is critical for academic achievement. The data also point to the strong role played by adults who provide only affective support. This finding is not startling. Affective support probably provides an emotional cushion that enables the individual to cope with anxieties concerning abilities to compete. 65

There is a shift in the types of support which are most predictive in the group whose fathers have had some college training. Significant others who are both admired and give advice are the important source of support for academic achievement; they account for sixteen percent of the variance in GPA. Additional support is provided by significant others who advise and others who provide affective support; however, both of these variables are inversely related to academic performance.

The shift in the importance of particular types of support

65 See Ellis and Lane, "Social Mobility and Social Isolation: A Test of Sorokin's Dissociative Hypothesis," op. cit.
TABLE IX.
Amount of Variance in GPA Accounted for by Specific Types of Peer Significant Other Support, by father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's education</th>
<th>TYPE I</th>
<th>TYPE II</th>
<th>TYPE III</th>
<th>TYPE IV</th>
<th>TYPE V</th>
<th>TYPE VI</th>
<th>Total variance accounted for by all peer support items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college education</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college education</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained BA degree</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained MA degree</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained PhD or equivalent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
detected in the group whose fathers have some college training is paralleled to a certain extent in the group whose fathers have a master's degree. The influence of support provided by role models, whether or not they also act as advisors, is dominant, accounting for a total of nine percent of the variance. In addition, the presence of significant others who provide affective support, who advise or who combine both, is inversely related to academic performance.

The group whose fathers have obtained a bachelor's degree is anomalous to the pattern established in the above groups. A different variable is the dominant predictor; supports provided by role models have virtually no influence. It is difficult to interpret this pattern of influence. Moreover, it is not profitable to do so, since the predictive utility of the adult significant other support variables is so limited.

Patterned influences are difficult to determine in the case of peer significant other supports (Table IX). Furthermore, none of the equations accounts for a substantial portion of the variance. Consequently, there is little support for the hypothesis among peer significant other supports. In light of the theory presented, this is hardly surprising, since peers do not have the higher levels of information to serve in an instrumental capacity.

An additional reason accounting for the failure to detect influences provided by peer supports is that older and cohort peers were not coded separately. Wallace found that interaction with older college students had clear socializing impact on attitudes of freshmen,
in contrast with cohort peers. This finding is congruent with the explanation that older students would have greater information about the college community and its norms than would cohort peers. However, data for this paper were not analyzed by separate examination of these two types of peer influences. Hence, varying proportions of older and cohort peers in individual interaction networks may obscure existing patterns of influence. Given the analytic procedure employed, the hypothesis, as it relates to peer significant other supports, must be rejected.

The influence of significant other supports on academic performance of black students was examined separately. Results of the analysis are descriptive of the particular group of black students interviewed, and generalizations should be made cautiously since the group was by no means a representative sample of black college students. Moreover, the group is small (N=24), and statistical results could be unstable, particularly when using regression analysis.

This particular group of black students do not differ extensively from white students at Oberlin on socioeconomic indices (Table X). While the mean level of father's education for the black students is some college training, the mean for fathers of white students is a bachelor's degree. Also, the means of occupational prestige for fathers and the means of mothers' education differ only slightly between the two groups.

However, there is a sharp contrast in the occupational prestige ranking of closest relatives for black and white students. Undoubtedly,

Wallace, "Peer Influences and Undergraduates' Aspirations for Graduate Study," op. cit.
this is a reflection of the skewed occupational distribution of black people in this country. It also indicates that these black students come from socioeconomic backgrounds which are not as homogeneous as those of white students. Presumably, this could affect the availability of information and role models relevant for performance in the academic arena. The data indicate that black students do report substantially fewer significant others among both adults and peers (Table XI); the one exception is the number of peers to whom they feel close.

It is also evident that their scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test are below those of white students. Although one well-known psychologist would probably interpret the differential as support for his theory of genetically-based learning styles, most social scientists interpret this in terms of environmental differences due to family background, racial origin and quality of schooling. Lower scores on the SAT undoubtedly reflect a certain disadvantage when


68 See Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, 39 (1969), 1-123. Jensen demonstrates that control for socioeconomic origins does not destroy the difference in IQ scores, although it does weaken it. He seems to assume that socioeconomic origins are the sole environmental influences on an individual, since he infers from the above finding that the remaining differences are due to genetic factors. The environmental effects of being black in this society are not considered.
### TABLE X
Comparison of Means on Selected Variables for Black Students and White Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Black students</th>
<th>White students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's educationa</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's educationa</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupational rank</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td>69.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closest relative's occupational rankb</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td>75.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal SAT score</td>
<td>563.04</td>
<td>651.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math SAT score</td>
<td>559.13</td>
<td>652.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school rank</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA at Oberlin</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a** Educational attainment was measured by the following index:
- 1 = 8th grade or less
- 2 = high school, not finished
- 3 = graduated from high school
- 4 = some college, or additional technical training beyond high school
- 5 = obtained BA degree
- 6 = obtained MA degree
- 7 = obtained PhD or its equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Significant Other Supports</th>
<th>Black Students</th>
<th>White Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADULT SUPPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and affective support</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and role model</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice only</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model and affective support</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model only</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support only</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEER SUPPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and affective support</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and role model</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice only</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model and affective support</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model only</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support only</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XII

Amount of Variance in GPA Accounted for by Various Significant Other Supports, Black Students (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Other Variables</th>
<th>Amount of variance accounted for by adult supports</th>
<th>Amount of variance accounted for by peer supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice and affective support</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and role model</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice only</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model and affective support</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model only</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective support only</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple R** = .410

Amount of variance accounted for by all support items ($R^2$) = 16.8

*Regression coefficient for this category significant at the .05 level.*
entering a highly competitive college in which most students have had more adequate preparation. This is evident in the differences between the mean GPAs of the two groups.

The presence or absence of significant other support does influence the level of academic performance for this particular group of black students (Table XII). Adult significant other supports account for seventeen percent of the variance, while peer supports account for a substantial thirty-eight percent.

Adult significant others who combine salience and information transmittal are important. Both forms of salience are important for black students, contrary to the previously considered socio-economic groups in which one of the two forms was more strongly related to academic performance. Presence of those who are not salient and supply advice is of little consequence and is negatively related to GPA.

The presence of peer supports is overwhelmingly predictive for black students. However, it is interesting that the strongest predictor, peers who provide only advice, is negatively related to GPA; in all probability, these individuals do not transmit relevant information. This particular type of support is highly correlated with other types of support. Removing it from the equation uncovers two other predictive supports, which are positively related to GPA; peers who combine advice and affective support account for six percent of the variance and peers who provide only affective support account for an additional two percent.

It is not possible to determine rigorously the effects of social
class on various types of support for this group of black students. However, it is interesting that social class origin, measured by Duncan's index, is associated with the presence of adults combining advice and affective support (.27), the presence of adults who are admired (.24), and with the presence of adults who give advice (-.27). These relationships all operate in a direction that would maximize GPA. Hence, although the zero-order correlation of social class background and GPA is low (.10), social class background may operate indirectly through influence on the significant other support structure.

SUMMARY

In general, the data have indicated that significant other supports are important variables for the prediction of academic performance in certain groups. The variables appear to be most efficient for groups in which information concerning techniques and requirements of academic was not readily available prior to college attendance.

For these groups adult supports are more powerful than peer supports. Evidence indicates that individuals supplying only advice are not influential. Instead, it is those individuals who are salient, by being close or admired, and also supply information, who are the most influential. For individuals whose fathers have not had any college education, adults who both provide affective support and advice are the most important significant others in relation to academic performance. For individuals whose fathers have had some
college training, adults who are perceived as both role models and advisors are most important.

Both adult and peer supports predict academic performance for black students, the latter being more powerful. Adults who are close and either give advice or are admired are important, as are adults who are only admired. The presence of peers who only give advice is negatively related to academic performance, while positive support is provided by peers who provide both advice and affective support.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings demonstrate that the proposed typology of significant other supports has a relatively strong relationship with academic performance for certain student groups. If the relationship is not only one of association, but of causation, implications of the findings would be particularly relevant for the maximization of the life chances of certain students.

Determination of causal influence is beyond the purview of this paper. Nevertheless, speculation about alternate influences operating either directly on performance or indirectly on it through significant other supports, can be advanced by examining zero-order correlations of relevant variables with GPA and with specific types of significant other support.

Variables which conceivably could operate in either fashion are academic ability, self-image of one's intellectual capabilities, and the degree to which aspirations include higher educational training.

On examination of the association of these variables with GPA, the only variable which is consistently as powerful as the significant other variables is high school rank, which was used as an indicator of ability (Table XIII). It is interesting to note that high school rank is increasingly powerful as the level of social class origin
### TABLE XIII.

Zero-order Correlations of Selected Variables with GPA, by sample subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Variables</th>
<th>Father's education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal SAT score</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school rank</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual self image</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of educational aspiration</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult significant other variables</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer significant other variables</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interpretation of its variable predictive power would be that, although it is related to performance for students of lower social class origins, other influences, specifically the presence of significant other supports, are equally or more powerful. The relationship is not surprising. The presence of significant other supports is subject to more variation among students from lower class origins than among students from upper class origins. Given relatively constant variation in ability in all groups, ability would be more highly predictive in the latter group since there is little variation in the support variables.

The other two variables, intellectual self-image and level of educational aspiration, are neither consistently nor strongly related to performance. Both variables probably interact with performance in a complex, continual feedback process. Hence, even if relationships were moderately strong, it would be difficult to make causal interpretations.

None of the alternative variables discussed above has strong potential for operating indirectly on GPA through their association with significant other supports. Several moderate relationships with GPA emerge, but none are substantial enough to warrant discussion.

In sum, ability is the only variable which is noteworthy for future consideration if the above relationships are accurate reflections of influence. However, it is not as powerful for individuals of lower social class origins. In future research, both ability and
significant other supports should be introduced as variables in a causal model. Given the weak association of ability with the structure of significant other supports, each probably accounts for independent variance; if so, the predictive power of the model would be further enhanced.

Another explanation for the existing significant other support structure is that supports might be located in a sequential process. In other words, individuals who had support prior to college entrance would continue to locate significant other supports. The worth of this speculation cannot be determined with precision. However, the item measuring perception of parental guidance and advice can be used as a rough indicator of the instrumental support available prior to college attendance. The relationship of this item with the present structure of significant other supports is moderately strong, with correlations ranging from .24 to .55.\(^70\) Hence, future research using a longitudinal design to locate continuity of significant other supports would further refine the causal model.

In conclusion, supports provided by significant others are important variables explaining not only educational aspiration and college attendance,\(^70\) but also academic performance, specifically

\(^{69}\) Previous familial instrumental support correlated with the presence of adult significant others who offer both affective support and advice .40 and .55 in the group whose fathers have no college training and the group of black students, respectively. It is also associated with the category of adult others who are admired and give advice in the group with some college background (.32), with those adults who are admired in the group whose fathers have a master's degree (.24), and with peers who give advice in the group of black students (-.28).

\(^{70}\) Sewell, Haller and Portes, op. cit.
for students from backgrounds with limited exposure to higher education.

To some extent these supports may be manipulatable, although intervention would require skill because its ultimate success would be contingent on the salience granted to those purporting to "intervene." In turn, the imputation of salience is contingent on an ability to communicate with such students in language relevant to and sympathetic with their present concerns. In essence, this parallels the conceptualization of the socializing agent as one who can operate in two systems, that of the socializee and that higher status one of which the agent himself is a member.

Some higher status individuals do not have the flexibility to operate in this manner; indeed, some are so confined within their own membership system, its norms and requirements, that they are not only incapable of this flexibility, but also consider it unnecessary. It is exactly this stance which leads to the higher status system being viewed as one that lacks relevance, a perception that may often be valid. This, in fact, may be at the root of student dissatisfaction and subsequent confrontations facing higher institutions and American society at large. Apart from the specific issues triggering confrontations, the general relevance of the higher status system, its values and modes of action, are being challenged.

Hence, those who are in positions serving as socializing agents have an immense responsibility: not only must they be able to serve as links between two systems, but must also insure that their system
is relevant to those whom they expect to be their young counterparts. The latter may, at times, require that the socializes and agent exchange functional roles, thus entering into a mutual learning process.

Returning to generalizations more directly derived from data considered in this paper, it is evident that supports provided by significant others are powerful variables and deserve more extensive research consideration. Replication of this study on other student populations are necessary to validate the model. Moreover, a number of areas remain unexplored. Who are the significant others providing influential supports? What information best equips the student for coping with academic requirements? Do admired individuals serve as role models for behavior, as was assumed? What are the effects of discontinuities in specific types of support? Further research on these questions would provide knowledge of the processes that structure achievement opportunities and performance outcomes; it might also provide a basis for effecting change in the consequences of particular social positions so that fewer individuals are constrained by situations imposing limited achievement.
APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A

Please circle, check or write in as necessary. Please answer every item as requested.

1. Class: Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior

2. Sex: Male  Female

3. Major (or prospective major): ________________________________________

4. My grades are: Cumulative average____
    Average in major ______

5. In what type of community have you lived most of your life?
   __ In the open country or in a farming community
   __ In a small town (less than 10,000) that was not a suburb
   __ Inside a small sized city (10,000 to 50,000)
   __ In a suburb of a small city
   __ Inside a medium sized city (50,000 to 250,000)
   __ In a suburb of a medium sized city
   __ Inside a large city (250,000 to 750,000)
   __ In a suburb or a large city
   __ Inside a very large city (over 750,000)
   __ In a suburb of a very large city

6. Father's education? ___________________________

7. Mother's education? ___________________________

8. How well did your high school training prepare you for college in the following areas? Indicate either very well, fairly well, adequately, not well, or don't know.
   In the sciences? ___________________________
   In math? ___________________________
   In English? ___________________________
   In foreign languages? ___________________________

9. List the full-time jobs which members of your family (over 30 years old) and relatives close to your family (also over 30) are presently holding. Be as specific as possible.
   Father ___________________________
   Mother ___________________________
   Close relatives ___________________________

10. Indicate the number of your family members and close relatives who are attending college, graduate school or a technical training school at the present time. Also list the schools they are attending and their major (or prospective major) fields.
11. What are your close high school friends doing now? If studying, indicate the school and major. If working, indicate the kind of job.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. In what kind of positions do you think these friends will end up? Be as specific as possible.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. Among those close high school friends who are in college, how many do you feel will complete college? Give brief reasons for those whom you feel will not complete college (emotional difficulties, marriage, financial problems, grades, etc.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14. Would you recommend to any of your close friends that he (she) come to Oberlin? Why or why not? If you would not, would you recommend Oberlin if certain conditions were different? What conditions would lead you to make a firm recommendation?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

15. Who among those close to you has felt that college education is absolutely essential for you?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

16. Did anyone give you active help and guidance in encouraging you to go to college? Who gave you help--

Among your teachers and guidance staff?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Among your high school friends? (Indicate what they are doing now).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

In your family? (Indicate the relationship to you).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Among other adults? (Indicate the occupation).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
17. Among the persons listed above, who was the most helpful among these individuals? Describe briefly what stands out about their help to you.

18. What college other than Oberlin would you have liked to attend? What grades do you think you would have gotten at these schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What are the expectations of your family and kin about completing your work at Oberlin?

very high:very low

Where do you rate your own expectations?

very high:very low

20. How far would you like to continue your education?

21. Disregarding your grades, how would you rate your intellectual ability in comparison with the average Oberlin student?

higher:average:lower

22. Which areas do you feel have most priority for the Oberlin student body? Indicate in rank order.

- Relaxing with friends
- Participation in activist concerns
- Becoming a knowledgeable liberal arts student
- Academic performance in major field
- Attendance at plays, concerns, etc.
- Participation in sports (intramural or college)
- Other (specify):

23. How does the financial outlay for your college education bear on you and your immediate family in the coming years?

___ can manage ___ can manage with some difficulty ___ will demand
___ may not be able to manage ___ will demand much sacrifice

Will you be taking a summer job? ___ Approximately how much will you earn? ___ Was earning money for college one of your primary considerations in taking this job rather than other things you might have done over the summer? ___ If yes, what other things would you rather do?
If you and your family are having difficulty in financing your education, what proportion of scholarship and loan would be adequate to ease your situation? 

How much loan would you yourself be willing to take out over four years to finance your education here at Oberlin? Would you consider going to a school nearer to your home that is less costly, if finances become very difficult? Check here if you don't know what you would do.

24. What prospective career plans do you have? 

Who (or what experiences) has helped to influence your consideration?

25. Have you ever seriously contemplated other majors? What were they? What led you to reject these choices?

26. Have you ever thought of transferring from Oberlin or leaving Oberlin? If you have, what have you thought of doing? What has kept you from transferring (or leaving) Oberlin so far? Or, if you already have left for a period of time, what has brought you back?

If you were to leave school, would you complete your degree later (either here or elsewhere)? If not, what would keep you from completing (emotional difficulties, grades, problems in financing, etc.)?

27. Do you feel there are colleges other than Oberlin that would be more ideal for you? If yes, which schools would be better, and what conditions make these schools preferable to you?

28. In what campus organizations (formal and/or informal) are you involved? Indicate whether you are very involved, moderately involved, or somewhat involved in each organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Are there any organizations or activities which you would like to be involved in? Indicate what these are.
Why aren't you involved in these organizations? 

30. Who has been helpful to you in:
Selecting courses?
Giving information about a summer job?
Advising you on your grades and course work?
Choosing a major?
Giving advice about paying for your education?
Stimulating your ideas on career possibilities?

31. List the number of your close friends on campus who are:
  - Oriental
  - Negro
  - White Protestant
  - White Catholic
  - Jewish
  - Other (please specify): 

32. List the number of individuals who you feel close to. Indicate the relationship to you (cousin, boyfriend or girlfriend, roommate, section buddy, etc.) and the individual's occupation or major. Please be as specific as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to you</th>
<th>Occupation or major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Among these, which individuals are closest to you?

Among those about your same age, who are you closest to?

Among those considerably older than you, who are you closest to?

34. Indicate the following about your close friends on campus:
   a) How well do your friends perform academically? Indicate the range of their performance (eg. some are doing well, a few not so well, most average)
      _very well   _well   _average   _not so well   _poorly
b) How involved are your friends in extracurricular activities? Again, indicate the range of their involvement.

- very involved
- moderately involved
- somewhat involved
- not involved at all

c) Are any of these friends planning on a long-term basis—

- not to complete college?
- not to go on to grad school?

If yes, what are these friends planning to do?

35. List those individuals you admire and look up to whether they are close to you or not. Indicate the relationship to you and the individual's occupation or major. Please be as specific as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to you</th>
<th>Occupation or major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Oberlin faculty or staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Oberlin students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Oberlin students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among national figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among international figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Of these, which individuals do you most admire? Briefly state what particular aspects of the individual you admire.

37. Of the following areas, which has the most importance to you at Oberlin? Please indicate in rank order.

- Participation in sports (intramural or college)
- Academic performance in major field
- Becoming a knowledgeable liberal arts student
- Relaxing with friends
- Participation in activist concerns
- Attendance at plays, concerts, etc.
- Other (please specify):

38. How do you rate your own abilities to complete work at Oberlin?

- I have enough confidence in my abilities to complete work.
- I have some confidence in my abilities.
- I have my doubts at times.
- I have little confidence that I will be able to complete the work.
- I have no confidence in my abilities.

39. How do you feel about the time you have spent at Oberlin? What things about Oberlin have you liked?

What things about Oberlin have you not liked?

40. Do you feel that further study of the problem pursued in this questionnaire would be helpful?

41. Are there any questions essential to the problem we are considering that you feel are missing? What are they?
APPENDIX B
## TABLE I

High School Teachers Mentioned as Regarding College to be Essential, by father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not complete</th>
<th>HS complete</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not complete</th>
<th>HS complete</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2$: 5.81  
Cramer's Statistic: .16

## TABLE II

High School Peers Mentioned as Regarding College to be Essential, by father's education (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not completed</th>
<th>HS completed</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not completed</th>
<th>HS completed</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2$: 6.71  
Cramer's Statistic: .17
TABLE III

Mentioned Guidance from Older Siblings
by father's education
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not completed</th>
<th>HS completed</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

$\chi^2$: 14.90*

Cramer's statistic: .26

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE IV

Mentioned Guidance from High School Teachers
by father's education
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not completed</th>
<th>HS completed</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

$\chi^2$: 10.41

Cramer's statistic: .21
TABLE V

Mentioned Guidance from High School Peers
by father’s education
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS not completed</th>
<th>HS completed</th>
<th>some college</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\[ x^2: 7.85 \]

Cramer's statistic: .19
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