COMPARISON OF FAMILY BACKGROUNDS OF HONORS AND LOW POTENTIAL HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS

by 500

VIRGINIA MUNSON MOXLEY

B. S., Kansas State University, 1968

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Approved by:

Marjorie Stitt

Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Beverly Schmalzried for the advice and encouragement she provided. Her supportive guidance and resourcefulness made the study an educational and rewarding experience for the author.

A special thanks is extended to Dr. Marjorie Stith whose suggestions and support were of great value in the planning and development of the study. The author also expresses her gratitude to Dr. Ivalee McCord and Dr. David Danskin for their helpful suggestions and for serving on the author's committee.

The writer greatly appreciates the cooperation of the participants in the student research projects and their parents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Academic success is valued in our culture. While intelligence is one determinant of academic success, it is not the sole influencing factor. At the college level a wide range of academic achievement can be found among students of similar intellectual capacities.

Numerous researchers have attempted to show that family characteristics influence the academic success of children. In general, physical factors have been shown to be of minor importance. Factors such as place of residence, parents' status, family size, mother's education and mobility were found by Dibble (1967) to have little influence on the achievement of high school students. McGillivray (1964) found that in a group of eighth-grade students high and low achievers did not differ in family size, birth order, educational level of parents, family income and frequency of broken homes. Size of high school graduating class was the only characteristic of the male college students studied by Forrest (1966) in which achievers and non-achievers differed. Watson (1965) found that of the factors he considered only the educational level of the father was related statistically to academic achievement of male college students. On the basis of their work, both Nisbet (1967) and Cicirelli (1967) hypothesized that family size

influences academic achievement at the lower socio-economic levels. Findings from a study of sixth-grade students indicated that birth order was not related to achievement (Cicirelli, 1967). Farley (1967) reported a similar finding with a sample of university students. Such studies suggest that family influences on achievement of university students tend to be attributable more to psychological factors in the home than to physical factors.

Difficulties in student adjustment and success in college appear to be related to the degree of parent-student conflict (Kronovet and Barash, 1964). McGillivray (1964) reported that parents of high achievers showed more interest in education and the child than parents of low achievers. Christopher (1967) found female high school students' academic achievement was functionally related to the child's perception of parental attitudes toward achievement. According to Shaw (1964) parents of achievers wanted children to learn to make their own decisions, expected them to be adult in their behavior and stressed responsibility on the part of the child.

Research has indicated that factors influencing academic achievement vary with the sex of the child. Christopher (1967) found females tended to orient their academic behavior around perceived family values more than did males. According to Corliss (1964) elementary school girls scoring highest on a standardized achievement test tended to be only children while those scoring lowest were more likely to be the youngest or middle child. However, the high scoring boys tended to be oldest children and the lowest scores were made by boys who were youngest or only children. Dibble (1967)

indicated that I. Q. was a greater factor in the academic achievement of girls than of boys.

Research concerned with family influences on academic achievement has dealt primarily with grade school and high school students living at home. Most studies of college students have used male subjects. The need for further research on the family influence on children not living in the home, on female children and on the influence of actual and perceived psychological family factors on the academic success of young adults is indicated. Therefore, the present study will examine family background factors which may be related to the academic potential of female university students.

The population studied consisted of Kansas State University home economics majors. The population was composed of two groups. One group scored in the upper 10 percent of students taking the entrance exam, and the other group scored in the lowest 10 percent.

The major objectives of the research were:

(1) To describe the home and community background of the two groups of subjects.

(2) To investigate difference in parental attitudes and behaviors of the two groups.

(3) To study parent-child interaction in the two groups.

(4) To identify common characteristics of students who compose each group.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Man ought to be man and master of his fate, but children are at the mercy of those around them--John Lubbock (Lord Avebury) The Pleasure of Life, I, 1887 (Worley, 1967).

The dominant attitudes and values of our culture create a desire for success in academic and vocational competition (Bruckman, 1966). Erich Fromm, in the introduction to Summerhill, stated that "few parents have the courage and independence to care more for their children's happiness than for their success." The thoughtful parent would be shocked to realize the extent of pressure and power that he unwittingly uses against the child (Heffernan, 1965). Heffernan also stated the parent's major task is to provide a physical and social environment favorable to learning. Parents should help the child interact with his environment, guide him into experiences that answer his questions, challenge his curiosity, and expand his interests. A special issue of the Saturday Evening Post declared:

> We assign an overwhelming importance to the formality of education, rather than the love of learning and then expect a miracle. The mystical thing doesn't happen in the school, it happens in the child. No institution ever gave a child tenderness, compassion, a lively curiosity, quick humor, self-confidence--these qualities grow in response to the all encompassing education, the "leading forth" that only parents can provide (Heffernan, 1965).

Kessler (1965) stated that intelligence is a product of the interaction of heredity and environment. Prenatal factors influence genetic potential. It is several years after birth and exposure to environment before any measures of intelligence can be obtained, and the reliability of these is questioned. The mother's gratifications introduce the young child to the outside world. He acquires powers of perception, memory, discrimination, motor coordination, and imitation.

SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY FACTORS

Social and cultural factors influence a child's academic achievement. If the child has been taught that success is important and profitable, he will tend to do his best in school. Because learning requires acceptance of someone's superiority, it can be blocked by unconscious feelings against superiors (Kessler, 1965).

In a study of academic behavior of first year Harvard students, Ramsey (1962) found that students from different cultural orientations perceived academic roles differently. The group lowest in academic performance tended to have private school backgrounds, professional-managerial fathers, upper income level families, profess higher level Protestant denominations indicative of security and satisfaction as opposed to the militant, mobile individualism associated with others showing stronger academic performance. Students showing the highest academic performance tended to have public school backgrounds, lower family incomes, predominately Jewish, Roman Catholic, and middle level Protestant backgrounds.

Smith (1965) also found differences in the religious orientation of high and low achieving college freshmen. He found significantly more achievers than nonachievers were affiliated with Protestant churches and achievers were by their own admission more religious than were nonachievers. However, Watson (1965) found no relationship between family religious preference and academic achievement of male university upperclassmen.

Socio-economic level appears to have a significant relationship to academic achievement at all educational levels. Cary (1966) found: lower income children were handicapped in coping with schools demands when not stimulated to learn at home, the middle socio-economic group emphasized education to achieve prestige or status in professional or managerial positions, and lower class children were directed by short-range goals for survival rather than by long-range educational aspirations.

In a study of family income and the characteristics of college-bound students, Baird (1967) reported that students from low income families, when compared to students from high income families, had lower ability test scores, but higher high school grades; were more likely to attend colleges with low tuition; were more likely to expect to work, live at home, choose majors and vocations in education or social areas; and were less likely to expect to live in fraternities or sororities, participate in student government, choose majors or vocations in administrative fields, or plan any advanced degree work.

In general, studies have indicated that community size is not an

important factor in academic achievement. Watson (1965) found no relationship between hometown population and rural vs. urban home setting and academic achievement of male university upperclassmen, and Dibble (1967) reported that residence had little influence on high school academic achievement.

However, Smith (1965) identified significant differences in size of home community between achieving and non-achieving college freshmen as revealed by interview data. Results indicated that more nonachievers came from metropolitan areas of 600,000 population and over while the largest group of achievers came from communities of 50,000 to 100,000 population.

Evans (1966), in a study of elementary school students, found that mobility did not have an adverse effect upon academic achievement. These findings were supported by Perrodin (1966) who also reported that the number of moves made by pupils did not appear to affect academic achievement. He found that pupils moving long distances tended to receive higher scores on standardized intelligence tests than their short-moving or non-moving peers. Dibble (1967) found that mobility had little influence on the academic achievement of high school students.

FAMILY COMPOSITION

Watson (1965) found no relationship between number of siblings and academic achievement of male university upperclassmen. Dibble (1967) found family size had little influence on academic achievement of high school students. In support of this finding, both McGillivray (1964) and

Wellington and Wellington (undated) found no significant differences in family size of low and high achievers.

However, in a study of high school boys, Chopra (1966) observed a gradual decline in mean intelligence test scores and mean high school marks as the size of the student's family increased. The differences in mean intelligence and achievement scores for the different groups based on family size were statistically significant. The differences in the means for academic achievement continued to be significant even when intelligence test scores were held constant. Nisbet (1967) also noted an inverse relationship between family size and intelligence test scores. This was more marked on verbal tests than on nonverbal. Consistently larger regression coefficients were obtained for the female sample than for the male sample.

Lavin (1965) agreed that family size was inversely related to both intelligence and academic performance and attributed this to the negative influence of large families on verbal development. However, the only child's performance tended to be significantly lower than children with siblings matched for scholastic aptitude because he lacked experience with social relationships. Lavin found that the student who did well in school tended to come from a family with a small number of children, have warm, interested parents, have a fairly high degree of power in decision making, and come from a family which had reached a concensus regarding values and decisions.

Cicirelli (1967), studying with a sixth grade middle class white

population, found no significant relationship between family size and measures of ability and achievement in families ranging in size from one to eleven children. Birth order was not related to abilities or achievement in three- or four-child families. In three-child families, subjects (male or female) with two brothers scored lower in intelligence tests and reading achievement than subjects with at least one sister. It was speculated that the presence of more than one brother in the family increased the pressures toward play, sports, and other nonintellectual activities. In two-child families first-born girls and second-born boys scored higher on IQ tests than second-born girls and second-born boys scored. Cicirelli (1967) concluded that birth order did not appear to be an important factor affecting ability and achievement in sixth grade students. This was consistent with the hypothesized developmental trend that the later-born child does better in early childhood, while the skills of the first-born come to the fore in high school and college.

Sampson's (1962) study indicated that the relationship between birth order and need for achievement is stronger for females than for males. He reported that first-borns had higher need for achievement than did later-borns. Although first-born females had a greater resistance to influence than later-borns, first-born males had less resistance to influence. It was assumed that first-born females were significantly more involved in independence training than first-born males. Early independence training created greater need for achievement and resistance to influence. Farley

(1967) and Watson (1965) supported this finding with their studies of males. In their studies they found that birth order and relative academic achievement in the university were unrelated. However, in the Wellington and Wellington (undated) study more oldest children were among the high achievers and more youngest children were among the low achievers.

Chopra (1966) did not find a significant relationship between ordinal position and intelligence test scores or academic achievement. McGillivray (1964) also found no difference between high and low achievers in regard to birth order.

According to Corliss (1964) elementary school girls scoring highest on a standardized achievement test tended to be only children while those scoring lowest were more likely to be the youngest or middle child. However, the high scoring boys tended to be oldest children and the lowest scores were made by boys who were youngest or only children.

Some differences in the achievement levels of males and females have been attributed to sex differences. Dibble (1967) found that sex contributed to high school academic achievement to a small extent, and the influence was greater in lower income than higher income groups. Intelligence test scores were more closely related to girls' achievement than to boys'.

Age of parents also appeared to be a contributing factor in academic achievement. In a study of high school students, Roberts (1962) found that fathers of high achievers were significantly younger than those of low achievers and the achievers' mothers tended to be younger also.

Wellington and Wellington's (undated) findings supported this influence of father's age.

Crescimbani (1964) stated that one out of eight children was not living with both parents. He found a significant difference in academic achievement of children in one- and two-parent homes at the same intelligence test score level. However, Birnbaum (1966) found no significant difference between grade-point average, work habits, cooperation, attendance, or extracurricular participation of secondary school boys from broken and unbroken homes. McGillivray (1964) found that the incidence of broken homes was not a factor in high and low academic achievement.

Kriesberg (1967) reported that under favorable circumstances husbandless mothers were more likely than married to value education and have high educational aspirations; however, the implementation of these values and aspirations was often difficult. Some husbandless mothers applied more pressure for educational achievement than married ones, but at the same time were less likely to participate in the school's parent activities. They were more likely to have encyclopedias and less likely to go to concerts and museums.

Rolcik (1965) found no significant difference in scholastic achievement of teenagers from broken homes and those from unhappy complete homes. Higher achievers tended to be from happy complete homes. In all three types of families, students with higher grades were more likely to indicate that their parents often took an interest in school work. With interest in

school work held constant, a significant relationship was found between scholastic achievement and parental interest in school work of children from happy complete homes.

OCCUPATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PARENTS

The father's educational and both parents' occupational levels have been shown to affect academic achievement. Watson (1965), in a study of male university upperclassmen, found father's educational level was related to academic achievement as measured by grade point average but the educational level of the mothers was not. Dibble (1967) found mother's education had little influence on the academic achievement of high school students. According to Roberts (1962) fathers of high achieving high school students had slightly more formal education than fathers of low achievers. Mothers of high achievers also had slightly more formal education.

Smith (1965) reported that achievers and nonachievers did not differ significantly in regard to parents' professional background or financial status. Dibble (1967) found that although income level contributed to academic achievement of high school students, parent status had little influence. Intelligence, as measured by a standardized test, was a greater factor in the achievement of students from higher income families than in the achievement of students from lower income families. McGillivray (1964) found no differences between high and low academic achievers in regard to educational level of the parents or family income.

Sanford (1965) found the family had the main role in motivating a student

to seek higher education. Many students from working class homes had parents indifferent or hostile to children's efforts to obtain a college education. Roberts (1962) studied factors affecting the underachievement of bright high school students. She found that fathers of high achievers were engaged in higher ranking occupations than fathers of low achievers.

Wade (1962) investigated the relationship between school achievement and parent employment for seventh grade students. She found the average intelligence test score of students with one parent employed was 113.73, while the average for students with both parents employed was 106.83--a significant difference. However, both groups achieved at approximately the same level. The hypothesized reasons for this similarity were (1) drive and motivation were stronger as a result of having both parents work, (2) children of employed mothers were more independent, self-reliant, and better adjusted.

Banducci (1967) found maternal employment had little if any detrimental effect on children in regard to educational aspirations, expectations, and achievement. He noted a trend for children of working mothers to have higher educational aspirations and expectations than children of non-working mothers with the exception of boys from the professional socio-economic level. Girls with working mothers planned to combine homemaking and a working career more often than ones with non-working mothers. This study supported the hypothesis that children of working mothers generally earn higher grades than children of non-working mothers.

In a study of sixth-grade children Jones (1967) found children of professionally employed mothers scored significantly higher in reading achievement than children of housewives. Professionally employed mothers had more years of college, more books in the home library, spent more time each day reading, and expected the child to finish college and enter a profession. The homemaking mothers had fewer years of college, read less, and indicated no definite plans as to the child's college attendance.

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES PROVIDED IN THE HOME

Ambrosino (1967) labeled parents the "most influential molders of human clay." He reported that parents tend to have high expectations for children and schools and feel a sense of urgency to rear children who can cope with today's world. Because social pressures foster a busy, over-committed schedule, children need a place for the solitude and relaxation necessary for emotional restoration needed for greater efforts.

From his beginning efforts to learn, a child needs to experience the thrill of success, no matter how slight. He should perceive self as important and capable of mastering new skills (Unruh, 1966). Sarcasm, belittlement, suspicion, and constant reprimands make a child nervous and anxious. A parent who discourages questions makes a child doubt his ability and opinions and is likely to kill the child's urge to learn. An indifferent adult who ignores a child's plea for attention and help or is too easily satisfied with the child's response to questions fails to inspire him to explore, reason, and develop judgment. A child needs a warm supportive environment,

opportunities for success, a variety of experiences, and a chance to become actively involved in his own learning.

Klemm (1967), in his paper on gifted children, stated that parents of gifted children were fortunate. The gifted child tended to be bigger and stronger than most children and to have a healthier childhood with fewer childhood ills than others. The parents tended to be above average in intelligence, have sound attitudes toward children and provide an environment conducive to optimum development of the child's potentials in all areas of experience or endeavor. Klemm listed methods for parental help. Parents should help the child set realistic goals and develop self confidence. They should be permissive enough to allow the fullest development of curiosity and creativity and restrictive enough to control quarrels and disobedience. They should support and praise without molding the child into their own ideal.

Cheyney (1962) found that parents recognized giftedness in children through their interests, school work and reading. They fostered the child's potential by purchasing encyclopedias and books and using the public library; by providing music, art, typing, and language lessons; by encouraging participation in organizations and travel; and by helping with extra assignments, homework, and by encouraging family discussions.

According to Worley (1967), parents are the first and most important teachers of their children. If parents have a positive effect, children start school with a vast fund of information, ideas, and values. If negative,

the child will either neglect or fear school and learning. Parents can establish a learning atmosphere by encouraging the use of books and poetry in the home and library visits, by spending time with children for unplanned things, by discussing current issues at mealtime, and by taking trips within the community. To insure optimum health, parents should encourage a child's individuality, share in his interests, help him develop self confidence, set realistic expectations for him, and encourage good health habits and exercise. By example, parents teach values such as respect for authority and tolerance and understanding of others.

McGillivray (Gallagher, 1966) stated that the psychological environment is more important than the physical environment of the home. According to Lipsman (1966) the predominating goal for parents of young children should be to cultivate independence, spontaneity, self confidence and value for what the child is rather than for what he does.

PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

Katkovsky, Preston, and Crandall (1964) reported the greater the importance placed on intellectual achievement by both mothers and fathers, the more they valued intellectual achievement for their offspring--especially the daughters. Fathers tended to set standards for boys similar to standards for themselves. Parents frequently considered it inappropriate for grade school boys to pursue intellectual activities and neglect "masculine" interests. Grade school girls often were expected to emphasize intellectual activities. Parents who value intellectual achievement for themselves may

consider this more important for young daughters than young sons. In the case of minimal standards, however, the parent who demands a high level of intellectual performance from himself may be more willing to accept less from a daughter than from a son. Because intellectual competence is associated with vocational success and the male role of breadwinner, parents with high intellectual standards for themselves are more likely to establish high standards for sons than for daughters.

Crandall and others (1964) found most entering grade school students valued intellectual and academic achievement and had expectations for success and standards to judge efforts. Girls who scored highest academically had mothers less affectionate and less nurturant than girls less proficient. High nurturance restricted learning experiences in independence and achievement by decreasing possibilities to develop independent problem-solving techniques and by decreasing confidence in abilities to do so. Attainment values parents placed on child's intellectual competence were essentially unrelated to academic achievement test performances. A significant negative correlation was noted between father's strong desire for daughter to be intellectually competent and daughter's performance on a reading achievement test. A significant positive relationship was indicated between reading performance and mother's assessment of general intellectual competence. The mothers had more accurate information on how the child was performing than did the fathers. Mothers who set high standards for daughter's intellectual achievement efforts had daughters who scored higher

on the achievement test. Girls who performed especially well on tests had parents less prone to encourage and push them toward intellectual activities than less academically proficient girls. Parents' participation with children in intellectual activities had little relation to the competence of children on academic achievement tests. Girls who did especially well on the reading test had fathers who praised and rewarded rather than criticized and punished intellectual achievement behavior. The findings of the study supported the hypothesis that girls are less autonomous of adults than are boys.

Shore and Leiman (1965) studied parental responses on an open-ended questionnaire completed at the time of their son's admission to a junior college in an effort to identify family characteristics of underachievers and achievers. A significant difference was found between the two groups in the parental descriptions of their child's vocational goals and interests. The parents of achievers saw their children as having specific goals which required academic training, while the parents of underachievers saw their children as undecided on vocational plans or seeking goals that required little academic training. The parents of achievers saw their child's assets and liabilities in terms of academic abilities while the parents of underachievers saw their child's assets and liabilities in terms of personality traits and social ability. There was no difference between the achievers and underachievers in intelligence test performance or performance on achievement tests, although their performance in course work was markedly different.

Anderson, Mawby, Miller, and Olson (1965) found that parents were most frequently cited by young people as having the greatest influence on occupational and educational plans. Young people try to satisfy parents' aspirations. There is a strong relationship between the individual's self-perception of his academic and occupational abilities and his achievement in these areas. Parents are the primary reference group for the child's formation of this aspect of his self-concept.

Wellington and Wellington (undated) in a study of elementary and secondary school underachievers found that over one-half of the underachievers interviewed reported rebelling against parental pushing. Three-fourths said their parents worried a lot about their not studying. The underachievers and parents expressed a lack of mutual understanding and the youngsters felt pushed and engineered. Three-fourths of the students considered their homes happy.

Other studies supported these trends. Smith (1965) reported that nonachievers felt their parents pressed them for grades and the achievers felt they had applied their own pressure. According to McGillivray (1964) parents of high achievers showed more interest in education and in the child than did parents of low achievers. Shore and Leiman (1965) suggested that parental expectations with regard to academic achievement and parental concern and interest over academic issues was an important factor in motivation for high performance.

Ellsworth (1967) wrote that negative feelings about self come from

overprotection, domination, and neglect. A person needs to know that he is capable of doing and deciding things and is worthy of the respect of others. A positive self-concept indicates the individual feels adequate to meet the situation, is capable of dealing with the world, is likeable, valued, intrinsically worthy, and free. Low intelligence, as measured by standardized tests, in many cases is caused by emotional deprivation.

In a study of high ability high school seniors Nichols (1964) found that authoritarian childrearing attitudes of the mother were negatively related to measures of creativity and originality of the child, but were positively related to academic performance. The finding that the children of authoritarian mothers obtained better grades in school and more favorable ratings by their teachers is consistent with the hypothesis that authoritarian childrearing practices lead to conformity and good behavior but stifle originality.

Teahan (1963) hypothesized that different personality characteristics are related to success in different levels of the educational effort. Successful high school students tend to be accepting of convention, orderly, and docile. In college the high achiever needs self-sufficiency and independence of judgment. Perhaps low achievers have not been allowed to develop the self-sufficiency and independence of thought necessary for college success. This hypothesis suggests that although some level of parental demands and, perhaps, even domination is necessary, too much can interfere with academic success beyond the secondary school level.

In a study of junior high students, Drews and Teahan (1965) found

that mothers of high achievers were more authoritarian and restrictive in the treatment of their children than mothers of low achievers. Parents of high achieving gifted children also seemed to have more punitive attitudes about child rearing.

In contradiction, Duvall (1962) declared that the child's need for achievement, which is related to accelerated mental growth, develops in a family situation in which the mother uses democratic principles in disciplining the child. Teachers selected the parents of well-adjusted students from 5 to 21 years of age. Common attributes of the parents were that they enjoyed being parents, believed in having fun together with children, appreciated and trusted children, and, most important, loved the children and let them know it. Children who had grown up in warm, democratic families had more initiative, higher achievement drives and accelerated rates of mental growth.

Shaw's (1964) research on parent attitudes toward independence training and the academic achievement of their children indicated that demands made by parents of achievers were more specific than those made by parents of underachievers. Parents of achievers wanted their children to learn to make their own decisions and expected children to be more adult in their behavior, while parents of underachievers were concerned with having their children learn to protect their personal rights. Goals favored by parents of achievers seemed to stress the responsibility of the child to the parent and appeared to be aimed at relieving the parent of certain

responsibilities.

Teahan (1963) administered the Shoben Parental Attitude Scale to high and low achieving college freshmen and their parents. Both male and female students were studied. No differences were found in the child rearing attitudes of high and low achieving female students. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of mothers and their daughters in the low achieving group. Mothers of low achievers were more dominating than their daughters while no such disparity was found between high achievers and their mothers. The fathers of both female groups were similar in the sense that they were significantly higher than their daughters on the possessive and dominating scales. In addition, the fathers and mothers of high achieving females were significantly lower on the ignoring scale than their counterparts for the low group.

Fathers' attitudes differed for the high achieving and low achieving male groups. Fathers of low achievers were significantly higher than their sons on the possessive and ignoring scales while no such differences appeared when the high achievers and their fathers were compared. Fathers of high achievers were also significantly lower on the possessive scale than fathers of low achievers. Only in the case of high achievers did a difference appear between sons and mothers with the latter having a significantly lower score than their offspring on the ignoring scale.

All fathers were shown to be somewhat possessive and dominating in their attitudes toward their daughters. Both parents of low achievers seemed

to demand rather unquestioning obedience from their children and were more punitive in their approach to them. Perhaps the dominating attitude of the high achiever's father is tempered in the home by more permissiveness on the mother's part with a better relationship between mother and daughter because of their similar attitudes.

The high and low achieving students agreed among themselves in terms of expressed attitudes towards child rearing. Perhaps peer influence or the more intellectualized standards learned in college courses had a stronger effect on such attitudes, especially when it pertained to "children in the abstract." Whether these attitudes would hold true when they themselves become parents is, of course, another matter.

PERCEIVED PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

The student's perception of his parents is his reality. He may perceive parents differently from the image that they believe they are projecting or differently than their actual behavior.

Davids and Hainsworth (1967) administered the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) to bright teenage boys enrolled in special education programs for academic underachievers and high achievers with instructions to complete the inventory the way their mothers would respond. The PARI was also administered to the mothers. The two groups of boys did not differ in perceptions of maternal hostility, but the underachievers perceived their mothers as significantly higher on maternal control. There were no significant differences between maternal attitudes avowed by the two groups

of mothers, although there was a trend suggestive of more control avowed by mothers of the high-achieving group, with the most pronounced discrepancies being evidenced on measures of maternal control. Whereas mothers' and sons' scores correlated significantly for the control factor in the group of high achievers, there was no significant association between attitudes ascribed to their mothers and actual attitudes avowed by mothers of the underachievers.

Williams and Williams (1963) investigated the relationships between authoritarian attitudes of college students, estimation of parents' attitudes and actual parental attitudes. Students' image of mother indicated she was more restrictive and authoritarian than she actually was. Females were more aware than were males of their parents' attitudes and the college student was more aware of the attitudes of the opposite sex than of same sex parent.

Cristopher (1967) found that the academic achievement of females was functionally related to the strength of the parent-child relationship and to the child's perceived parental attitudes toward achievement. Lower achievement was characteristic of females of high intelligence who viewed their parents as placing low value on achievement. Females tended to orient behavior around the family unit and operate on perceived family values.

Barwick and Arbuckle (1962) noted that father acceptance as perceived by adolescent girls increased as the level of academic achievement increased. Mother acceptance as perceived by the girls also increased as

the level of achievement became higher. Mother acceptance was perceived by the girls at all achievement levels as greater than father acceptance. In general, no particular trends were evident in the mean values of the scores of tests measuring the parents' report of their own attitudes. However, it was felt that the child's perception was a stronger factor in achievement than the actual stimulus or the parental report of it.

Mueller (1966) in a study of university freshmen found that female subjects' intellectual orientation was related to perceived father's activity rather than mother's. Father's activity took precedence over his strength. Female subjects with greater intellectual orientation perceived father as more passive. A passive father was described as level headed, calm, light, rather than excitable. The more active the mother, the higher the males' intellectual needs. Mueller hypothesized that intellectual orientation of females grows out of earlier defenses against unresolved dependency needs.

Norman (1966) administered the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values to parents of gifted children (IQ of 130 or more) who had been categorized respectively as achievers or nonachievers. It was found that the identification process was strongly operative, for fathers of achieving boys and mothers of achieving girls made significantly higher mean scores in Independence and lower ones in Conformity than the same-sex parents of nonachievers. When correlations were calculated between husband-wife pairs, it was found that different patterns of significant correlations on the SIV

emerged for the respective parent groups and the correlations for parents of achievers were significantly less variable than those of nonachievers.

In another study of identification with parents, Warriner and Trites (1966) found college freshman males whose fathers and mothers failed to complete educational undertakings more often discontinued their education than males whose parents had a converse educational history. Level of academic aptitude did not appear to be an influential factor in this relationship. Freshman females appeared to be similarly influenced by fathers, but this finding was not completely unrelated to academic aptitude.

Family relationships of achieving and underachieving readers differed in a study by Mutimer et al. (1966). Achieving girls tended to identify with mothers and reject siblings more than did underachieving girls while underachieving girls tended to be more dependent on siblings. More sibling rivalry existed among achieving girls. The achievers identification with parents and accepting-rejecting attitude with siblings is considered healthy in our culture.

Kinnane and Bannon (1964) reported that among college women perceived parental influence was highly related to socio-economic status of the family as indicated by the occupational level of the father. Fathers in professional work with education and training superior to mother may have exerted greater influence on female and she internalized his idealized goals for her. A girl who identified with her mother often came from a home where the father worked at the skilled or unskilled level and where work was a more realistic

possibility for women.

Heilbrun (1962) found that higher identification with father indicated better adjustment for college males and higher identification with mother tended to be associated with poorer adjustment for college females.

STUDENT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

Smith (1965) indicated that achievers were more concerned with cultural aspirations and service to humanity than with status, money, or the good life, and had more hobbies and perceived fewer personal problems than did the nonachievers. Nonachievers were more negative and hostile in their attitude toward authority than were achievers.

Watson (1965) suggested that the relationship between personal background factors of students and academic achievement varies with the sex, level of adjustment, and type of educational institution characterizing the sample.

Great variability was found in results of research in high school participation of achievers and nonachievers. Dibble (1967) found intelligence test score was the major influencing variable in academic achievement, and participation in school activities contributed to a lesser extent. According to Smith (1965) high school grades were significantly higher for achievers. Wellington and Wellington (undated) indicated significantly more high achievers than low achievers had taken or were taking music lessons, and that high achievers participated in more school activities and had more offices than low achievers. Watson (1965) found no relationship

between size of high school graduating class, high school extracurricular activities and academic achievement of male university upperclassmen.

In a comparison of achieving and underachieving male university students, Forrest (1966) found size of high school graduating class was the only background factor out of 22 comparisons made which differentiated between achievers and underachievers. More withdrawing underachievers attended high schools of more than 150 students and more persisting underachievers attended schools of less than 150 students.

Differences were indicated in the way students spent time at home. Although Wellington and Wellington (undated) found no significant difference between low and high achievers in the number of home duties performed, nor age at which home duties were begun, they did find high achievers spent significantly more hours studying and less time watching television, movies, or reading.

Roberts (1962) found that high achievers spent an average of 4.43 hours per week watching television compared to 9.95 hours for low achievers--a highly significant difference. Ridder (1963) found no significant relationship between academic achievement and the total number of hours per week spent watching television. She suggested that a child who neglected school work to watch television would also neglect it for other reasons.

Hass (1963) administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to upperclass undergraduate students with grade point averages of 3.6 or better on a 4.0 scale attending a state university. Their scores on the 15

personality needs measured by the EPPS were not found to be significantly different from the norms. The students did not evidence higher achievement needs or significant drives for order, endurance, etc. The parents were not found to be significantly characterized by dominance or some of the other personality variables frequently assumed. The researchers concluded the superior students were probably not very different from other college students except in terms of ability and diligence.

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP

Wellington and Wellington (undated) found high achievers indicated better parent-child relationships than did underachievers. A positive relationship between good parent-child interaction and achievement was supported by other research studies reviewed.

Tibbits (1965) studied the family relationships associated with the underachievement and high achievement of high school males. High achieving boys and parents were more alike in expressing greater satisfaction with family relations than were low achieving boys and parents in their less satisfactory description of family behavior patterns. Low achievers indicated lack of agreement between parents on standards of behavior expected for boys. High achievers tended to identify with their families and were likely to be motivated by a desire to please parents. High achievers described parents as more thoughtful, understanding, and interested. Father-son relationships depended on mutual interests and shared activities while mother-son relationships were based on mutual affection and trust.

According to Richardson (1966) first-year college women who scored high on tests of creative thinking tended to perceive former parent-child relationships as categorically and significantly more loving and less rejecting than those first-year college women who scored low on tests of creative thinking.

Hollenbeck (1961) studied university students' relationships with parents. Women saw mothers as more congruent than did men. Men saw mothers' responses as more positive than fathers' on level of regard, empathic understanding, and total score. Women saw mothers as significantly more empathic than fathers.

In a study of parent-student relationships of college students, Kronovet and Barash (1964) found that the degree of parent student conflict appears to be correlated with difficulties in student adjustment and success in college. By working with parents, educators could be in a better position to make a strong impact on the student.

Hollenbeck (1965) hypothesized that high levels of congruence, empathic understanding, and unconditional positive regard by parents would be positively related to adjustment and achievement of students. The hypothesis with respect to adjustment was given strong support, but the hypothesis with respect to achievement was given minimal support. Adjustment was measured by the correspondence between self and self-ideal Q-sorts and achievement was measured by grade point average controlled for ability. Empathic understanding and congruence appeared to be effective variables

in the father-son relationship, but not in the father-daughter relationship with regard to intellectual achievement. The father-daughter relationship appeared more important to student adjustment than the father-son. The relationships between Q-sort scores and grade point average suggested that different factors were important in the achievement of men and of women.

SUMMARY

Studies concerned with students of differing academic achievement as shown by school grades and of academic aptitude as shown by intelligence test scores were reviewed. It was felt that both achievement and aptitude are related to a student's potential for success in the university.

Although many researchers have examined the relationships of factors outside of the school room to the academic achievement of students, few conclusions have been reached. A brief summary of the findings follows.

A review of studies concerned with social and community variables indicated that middle class children were more likely than lower or upper class to be high achievers. They received more parental encouragement than did lower class children, and did not have the security and satisfaction of upper class children. Religious affiliation, community size, and mobility seldom affected academic achievement.

When middle class populations were studied, family size was unrelated to academic achievement. Although ordinal position was often reported to be unrelated to academic achievement, high achieving girls were often oldest children. Incidence of broken homes was not an important factor in academic

success; however, satisfaction with the home situation was important for academic success.

Father's educational level appeared to affect the child's academic achievement, while mother's did not. Family income and occupational level were unrelated to academic success. Maternal employment was seldom detrimental to the child's academic accomplishments, and children of working mothers often made better grades than children of non-working mothers.

Parental encouragement of and involvement in intellectual and academic pursuits was important to the child's success. Loving concern for the child as a person yielded better results than attempts to mold the child into the parent's ideal. Parents, through their attitudes and behavior, prepared the child to accept or reject school. Although authoritarian child rearing attitudes frequently produced orderly, docile students, successful at lower levels; more self-sufficiency and independence were needed for success in college. Early involvement in decision making and acceptance of adult standards of behavior were characteristics of high achievers. Involvement in extracurricular activities was unrelated to academic success as were personality variables. High achievers indicated more satisfaction with family relationships than did low achievers.

Although the relationship of academic achievement to the child's physical surroundings in terms of community and family composition remains in question, parents' interest in the child and the child's acknowledgment and acceptance of this interest is related to success in school. Students

tend to identify with parental academic values. Students tend to respond positively to parental interest in school achievement. Students tend to respond negatively to a lack of interest from their parents.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this investigation was to study the family backgrounds of two groups of home economics freshmen differing in scholastic potential. Grade point average predictions derived from American College Testing Program (ACT) and American College Examination (ACE) were utilized in the selection of the criterion groups for this study.

SUBJECTS

The subjects for the present study were drawn from two research projects conducted under the auspices of the Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University. One study was designed to measure developmental processes of honors students and the other dealt with the college experiences of students showing low potential for graduation. All subjects were female home economics majors at Kansas State University.

The two groups were selected on the basis of their scores on entrance examinations. The longitudinal studies were concerned with the students for the duration of their college careers as well as with post-college experiences. For the purposes of this study only the research conducted during the freshman year of the two groups was utilized.

The honors research project was begun in the fall of 1958 and was

continued to include entering freshmen in 1959, 1960, and 1961. The honors subjects had all scored in the top 10 percent of students taking the entrance examinations and were included in the College of Home Economics Honors Program.

The study of students demonstrating low academic potential began in the fall of 1963 and was continued for the entering class of 1964. The low potential students comprised the lower 10 percent of students entering the College of Home Economics.

The subjects included in the present study were ones for whom comparable information was available. The number of participants from each freshman class is shown in Table 1. Although the original honors project had 37 participants and the low potential project had 48, only 36 and 23 respectively could be used for this study. The omitted subjects were ones for whom complete or partial information was not available from the original research project.

TABLE 1

YEAR OF MATRICULATION OF SUBJECTS

Year	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1958	5	13.9	...	...
1959	6	16.6	...	...
1960	14	38.9	...	...
1961	11	30.6	...	...
1963	...	...	19	82.6
1964	...	...	4	17.4
Total	36	100.0	23	100.0

The subjects were enrolled in almost every area of home economics offered at Kansas State University. The distribution of subjects by group and major is presented in Table 2. The majors were not available for many of the low potential students who left school during their first year. Many students who remained to graduate changed curriculums.

TABLE 2

FRESHMAN CURRICULUM OF SUBJECTS

Curriculum	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Art	4	11.1	3	13.0
Clothing & Textiles	...	...	5	21.8
Family & Child Dev'l	1	2.8	...	...
Foods & Nutrition	5	13.9	2	8.7
Family Economics	...	...	...	...
General	10	27.8	...	...
Nursing	3	8.3	2	8.7
Teaching	3	8.3	...	...
Journalism	1	2.8	...	...
Elementary Education	3	8.3	2	8.7
Unknown	6	16.7	9	39.1
Total	36	100.0	23	100.0

All but one of the subjects for whom the age at entrance to college is reported is in the age range of 17.5 to 19.5 years as are most entering freshmen. Age differences between the groups are small. The age distribution is presented in Table 3.

Many of the students' parents participated in the study by being interviewed concerning their respective families and their child rearing methods and attitudes about children with special emphases on their relationship

with the student in the research project. Twenty-two honors mothers and 20 fathers took part as well as 11 low potential mothers and eight fathers.

TABLE 3

AGE OF SUBJECTS AT COLLEGE ENTRANCE

Age	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
16.5 - 17.49	...	...	1	4.4
17.5 - 18.49	30	83.3	13	56.5
18.5 - 19.49	6	16.7	5	21.7
Unknown	...	...	4	17.4
Total	36	100.0	23	100.0

INSTRUMENTS

The information for the present study was gathered from a series of instruments administered to subjects in both the honors and low potential groups during their respective freshman years.

Biographical information for each subject was available in the permanent files of the College. During the first semester of her freshman year each subject was interviewed by a researcher to learn about her background experiences. At this time the subjects completed a Cultural Interest Questionnaire. All parents who could come to the campus were interviewed to provide additional information about the student's background. Copies of the questionnaire forms and interview questions are included in Appendix A.

The information selected for further examination and analysis was chosen to meet the goals of the study which were:

(1) To describe the home and community backgrounds of the two groups of students.

(2) To investigate differences in parental attitudes and behaviors between the two groups.

(3) To study parent-child interaction in the two groups.

(4) To study characteristics of the members of the low potential and honors groups.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The interview responses of students and parents and the students' responses to the questionnaire were coded numerically and recorded. Copies of the numerical codes are included in Appendix B. The frequencies and percentages for each variable were computed for the two groups by the Kansas State University Computing Center. The Chi Square test was used for comparisons where appropriate and where sample size permitted.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purposes of the study were to describe the home and community backgrounds, to investigate differences in parental attitudes and behaviors, to study parent-child interaction, and to identify characteristics of students in the honors and low potential groups.

HOME AND COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

The subjects were all females and ranged in age from 17 to 19 years at the time they entered the University. Subjects in both groups enrolled in the College of Home Economics at Kansas State University and were selected to participate in research dealing with their college experiences. The part of this research selected for study concerns the students' pre-college experiences within their homes and communities.

Although the original research projects included 37 honors and 48 low potential students, only those for whom the desired information was available were selected for the present study. Included were 36 honors and 23 low potential students.

All but three of the 59 subjects were Kansas residents at the time of their enrollment and most had lived in Kansas their entire lives. Both groups showed a slight trend to move from farm to city during their childhoods.

During their high school years, 30.1 percent of the honors and 17.4 percent of the low potential students resided on farms. While a greater proportion of honors than of low potential students resided on farms, the difference was not significant at the .05 level of probability.

More honors students than low potential tended to come from small towns. While 63.9 percent of the honors students resided in towns with under 10,000 population, only 38.1 percent of the low potential group were from towns of this size. This difference was not significant at the .05 level of probability.

Family size ranged from one to seven children in the honors group and from one to six in the low potential group. Most of the students in both groups reported having one or two siblings. No inter-group differences in family size were found, however differences in birth order and sex of siblings were noted.

Greater differences between groups in number and placement of sisters were noted than in the number and placement of brothers. Subjects in both groups were more likely to have younger brothers than older. While approximately 25 percent of both groups had older brothers, the low potential students were more likely to have younger brothers (58.5 percent compared to 38.3 percent for the honors).

Honors subjects were frequently the oldest girls in the families with one or more younger sisters. There was a tendency for low potential students to be the youngest girls in the families with older sisters. More honors than

low potential students had younger sisters. The difference was significant at the .05 level of probability.

Most subjects were affiliated with a Protestant denomination. All but two of the honors students and six of the low potential students were Protestants. Of these eight subjects, five were non-respondents and three were Roman Catholics.

The parents of both groups of students were well-educated in terms of years in school. Over one-half of the mothers and two-thirds of the fathers in both groups had some college background. There was a tendency for the honors student parents to have more years of formal education than the low potential students' parents but this difference was not significant at the .05 level of probability.

Most of the mothers of both groups were full-time homemakers. Of the 27.8 percent of honors students' mothers who worked, 5.6 percent were engaged in clerical and sales work and 22.2 percent were in professional occupations. None of the 34.8 percent of low potential students' mothers who worked were employed professionally, but 21.7 percent of the mothers were in clerical and sales work. While the proportion of low potential students' mothers working was greater than the proportion of honors students' mothers, the honors mothers were engaged in higher level occupations.

The largest area of employment for the fathers of both groups was the "professional, managerial, executive, and semi-professional" area which included 47.2 percent of the honors and 34.8 percent of the low potential

fathers. The second largest grouping was farming which encompassed 30.6 percent of the honors students' fathers and 17.4 percent of the low potential students' fathers. Although 13.0 percent of the low potential subjects' fathers were engaged in semi-skilled and unskilled work, none of the honors students' fathers were.

Differences in frequency of family newspaper and magazine subscriptions and book club membership were examined. Although most families in both groups received both local and major city newspapers and subscribed to four or more magazines, the groups differed greatly in frequency of book club membership. Although 72.2 percent of the honors students' families belonged to a book club, only 17.4 percent of the low potential students' families did. The difference was significant at the .001 level of probability. With regard to type of magazines received, most families in both groups subscribed to "news and general interest" and "woman's" magazines. A major difference between groups was the frequency of subscription to Reader's Digest (66.7 percent of honors and 30.4 percent of low potential families). This difference was significant at the .01 level.

A detailed account of the home and community background of the two groups of subjects is presented in Table 4. Because of incomplete data collection, failure to answer a question, or misunderstanding of the question asked, some responses were not available for study. These are included in the "unknown" category.

TABLE 4

HOME AND COMMUNITY BACKGROUND OF SUBJECTS

Variable	Honors (N = 36)		Low Potential (N = 23)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
PLACE OF RESIDENCE				
State				
Kansas	33	91.7	23	100.0
Other	3	8.3	...	...
Size of Hometown				
Less than 1,000	10	27.8	2	8.7
1,000 to 2,500	7	19.4	6	26.1
2,500 to 10,000	6	16.7	...	...
10,000 to 25,000	6	16.7	5	21.7
More than 25,000	7	19.4	8	34.8
Unknown	...	...	2	8.7
Grade School Residence				
Farm	15	41.7	5	21.7
City	21	58.3	18	78.3
High School Residence				
Farm	13	36.1	4	17.4
City	23	63.9	19	82.6
FAMILY COMPOSITION				
Number of Siblings				
0	2	5.6	4	17.4
1	14	38.8	7	30.4
2	15	41.7	7	30.4
3	3	8.3	2	8.7
4	1	2.8	1	4.4
5	...	...	2	8.7
6	1	2.8	...	...
Number of Older Brothers				
0	27	75.0	18	78.3
1	6	16.7	4	17.4
2	3	8.3	1	4.3
Number of Younger Brothers				
0	24	66.6	10	43.5
1	10	27.8	9	39.1
2	1	2.8	2	8.7
3	1	2.8	2	8.7

TABLE 4--Continued

Variable	Honors (N = 36) Number	Percentage	Low Potential (N = 23) Number	Percentage
Number of Older Sisters				
0	29	80.5	14	60.9
1	6	16.7	9	39.1
2	1	2.8	...	...
Number of Younger Sisters				
0	17	47.2	17	73.9[a]
1	12	33.3	5	21.7
2	6	16.7	1	4.4
3	1	2.8	...	...
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION				
Protestant	34	94.4	17	73.9
Catholic	1	2.8	2	8.7
Unknown	1	2.8	4	17.4
PARENT OCCUPATION AND EDUCATION				
Mother's Years of Education				
Less than 9	1	2.8	...	...
9, 10, 11	1	2.8	...	...
12	7	19.4	8	34.8
13, 14	9	25.0	4	17.4
15, 16	13	36.1	5	21.7
More than 16	5	13.9	...	...
Unknown	...	...	6	26.1
Father's Years of Education				
Less than 9	1	2.8	1	4.4
9, 10, 11	1	2.8	...	...
12	8	22.2	4	17.4
13, 14	10	27.8	5	21.7
15, 16	8	22.2	5	21.7
More than 16	8	22.2	2	8.7
Unknown	...	...	6	26.1
Mother's Occupation				
Housewife	26	72.2	10	43.5
Semi-skilled Occupation	...	...	2	8.7
Skilled Occupation	...	...	1	4.4
Clerical and Sales	2	5.5	5	21.7
Professional	8	22.2	...	...
Unknown	...	...	5	21.7

TABLE 4--Continued (2)

Variable	Honors (N = 36) Number	Percentage	Low Potential (N = 23) Number	Percentage
Father's Occupation				
Unskilled and semi-skilled	...	...	3	13.0
Skilled	4	11.0	2	8.7
Agriculture-related	...	...	1	4.4
Farming	11	30.6	4	17.4
Service	...	...	...	...
Clerical and Sales	2	5.6	2	8.7
Professional, Managerial, Executive and Semi-professional	17	47.2	8	34.8
Deceased or Unknown	2	5.6	3	13.0
EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS IN THE HOME				
Newspaper Subscriptions				
Major City	3	8.3	5	21.7
Local	6	16.7	2	8.7
Both	27	75.0	15	65.2
Unknown	...	...	1	4.4
Magazine Subscriptions				
None	...	...	...	...
1 to 3	10	27.8	9	39.1
4 or more	26	72.2	14	60.9
Family in Book Club				
Yes	26	72.2	4	17.4[d]
No	9	25.0	19	82.6
Unknown	1	2.8	...	...
Type of Magazine Subscriptions				
Literary	2	5.6	...	...
Women's	25	69.4	17	73.9
Farm	15	41.7	7	30.4
News and General Interest	31	86.1	17	73.9
Sports	4	11.1	6	26.1
Church	10	27.8	5	21.7
Reader's Digest	24	66.7	7	30.4[c]
Technical	3	8.3	1	4.4

[a]Significant at .05 level.
[b]Significant at .02 level.
[c]Significant at .01 level.
[d]Significant at .001 level.

To facilitate the comparison of the home lives of families in the two groups, each subject completed a questionnaire that dealt with activities of family members.

The subjects' reports of their fathers' leisure time activities were similar, with two notable exceptions. First, while 63.9 percent of the honors students indicated their fathers read in their leisure time, only 21.7 percent of the low potential students indicated this. The difference was significant at the .01 level of probability. Second, more low potential students' fathers than honors' fathers (56.5 percent compared to 27.8 percent) engaged in participant sports. This difference was significant at the .05 level of probability.

The subjects noted this same difference with regard to mothers' leisure time activities. Although 72.2 percent of the honors students reported that their mothers read, only 30.4 of the low potential students' mothers did (significant at the .01 level of probability). A difference between groups existed in involvement in participant sports. While 21.7 percent of the low potential students' mothers engaged in sports, only 5.6 percent of the honors' mothers did. The numbers were too small to test for significance. Another difference was evidenced in participation in organizations and community activities. Of the honors' mothers, 27.8 percent were involved compared to 13.0 percent of the low potential students' mothers. More honors' mothers (91.7 percent) than low potentials' mothers (52.2 percent) spent leisure time in creative pursuits in the home such as sewing,

refinishing furniture, or gourmet cooking.

The amount of reading done in the students' leisure time differed between the two groups. While 88.9 percent of the honors students spent time reading, only 52.2 percent of the low potential students did. The difference was significant at the .01 level of probability. The honors students also appeared to be more involved in community activities and organizations than the low potential students.

Over 90 percent of the families in both groups had television sets in the home; however, the low potential students' families tended to spend more time viewing television. Only 44.4 percent of the honors students reported television viewing, but 69.6 percent of the low potential students did.

Over 80 percent of the families in both groups had record players. It would appear that in both groups the families possess recreational equipment for the students' use.

That the families of honors students took part in more activities outside the home was indicated by their recent attendance at a concert or play (58.3 percent compared to 26.1 percent of the low potential). This was a significant difference at the .02 level of probability.

Table 5 presents in detail the leisure time activities of family members of both groups. The data were derived from student responses to an open-ended questionnaire.

TABLE 5

ACTIVITIES OF FAMILY MEMBERS

Variable	Honors (N = 36)		Low Potential (N = 23)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
FATHER'S LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES				
Reading	23	63.9	5	21.7[c]
Participant Sports	10	27.8	13	56.5[a]
Games, Puzzles, Collecting	2	5.6	3	13.0
Organizations, Community Activity	2	5.6	2	8.7
Spectator Sports	6	16.7	4	17.4
Activities with Children	1	2.8	3	13.0
Rest, Watch Television	8	22.2	4	17.4
Visit Friends	1	2.8	1	4.4
Work around Home	18	50.0	10	43.5
MOTHER'S LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES				
Reading	26	72.2	7	30.4[c]
Participant Sports	2	5.6	5	21.7
Games, Puzzles, Collecting	3	8.3	3	13.0
Organizations, Community Activity	10	27.8	3	13.0
Spectator Sports	1	2.8	1	4.4
Activities with Children	...	...	1	4.4
Rest, Watch Television	5	13.9	3	13.0
Visit Friends	5	13.9	1	4.4
Work around Home	33	91.7	12	52.2
STUDENT'S LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES				
Reading	32	88.9	12	52.2[c]
Participant Sports	11	30.6	9	39.1
Games, Puzzles, Collecting	8	22.2	7	30.4
Organizations, Community Activity	4	11.1	1	4.4
Spectator Sports	...	...	...	...
Activities with Children	...	...	...	...
Rest, Watch Television	12	33.3	4	17.4
Visit Friends	9	25.0	5	21.7
Work around Home	24	66.7	13	56.5

TABLE 5--(Continued)

Variable	Honors (N = 36)		Low Potential (N = 23)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
INFLUENCE OF TELEVISION				
Family has Television Set				
Yes	33	91.7	21	91.3
No	3	8.3	2	8.7
Father Watches Television				
Yes	24	66.7	17	73.9
No	12	33.3	6	26.1
Mother Watches Television				
Yes	20	55.6	18	78.3
No	16	44.4	5	21.7
Student Watches Television				
Yes	16	44.4	16	69.6
No	20	55.6	7	30.4
FAMILY HAS RECORD PLAYER				
Yes	30	83.3	20	87.0
No	6	16.7	3	13.0
FAMILY ATTENDED CONCERT OR PLAY RECENTLY				
Yes	21	58.3	6	26.1[b]
No	15	41.7	17	73.9

[a]Significant at .05 level.
[b]Significant at .02 level.
[c]Significant at .01 level.
[d]Significant at .001 level.

The amount of reading done by subjects in the two groups appeared to differ more than the other activities in which the subjects engaged. This difference was greater between the subjects in the two groups than between

any of their family members. The honors students' family members tended to read more than low potential students' family members.

All but two families had a public library accessible to them. The children appeared to use the library more than the parents and there was a slight tendency for more honors' than low potential students' families to check out books. Although one-half of the mothers in each group (52.8 percent of the honors and 47.8 percent of the low potential) checked out books, greater differences existed in the fathers' use of the library. In both groups the fathers checked out fewer books than the mothers, but while 27.8 percent of the honors' fathers checked out books, only 13.0 percent of the low potential students' fathers did. The students indicated they were the major library users in their families. The students reported that 80.6 percent of the honors and 69.6 percent of the low potential participants checked out books. Percentages for sibling check outs were slightly lower because some subjects were only children.

The mothers in both groups read more books than the fathers. Sixty-one percent of the honors' mothers and 52.2 percent of the low potential students' mothers read books while only 38.9 percent and 39.1 percent of the fathers did.

Because a great deal of the reading done by both parents was magazines and newspapers, the accuracy of the above percentages as a measure of total reading is questionable.

The honors students found much more enjoyment in reading than did the

low potential students. Although 94.4 percent of the honors students indicated that they enjoyed reading, only 43.4 percent of the low potential group did. This difference was significant at the .001 level of probability. The other 5.6 percent of the honors students reported they enjoyed reading "at times." Of the low potential students, 47.8 percent enjoyed reading "at times," 4.4 percent "not too much" and 4.4 percent "did not enjoy" reading.

Both groups of students read magazines and newspapers frequently. Most students (66.7 percent honors and 60.8 percent low potential) read four or more magazines regularly. The news section of the newspaper was read by 83.3 percent of the honors and 78.3 percent of the low potential students. Although 41.7 percent of the honors students also read the editorial section, only 8.7 percent of the low potential group did. While 52.2 percent of the low potential students reported reading the society pages, only 30.6 percent of the honors students read this section. A significant difference (.01 level of probability) was found between groups with regard to reading the comics section. Although 83.3 percent of the honors students read the comics, only 52.2 percent of the low potential students did.

The family reading data are presented in detail in Table 6. Additional information about reading material available in the home can be found in Table 4, page 45.

TABLE 6

FAMILY READING

Variable	Honors (N = 36) Number	Percentage	Low Potential (N = 23) Number	Percentage
Public Library Accessible				
Yes	35	97.2	22	95.6
No	1	2.8	1	4.4
Family Members Who Check Out Books				
Father	10	27.8	3	13.0
Mother	19	52.8	11	47.8
Student	29	80.6	16	69.6
Siblings	28	77.8	15	65.2
Father Reads Books				
Yes	14	38.9	9	39.1
No	22	61. 1	14	60.9
Mother Reads Books				
Yes	22	61.1	12	52.2
No	14	38.9	11	47.8
Student's Enjoyment of Reading				
Yes	34	94.4	10	43.4[d]
At Times	2	5.6	11	47.8
Not too Much	...	...	1	4.4
No	...	...	1	4.4
Number of Magazines Read by Student				
None	...	...	1	4.3
One to Three	12	33.3	8	34.8
Four or More	24	66.7	14	60.9
Newspaper Sections Read by Student				
News	30	83.3	18	78.3
Editorial	15	41.7	2	8.7
Women's Page	10	27.8	4	17.4
Society	11	30.6	12	52.2
Sports	5	13.9	3	13.0
Comics	30	83.3	12	52.2[c]
Scan Entire Paper	10	27.8	4	17.4

[c]Significant at .01 level.
[d]Significant at .001 level.

PARENTAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

The description of parental attitudes and behaviors was drawn from parent responses to interview questions and from student reports. Only parents who could come to campus during their daughter's first semester of college were interviewed. The total number of parent respondents was too small to test for significance. Differences existed between the parents' report of their attitudes and behaviors and the students' perception of them.

The students reported that mother's rules were stressed more frequently than father's rules. Most students (66.7 percent of the honors and 78.3 percent of the low potential) reported mother's rules were "often stressed," while only 19.4 percent of the honors and 52.2 percent of the low potential reported that father's rules were "often stressed." The difference between groups about father's stress of rules was significant at the .02 level of probability.

The low potential students' mothers were more likely to stress dating regulations and housekeeping responsibilities than were the honors' mothers. The students' perceptions of the type of rules their mothers stressed were close to the actual rules stated by the mothers interviewed. A Chi Square test of the students' responses to the question of mother's stress of dating regulations showed a significant difference at the .001 level of probability. The difference between low potential and honors students in their reports of mother's stress of housekeeping responsibilities was significant at the .05 level of probability.

The fathers in both groups reported stressing more rules than their daughters perceived. Although only 5.6 percent of the honors students and 17.4 percent of the low potential students reported their fathers stressed grades and study, 15.0 percent of the honors' fathers and 50.0 percent of the low potential students' fathers reported stressing rules in this area. The fathers also admitted to stressing housekeeping responsibilities to a greater extent than the students reported.

Table 7 illustrates the differences between rules stressed in honors and low potential students' families and differences between parent and student reports. The responding group is presented within parenthesis following each category.

TABLE 7

PARENTAL RULES

Variable	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Mother's Emphasis of Rules (Student)				
Often Stressed	24	66.7	18	78.3
Seldom or Never Stressed	12	33.3	5	21.7
Father's Emphasis of Rules (Student)				
Often Stressed	7	19.4	12	52.2[b]
Seldom of Never Stressed	27	75.0	11	47.8
Unknown	2	5.6	...	...
Rules Stressed by Mother (Mother)				
Achievement	1	4.5	...	...
Grades and Study	4	18.8	3	27.3
Relationships with Others	3	13.6	2	18.2
Dating Regulations	5	22.7	5	45.5
Moral Development	7	31.8	3	27.3
Housekeeping Responsibilities	8	36.4	8	72.7

TABLE 7---(Continued)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
Rules Stressed by Mother (Student)				
Achievement	2	5.6	1	4.4
Grades and Study	2	5.6	7	30.4
Relationships with Others	5	13.9	2	8.7
Dating Regulations	6	16.7	14	60.9[d]
Moral Development	2	5.6	...	...
Housekeeping Responsibilities	20	55.6	19	82.6[a]
Rules Stressed by Father (Father)				
Achievement	4	20.0	...	...
Grades and Study	3	15.0	4	50.0
Relationships with Others	3	15.0	...	...
Dating Regulations	6	30.0	5	62.5
Moral Developments	3	15.0	1	12.5
Housekeeping Responsibilities	6	30.0	5	62.5
Rules Stressed by Father (Student)				
Achievement	1	2.8	...	...
Grades and Study	2	5.6	4	17.4
Relationships with Others	3	8.3	1	4.4
Dating Regulations	4	11.1	2	8.7
Moral Development	4	11.1	...	...
Housekeeping Responsibilities	4	11.1	5	21.8

[a]Significant at .05 level.
[b]Significant at .02 level.
[c]Significant at .01 level.
[d]Significant at .001 level.

The low potential group parents reported giving more supervision for children's activities than did the honors parents. Although 62.5 percent of the low potential fathers and 81.8 percent of the low potential mothers reported they provided much supervision, only 10 percent of the honors fathers and 13.6 percent of the honors mothers reported close supervision. Honors parents tended to provide moderate to little supervision.

Most parents in both groups reported that they showed their affection by attention and interest rather than through physical means. A slight tendency for honors parents to show more physical affection than low potential parents did was noted.

A majority of parents in each group stated that when children disagreed with them they would discuss the differences. The honors parents were most willing to discuss with 86.4 percent of the mothers and 90.0 percent of the fathers choosing this method. In the low potential group 72.7 percent of the mothers and 62.5 percent of the fathers would discuss the situation. Although many parents were open to discussion, in the low potential group 18.2 percent of the mothers and 25.0 percent of the fathers would punish a child who disagreed with them.

The methods of discipline employed by the parents changed as the children grew. During the elementary school years the parents used physical punishment, deprivation, discussion and scolding but the largest segment used deprivation and physical punishment. In high school, 50 percent of the honors mothers and 40 percent of the honors fathers reported very little discipline was needed. A smaller group, 18.2 percent of the low potential mothers and 25.0 percent of low potential fathers indicated little discipline was needed. Most honors parents who did discipline their high school age children chose the discussion method while the low potential parents used deprivation most frequently (63.6 percent mothers and 55.0 percent fathers). Most of the honors parents indicated that the mother did most of the disciplining.

The low potential parents were not in agreement on the allocation of this responsibility. Of the low potential parents, 63.5 percent of the fathers indicated that the disciplining was shared equally while only 18.2 percent of the mothers shared this view. The low potential mothers were more inclined to feel they did most of the disciplining than were their husbands.

Table 8 presents information on parental supervision, affection and discipline in detail. The father and mother reports for both groups are presented separately.

TABLE 8

PARENTAL CONTROL

Variable	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
SUPERVISION OF CHILD'S ACTIVITIES				
Parental Supervision Given (Mother)				
Much	3	13.6	9	81.8
Moderate	11	50.0	2	18.2
Little	8	36.4	...	...
Parental Supervision Given (Father)				
Much	2	10.0	5	62.5
Moderate	6	30.0	3	37.5
Little	10	50.0	...	...
Unknown	2	10.0	...	...
DEMONSTRATION OF AFFECTION				
Parental Affection (Mother)				
Attention and Interest	20	90.9	11	100.0
Physical Affection	2	9.1	...	...
Neutral	...	...	...	...
Strict	...	...	...	...

TABLE 8--(Continued)

Variable	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Parental Affection (Father)				
Attention and Interest	17	85.0	7	87.5
Physical Affection	2	10.0	...	...
Neutral	1	5.0	...	...
Strict	...	...	1	12.5
RESOLVING DISAGREEMENTS				
Action when Children Disagree (Mother)				
Ignore	...	...	...	...
Punish	...	...	2	18.2
Discuss	19	86.4	8	72.7
Unknown	3	13.6	1	9.1
Action when Children Disagree (Father)				
Ignore	...	...	...	...
Punish	1	5.0	2	25.0
Discuss	18	90.0	5	62.5
Unknown	1	5.0	1	12.5
DISCIPLINE				
Most Effective Discipline (Mother)				
Physical Punishment	1	4.5	...	...
Deprivation	6	27.3	6	54.5
Discussion	11	50.0	2	18.2
Scolding	...	...	...	...
Unknown	4	18.2	3	27.3
Most Effective Discipline (Father)				
Physical Punishment	...	...	...	...
Deprivation	3	15.0	2	25.0
Discussion	10	50.0	1	12.5
Scolding	1	5.0	3	37.5
Unknown	6	30.0	2	25.0

TABLE 8--(Continued) (2)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
Method of Discipline used in Elementary School (Mother)				
Physical Punishment	3	13.6	4	36.3
Deprivation	6	27.3	5	45.5
Discussion	6	27.3	...	...
Scolding	2	9.1	1	9.1
Very Little Necessary	5	22.7	1	9.1
Method of Discipline used in Elementary School (Father)				
Physical Punishment	4	20.0	2	25.0
Deprivation	5	25.0	1	12.5
Discussion	4	20.0	1	12.5
Scolding	...	...	2	25.0
Very Little Necessary	7	35.0	2	25.0
Method of Discipline used in High School (Mother)				
Physical Punishment	...	...	...	...
Deprivation	3	13.6	6	54.5
Discussion	8	36.4	1	9.1
Scolding	...	...	1	9.1
Very Little Necessary	11	50.0	2	18.2
Unknown	...	...	1	9.1
Method of Discipline used in High School (Father)				
Physical Punishment	...	...	...	...
Deprivation	4	20.0	3	37.5
Discussion	7	35.0	1	12.5
Scolding	...	...	2	25.0
Very Little Necessary	8	40.0	2	25.0
Unknown	1	5.0	...	...
Did Most Disciplining (Mother)				
Mother	14	63.6	4	36.3
Father	4	18.2	3	27.3
Equal	3	13.6	2	18.2
Unknown	1	4.6	2	18.2

TABLE 8--(Continued) (3)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
Did Most Disciplining (Father)				
Mother	11	55.0	2	25.0
Father	3	15.0	1	12.5
Equal	4	20.0	5	62.5
Unknown	2	10.0	...	...

The students' responses to parental concern about their feelings indicated that honors parents were somewhat more concerned about how the child felt than about his behavior while the low potential parents stressed behavior. In the honors group, 58.3 percent of the mothers and 52.8 percent of the fathers were reportedly primarily interested in feelings. In the low potential group 30.4 percent of the mothers and 47.8 percent of the fathers were interested primarily in outward behavior. A large segment of both student groups stated that the parents were equally interested in behavior and feelings. The intergroup difference in mothers' interest in feelings was significant at the .05 level of probability and the difference in fathers' interest was significant at the .02 level.

Both groups indicated their parents were more interested in grades and effort in schoolwork than in the personal satisfaction of the daughter. The honors students reported that 47.2 percent of the fathers and 52.8 percent of the mothers were concerned with effort, and the low potential group reported that 60.9 percent of the fathers and 65.2 percent of the mothers were concerned with grades. The group of parents students felt were interested primarily in

personal satisfaction of student was limited to 13 percent of low potential parents and honors fathers and 25 percent of honors mothers.

Most students reported that their parents were moderately active in organizations in the community. The honors parents were involved in a greater number of activities than were low potential parents. The mothers in both groups were more involved than the fathers. A moderately active parent was interpreted as participating in two to three organizations, active as involved in more than three and nonactive as taking part in one or none.

TABLE 9

SUBJECTS' DESCRIPTION OF PARENTAL INTEREST AND INVOLVEMENT

Variable	Honors (N = 36)		Low Potential (N = 23)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
INTEREST IN CHILD'S FEELINGS				
Mother's Interest in Child				
Outward Behavior	7	19.4	7	30.4[a]
Behavior and Feelings	7	19.4	7	30.4
Inward Feelings	21	58.4	5	21.8
Unknown	1	2.8	4	17.4
Father's Interest in Child				
Outward Behavior	7	19.4	11	47.8[b]
Behavior and Feelings	6	16.7	6	26.1
Inward Feelings	19	52.8	4	17.4
Unknown	4	11.1	2	8.7
FEELINGS ABOUT SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT				
Mother's Feelings about School				
Concerned with Personal Satisfaction of Daughter	9	25.0	3	13.0[c]
Concerned with Effort	19	52.8	3	13.0

TABLE 9--(Continued)

Variable	Honors (N = 36) Number	Percentage	Low Potential (N = 23) Number	Percentage
Concerned with Grades	8	22.2	15	65.3
Unknown	...	...	2	8.7
Father's Feelings about School				
Concerned with Personal Satisfaction of Daughter	5	13.9	3	13.0
Concerned with Effort	17	47.2	4	17.4
Concerned with Grades	12	33.3	14	60.9
Unknown	2	5.6	2	8.7
PARTICIPATION IN ORGANIZATIONS				
Mothers' Participation				
Very Active	12	33.3	7	30.4
Moderately Active	23	63.9	13	56.6
Not Active	1	2.8	3	13.0
Fathers' Participation				
Very Active	10	27.8	5	21.8
Moderately Active	22	61.1	11	47.8
Not Active	3	8.3	7	30.4
Unknown	1	2.8	...	...

[a]Significant at .05 level.
[b]Significant at .02 level.
[c]Significant at .01 level.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

In interviews the subjects reported the activities they enjoyed as children. The two groups expressed similar levels of involvement in housekeeping activities, in games, and in care of animals. The low potential students indicated a greater amount of participation in organizations (significant at the .05 level), in church activities, and in sports (significant at the .001 level). More honors

than low potential students spent time reading (significant at the .05 level).

While the students were growing up, most of the low potential students had a few close friends while the honors students were more likely to have many casual friends or stay to themselves. The difference was significant at the .02 level of probability.

In their first year of college, most of the subjects made their decisions independently from their parents. Freedom to decide how to spend money and to select clothes was common to almost all students. However, approximately half indicated that they continued to ask permission to attend social events. Another fourth had asked until they began college. In terms of independent decision making, the members of both groups were similar.

Although the low potential students mentioned organization participation more often than honors when describing activities enjoyed as a child, the honors students indicated a greater willingness to become involved in community activities than did the low potential. Although 91.7 percent of the honors students would join a community organization if they had the time, only 69.6 percent of the low potential students would. Honors students are more interested in politics. At the state level, 36.1 percent considered themselves very interested, while only 4.4 percent of the low potential students shared this interest. Honors students were more interested in national events with 69.4 percent very interested. Only 30.4 percent of the low potential students shared this level of interest.

When asked in which area they had the most trouble getting their

daughter to do what they desired, parents most frequently mentioned housekeeping responsibilities. The only other areas mentioned were grades and study by three low potential parents and relationships with others by four honors parents.

When asked what their daughters had accomplished that made them proud, the honors parents mentioned more items than did low potential parents. Honors parents frequently cited achievement and grades and study, while the low potential parents were most likely to mention relationships with others.

Characteristics of the students are presented in detail in Table 10. Both student and parent responses are included.

TABLE 10

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS

Variable	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
ACTIVITIES ENJOYED AS A CHILD				
Dolls, Dressup, House	20	55.6	11	47.8
Housekeeping, Sewing, Cooking	9	25.0	5	21.7
Organizations	14	38.9	15	65.2[a]
Church Activities	4	11.1	6	26.1
Games	19	52.8	11	47.8[d]
Sports	8	22.2	15	65.2
Chores, Care of Animals	3	8.3	2	8.7
Reading	16	44.4	4	17.4[a]
FRIENDS WHILE GROWING UP				
Few Intimates	13	36.1	18	78.3[b]
Casual Friends	15	41.7	5	21.7
Lone Wolf	2	5.6	...	...
Unknown	6	16.7	...	...

TABLE 10--(Continued)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
DECISION MAKING				
Select own Clothes				
Yes	25	69.4	19	82.6
No	11	30.6	4	17.4
Decide How to Spend Money				
Yes	35	97.2	22	95.6
No	1	2.8	1	4.4
Ask Permission to Attend Social Events				
Presently Asked	16	44.4	11	47.8
Asked in the Past	19	52.8	10	43.4
Never Asked	1	2.8	1	4.4
Unknown	...	...	1	4.4
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT				
Interest in Joining Community Organization				
Yes	33	91.7	16	69.6
No	3	8.3	7	30.4
Interest in State Politics				
Very Interested	13	36.1	1	4.4
Slightly Interested	19	52.8	19	82.6
Find Politics Boring	4	11.1	3	13.0
Interest in National Events				
Very Interested	25	69.4	7	30.4
Slightly Interested	11	30.6	16	69.6
Find Them Boring	...	...	...	...
PARENTS' PERCEPTION OF DAUGHTER				
Daughter's Activities that Gave Concern				
Grades and Study	...	...	3	15.8
Relationships with Others	4	9.5	...	...
Housekeeping Responsibilities	10	23.8	8	42.1

TABLE 10---(Continued) (2)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
Daughter's Accomplishments that Made Mother Proud				
Achievement	12	54.6	2	18.2
Grades and Study	17	77.3	1	9.1
Relationships with Others	11	50.0	5	45.5
Moral Development	4	18.2	1	9.1
Housekeeping Responsibilities	...	...	3	27.3
Daughter's Accomplishments that Made Father Proud				
Achievement	10	50.0	1	12.5
Grades and Study	14	70.0	...	...
Relationships with Others	6	30.0	4	50.0
Moral Development	2	10.0	2	25.0
Housekeeping Responsibilities	...	...	1	12.5

[a]Significant at .05 level.
[b]Significant at .02 level.
[c]Significant at .01 level.
[d]Significant at .001 level.

PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION

The parent-child interaction in honors families was characterized by more student responsibility than in the low potential families. Although 86.1 percent of the honors students made decisions by themselves or jointly with parents, only 56.5 percent of the low potential students had a part in decision making.

The students reported a greater freedom to talk to mothers than to fathers while they were growing up. Freedom to talk to parents increased for many students when they came to college. Although few respondents in either group were free to talk to their fathers, the low potential students expressed more

freedom than the honors students (21.7 percent compared to 47.2 percent). The two groups of students felt equally free to talk with their mothers.

The parents' description of their relationships with the girls indicated that the honors mothers and low potential fathers felt closer to their daughters than did their mates. Although 90.9 percent of the honors mothers felt close to their daughters, only 50.0 percent of the honors fathers did. In low potential families 87.5 percent of the fathers felt close compared to 36.4 percent of the mothers.

In describing their parents, the honors students presented a slightly more favorable picture than the low potential. In both groups the mothers were spoken of more positively than the fathers, with the largest difference existing in the comparison of honors students' parents. The honors mothers were given a positive description by 61.1 percent of their daughters. The low potential mothers were the next highest, receiving 43.5 percent positive responses.

TABLE 11

PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION

Variable	Honors		Low Potential	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
DECISION MAKING				
By Mother	...	...	2	8.7[a]
By Father	...	...	5	21.7
By Parents	3	8.3	1	4.4
By Student and Parent (s)	23	63.9	9	39.1
By Student	8	22.2	4	17.4
Unknown	2	5.6	2	8.7

TABLE 11--(Continued)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
FREEDOM TO TALK TO PARENTS				
Freedom to Talk to Mother While Growing Up				
Very Free	16	44.4	10	43.5
Fairly Free	13	36.2	4	17.4
Not Free	7	19.4	9	39.1
Freedom to Talk to Father While Growing Up				
Very Free	4	11.1	5	21.7
Fairly Free	17	47.2	5	21.7
Not Free	14	38.9	13	56.6
Unknown	1	2.8	...	...
Freedom to Talk to Mother Now				
More Free	18	50.0	10	43.5
Same	16	44.4	7	30.4
Less Free	1	2.8	...	...
Unknown	1	2.8	6	26.1
Freedom to Talk to Father Now				
More Free	16	44.4	8	34.8
Same	15	41.7	5	21.7
Less Free	...	...	...	...
Unknown	5	13.9	10	43.5
PARENTS' DESCRIPTION OF RELATIONSHIP				
Mother's Description of Relationship with Daughter				
Close	20	90.9	4	36.4
Not Close	2	9.1	7	63.6
Father's Description of Relationship with Daughter				
Close	10	50.0	7	87.5
Not Close	10	50.0	1	12.5

TABLE 11--(Continued) (2)

Variable	Honors Number	Honors Percentage	Low Potential Number	Low Potential Percentage
DAUGHTERS' DESCRIPTION OF PARENTS				
Description of Mother				
Positive	22	61.1	10	43.5
Fairly Positive	12	33.3	10	43.5
Negative	2	5.6	3	13.0
Description of Father				
Positive	14	38.9	7	30.4
Fairly Positive	20	55.6	12	52.2
Negative	1	2.8	4	17.4
Unknown	1	2.8	...	...

[a]Significant at .05 level.

SUMMARY

The honors students more frequently than low potential students came from towns under 10,000 population or lived on farms. Family size was similar for both groups, however significantly more honors than low potential students were the oldest girl with younger sisters.

Although honors students' parents had more years of education than low potential students' parents, this difference was not significant. More low potential than honors mothers were employed; however, employed honors mothers were engaged in higher level occupations than were low potential mothers. Few inter-group differences existed in fathers' occupations.

The families of both groups subscribed to newspapers and magazines with similar frequency. Significantly more honors than low potential families belonged to a book club.

Honors students more frequently than low potential reported that their parents and they themselves read in their leisure time. The differences between groups in father's, mother's, and student's reading were significant at the .01 level. Low potential students frequently mentioned participant sports as a way family members spent leisure time. This difference between groups was significant at the .05 level for the fathers. Low potential students and their families spent more time than honors students and their families viewing television. Significantly more honors students' families attended plays and concerts.

The honors students' enjoyment of reading was significantly greater than the low potentials'. However, both groups read magazines and newspapers regularly. In reading newspapers, honors students were more likely than low potential students to read the editorials. Significantly more honors than low potential students read the comics section and more low potential students than honors students read the society section.

Parents of low potential students expressed more rules than did honors parents. Low potential parents expressed significantly more rules in the areas of dating regulations and housekeeping responsibilities. The low potential fathers expressed more rules of all kinds than did honors fathers. The low potential students' parents provided closer supervision of children than did honors. Most honors parents used discussion to discipline high school age children while low potential used deprivation. Low potential parents were significantly more interested in the child's behavior than were honors parents

who were more concerned with the child's feelings.

At this point in their lives, subjects in both groups appeared equally free to make decisions. The honors students were more likely to become involved in community activities and to be interested in national events. Honors parents expressed more pride in their daughters' accomplishments than did low potential parents.

While growing up, significantly more honors than low potential students were involved in decisions made about them. The honors mothers and low potential fathers frequently described their relationships with daughters as "close" while their mates tended to rate their parent-child relationships as "not close." The honors students more frequently than low potential students gave positive descriptions of their parents.

Significant differences between the two groups differing in scholastic potential were found for the following factors:

1. More honors than low potential students had younger sisters (.05 level).
2. More honors than low potential families had book club memberships (.001 level).
3. More honors than low potential families subscribed to Reader's Digest (.01 level).
4. More honors than low potential students reported fathers read in leisure time (.01 level).
5. More low potential than honors students reported fathers participated in sports (.05 level).
6. More honors than low potential students reported mothers read in leisure time (.01 level).

7. More honors than low potential students read in leisure time (.01 level).

8. More honors than low potential families had recently attended a play or concert (.02 level).

9. More honors than low potential students enjoyed reading (.001 level).

10. More honors than low potential students read the comics section of the newspaper (.01 level).

11. Low potential students reported fathers stressed more rules than did honors (.02 level).

12. More low potential than honors students reported mothers stressed dating regulations (.001 level).

13. More low potential than honors students reported mothers stressed housekeeping responsibilities (.05 level).

14. Honors students reported mothers were interested in feelings; low potential, in behavior (.05 level).

15. Honors students reported fathers were interested in feelings; low potential, in behavior (.02 level).

16. Honors students reported mothers were interested in the personal satisfaction of daughter in school; low potential, with grades and effort (.01 level).

17. More low potential than honors students reported childhood participation in organizations (.05 level).

18. More low potential than honors students reported childhood participation in sports (.001 level).

19. More honors than low potential students reported childhood reading (.05 level).

20. Honors students had casual friends or were lone wolves in childhood; low potential had a few intimate friends (.02 level).

21. More honors than low potential students participated in decisions made about them while growing up (.05 level).

The relationship between scholastic potential and each of the following

was not significant at the .05 level utilizing the Chi Square test.

1. Size of hometown
2. Grade school residence
3. High school residence
4. Number of older brothers
5. Number of younger brothers
6. Number of older sisters
7. Mother's years of school
8. Father's years of school
9. Number of family magazine subscriptions
10. Frequency of subscription to women's magazines
11. Frequency of subscription to farm magazines
12. Frequency of subscription to news magazines
13. Frequency of subscription to church magazines
14. Father's work around the home in leisure time
15. Student's participation in sports
16. Student's participation in games and puzzles
17. Student's participation in resting and television viewing
18. Student's work at home
19. Student's participation in visiting friends
20. Father's television viewing
21. Mother's television viewing
22. Student's television viewing

23. Father's use of public library
24. Mother's use of public library
25. Student's use of public library
26. Siblings' use of public library
27. Father's reading of books
28. Mother's reading of books
29. Number of magazines read by student
30. Student's reading of society page in newspaper
31. Mother's stress of rules
32. Father's participation in organizations
33. Childhood involvement in playing with dolls, dressup
34. Childhood participation in housekeeping activities
35. Childhood participation in games
36. Frequency of asking permission to attend social events
37. Freedom to talk to mother while growing up
38. Freedom to talk to father while growing up
39. Freedom to talk to mother now
40. Description of mother
41. Description of father

Lack of sufficient numbers made it impossible to test for significant relationships between scholastic potential and the other variables studied.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Most subjects in the honors and low potential groups were Kansas residents at the time they entered the university; however, differences existed between the sizes of home communities. A study by Danskin, Foster and Kennedy (1965) indicated that 57.8 percent of Kansas State University Home Economics Freshmen came from towns under 10,000 population. The honors students exceeded this percentage with 63.9 percent while only 34.8 percent of the low potential students came from this size town. This difference may be attributable to the general population shift from rural to urban centers that was occurring during the years of the study. The difference may also be attributable to the increased pressure and opportunity for urban students of all ability levels to attend college.

The average number of siblings of the students was close to the 1.8 average for Kansas State University home economics freshmen reported by Danskin, Foster and Kennedy (1965). The similarity in family size of the two groups supported a study by Cicirelli (1967) who found no significant relationship between family size and ability in middle class families. The honors and low potential groups did differ with respect to ordinal position of siblings. The honors students were more frequently oldest daughters

with younger sisters, and the low potential tended to be the youngest girl with older sisters. Perhaps, as Sampson (1962) indicated, this difference is attributable to involvement in independence training. The tendency for low potential students to have more younger brothers than the honors students may have "increased pressures towards play, sports, and other nonintellectual activities" (Cicirelli, 1967).

The findings of previous studies that father's educational level has a greater effect than the mother's on the child's academic orientation was not supported in this investigation. The parents of both groups had attended more years of school than the average home economics student parent as indicated by Danskin, Foster, and Kennedy (1965). The parents' educational attainments may have increased their pressure for their children, regardless of ability, to attend college.

A larger percentage of low potential than honors mothers were employed outside the home. Danskin, Foster, and Kennedy (1965) reported that 70.5 percent of home economics students' mothers were housewives. Although this proportion was representative of the honors group, only 43.5 percent of the low potential students stated their mothers were housewives. The honors mothers who were employed were engaged primarily in professional work while low potential mothers were primarily in clerical and sales occupations. It appeared that the honors mothers were working at jobs for which they were trained and which offered better opportunities for self-initiative and advancement than did the low potential mothers' jobs.

A slight tendency for more honors than low potential fathers to be engaged in professional and managerial occupations was indicated. At the same time more honors than low potential fathers were engaged in farming. An occupational hierarchy was not established for this study because many farming operations were of the professional, managerial nature. Greater differences were noted in mothers' employment than in fathers'.

Significant differences existed between groups with regard to almost every aspect of reading. Although frequency of newspaper and magazine subscriptions was similar for both groups, significantly more honors than low potential families had book club memberships. When books are available in the home, opportunities for reading are increased. The honors students more frequently than low potential reported that their mothers and fathers read in their leisure time. Perhaps the students' enjoyment of reading can be attributed to identification with parental enjoyment. Parents who enjoy reading may be more likely to encourage children to pursue this activity.

The honors families appeared to emphasize intellectual activities and take greater part in cultural events in the community than did low potential families. Low potential families more frequently engaged in participant sports or television viewing. It is assumed that honors families helped children learn to enjoy intellectual pursuits while in low potential families the emphasis was placed on nonintellectual activities.

Family life of the low potential students was more highly structured than that of honors students. Low potential parents reported stressing more rules

and supervising their children's activities more closely than honors parents did. Children in honors families were given more opportunities to develop independence.

Parents in both groups reported they had the greatest difficulty getting the child's cooperation in completing housekeeping responsibilities. Low potential parents put significantly greater emphasis on the fulfillment of housekeeping responsibilities than did honors parents. Honors parents, however, often cited difficulties separating the daughter from a book to do her housework. Low potential parents were significantly more likely than honors to stress dating regulations. While this may be attributable to greater structure in low potential families, the low potential students greater frequency of dating may have necessitated more parental guidelines.

The honors parents were willing to discuss disagreements with the child to a greater degree than were low potential parents. The interaction in honors families appeared to be superior to that in low potential families in terms of discussion. Honors parents frequently used discussion to discipline the child while low potential parents tended to use deprivation. Honors parents appeared to trust the child's judgment and ability and not to be threatened by his disagreeing. Significantly more honors than low potential students indicated that their parents were more interested in their feelings than in actual behavior. This would allow more freedom for investigation and experimentation on the part of the child.

While growing up, honors students had fewer close friends than did the

low potential. Greater involvement in reading and solitary activities may have affected their need for group activities. The higher level of parental interaction may also have lessened the need for peer relationships.

The honors students more frequently than the low potential expressed interest in joining a community organization. Honors students had a wide range of interests including interest in national events. This was consistent with the tendency for academically proficient students to develop outside interests because they have time to pursue them.

Honors parents and their children gave more favorable accounts of each other than did low potential family members. This supports the findings of Christopher (1967) and Tibbits (1965) who reported that academic achievement was related to the parent-child relationship and of Barwick and Arbuckle (1962) who found that acceptance of parents increased as academic achievement became higher. This could also be attributable to the greater accomplishments of honors students and their families.

LIMITATIONS

Sources of information in the study of an individual's background are numerous. Because this investigation was conducted using data collected at an earlier date, the researcher was unable to pursue many aspects of home and community life shown to be important in previous studies.

Additional study of the available information would be valuable. Further analysis of interviews to study fluency of conversation and comments other than direct answers to questions would provide additional insights. Closer

examination and comparison of student and parent responses would facilitate the study of parent-child relationships. Ideally, the studies would have been conducted simultaneously. Some inter-group differences may have resulted from the time factor rather than from actual characteristics of the students and their families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

An understanding of honors and low potential students in terms of other than measured academic ability may be valuable for educators working with them. The differing interests of the two groups may govern their motivation to pursue academic work. The greater social involvement of the low potential group may become a definite academic handicap at the university level where students reside in close proximity to each other and where social events are numerous. Lower interest in reading may be a definite handicap in the pursuit of a university degree. Having had close parental supervision, the low potential students may have more difficulty than honors adjusting to the responsibilities and freedom of college life.

Parents have a tremendous influence on the life styles of their children. Parents who enjoy and value intellectual pursuits for themselves are more likely to transfer this enjoyment to their children than are parents concerned only with the child's academic success. Coupled with interest in the child as a person with feelings this value may facilitate academic success.

Perhaps many of the low potential students should not have attended college because of lack of ability or interest as indicated in their family and

childhood interests. Knowledge of the existence of other training facilities may have helped the students direct their experiences more profitably and wisely and lessened parental pressure to attend college. Understanding of the forces which lead each group to enroll in the university also would add to knowledge of students of differing potential.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Further analysis of the students' college experiences would reveal students whose performance was not consistent with their potential. Perhaps certain background variables are related to high and low achievement of students with similar potential. Examination of college courses most meaningful to subjects in each level of academic potential would help educators direct students with similar abilities and interests. A follow-up study of the academic values the subjects held for their children and the relationship of these values to childhood and college experiences would assist educators in working with parents. Comparison of college and non-college youth of similar academic potential may increase understanding of forces which lead students to enroll in the university.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Research concerned with family influences on academic achievement has dealt primarily with young students living at home or with university males. Few studies have explored the family background of students with different levels of scholastic potential. The purpose of this study was to describe the home and community backgrounds, to investigate parental attitudes and behaviors, to study parent-child interaction, and to identify characteristics of students in two groups of university women differing in scholastic potential.

The subjects chosen for the study were classified either as honors or low potential. The honors group scored in the upper 10 percent of all persons taking the entrance examination, and the low potential group was composed of entering home economics freshmen whose scores were in the lowest 10 percent of all home economics students admitted to Kansas State University for that year.

Several recent studies in the area of family influence on academic achievement were reviewed. Physical factors such as place of residence, parents occupation, family size, and mobility were generally found not to influence academic achievement. Psychological factors including the parent-child relationship, parental attitudes and child rearing philosophies have been

found to be of greater importance to academic achievement.

The results of the present investigation supported previous studies which indicated few differences in physical factors existed between students differing in scholastic potential. However, as in the studies reviewed, more differences were found in psychological background factors.

No significant differences existed between sizes of home communities of the honors and low potential groups. Family composition of the two groups was similar with the exception of ordinal position. More honors than low potential students were oldest daughters with younger sisters.

In terms of childhood activities, the low potential students were more actively involved in sports and organizations and the honors did more reading. Low potential students had a few close friends, while honors had casual friends or kept to themselves.

Parents of honors students allowed the child more freedom and independence than did parents of low potential students. Low potential parents placed significantly more emphasis on rules than did honors parents, especially with regard to dating regulations and housekeeping responsibilities. Low potential parents supervised the child's activities more closely than did honors parents. Significantly more honors than low potential students participated in decision-making while growing up. Honors families appeared to be more free to discuss parent-child disagreements and used discussion as the most frequent method of discipline. Low potential parents were more likely to use deprivation of privileges as a means of discipline. Honors students indicated that their

parents were primarily interested in their feelings, while low potential students felt parents were most interested in behavior. Honors students reported their mothers were primarily interested in their personal satisfaction from school work, while low potential students felt their mothers were most interested in grades and effort. Honors parents and children both expressed a greater level of satisfaction with characteristics of other family members than did the low potential respondents.

The honors families were significantly more involved than the low potential families in intellectual and cultural pursuits. The parents of honors students as well as the students themselves read more than low potential subjects. Honors students found more enjoyment in reading than did the low potential. More honors than low potential families belonged to book clubs. Attendance at plays and concerts was more common for honors than for low potential subjects while low potential subjects were more likely than honors to engage in participant sports and other social activities.

The subjects tended to identify with parental values for intellectual activities. When parents valued and enjoyed intellectual pursuits for themselves, the children were more likely to value and enjoy them. Children allowed freedom and the opportunity to accept responsibility had greater potential for academic success.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Ambrosino, Salvatore. "Parents' Expectations," Childhood Education, 1967, 43, 397-399.

Anderson, Robert, Russell G. Mawby, Joe A. Miller and Andrew L. Olson. "Parental Aspirations: A Key to the Educational and Occupational Achievements of Youth," Adult Leadership, May, 1965, 14, 8-10.

Baird, Leonard L. "Family Income and the Characteristics of College-bound Students," ACT Research Reports, No. 17, 1967.

Banducci, Raymond. "The Effect of Mother's Employment on the Achievement, Aspirations, and Expectations of the Child," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 263-7.

Barwick, Janice M. and Dugald S. Arbuckle. "A Study of the Relationship Between Parental Acceptance and the Academic Achievement of Adolescents," The Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 148-151.

Birnbaum, Louis. "A Comparative Study of the Relation of Broken Homes to the Social Class and School Success of Secondary School Boys," Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27 (4-A), 928.

Bruckman, Idel R. "The Relationship Between Achievement Motivation and Sex, Age, Social Class, School Stream and Intelligence," British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1966, 5, 211-220.

Cary, Gene L. "Class Socialization Patterns and their Relationship to Learning," School and Society, 1966, 94, 349-352.

Cheyney, Arnold B. "Parents View their Intellectually Gifted Children," Peabody Journal of Education, September, 1962, 40, 98-101.

Chopra, Sukhendra L. "Family Size and Sibling Position as Related to Intelligence Test Scores and Academic Achievement," Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 70, 133-137.

Christopher, Samual A. "Parental Relationship and Value Orientation as Factors in Academic Achievement," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 921-925.

Cicirelli, Victor G. "Sibling Constellation, Creativity, IQ, and Academic Achievement," Child Development, 1967, 38, 481-490.

Corliss, William S. "Relationships in Achievement by Sex and Number of Children in the Family," Michigan Education Journal, October, 1964, 42, 28-29.

Crandall, Vaughn, Rachel Dewey, Walter Katkovsky and Anne Preston. "Parents' Attitudes and Behaviors and Grade School Children's Academic Achievements," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, March, 1964, 104, 53-66.

Crescimbeni, Joseph. "Broken Homes Affect Academic Achievement," Education, 1964, 84, 437-441.

Danskin, David G., James M. Foster and Carroll E. Kennedy, Jr. Attitudes and Ambitions of College Students. Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 479, January, 1965.

Davids, Anthony and Peter K. Hainsworth. "Maternal Attitudes about Family Life and Child Rearing as Avowed by Mothers and Perceived by their Underachieving and High Achieving Sons," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 29-37.

Dibble, John Goodwin. "A Study of the Relationship of Certain Factors to Academic Achievement of Public High School Students of Fairfax County, Virginia," Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27 (9-A), 2769-2770.

Drews, Elizabeth Monroe and John E. Teahan. "Parental Attitudes and Academic Achievement," in Milton Kornrich (ed.) Underachievement. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1965.

Duvall, Evelyn. Family Development. (2nd. ed.) New York: Lippincott, 1962.

Ellsworth, Sterling G. "Building the Child's Self Concept," NEA Journal, February, 1967, 56, 54-56.

Evans, John W., Jr. "The Effect of Pupil Mobility upon Academic Achievement," The National Elementary Principal, April, 1966, 45, 18-22.

Farley, Frank H. "Birth Order, Achievement-Motivation and Academic Attainment," The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 37, 256.

Forrest, Donald Vincent. "A Comparative Study of Male Secondary School Underachievers Matriculating at the U. of S. Dak.," Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27 (3A), 671-672.

Gallagher, James W. and William Rogge. "The Gifted; Family," Review of Educational Research, February, 1966, 36, 49-50.

Haas, Kurt. "Personality Needs of Academically Superior Students and their Parents," The Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 56, 389-390.

Heffernan, Helen. "Fostering the Child's Potential," Childhood Education, October, 1965, 42, 98-107.

Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. "Parental Identification and College Adjustment," Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 853-854.

Hollenbeck, George P. "Conditions and Outcomes in the Student-Parent Relationship," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 237-241.

Hollenbeck, George Penn. "The Use of the Relationship Inventory in the Prediction of Adjustment and Achievement," Dissertation Abstracts, 1961, 22 (6), 2063-2064.

Jones, Jack B., Sasa W. Lundsteen and William B. Michael. "The Relationship of the Professional Employment Status of Mothers to Reading Achievement of Sixth-grade Children," California Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 18, 102-108.

Katkovsky, Walter, Anne Preston and V. J. Crandall. "Parent's Attitudes toward their Personal Achievements and toward the Achievement Behaviors of their Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 104, 67-82.

Kessler, Jane W. "Environmental Components of Measured Intelligence," School Review, 1965, 73, 339-358.

Kinnane, John F. and Sister M. Margaret Bannon. "Perceived Parental Influence and Work-Value Orientation," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43, 273-279.

Klemm, Eugene. "Family Help for Gifted Children," Education, September, 1967, 88, 22-24.

Kriesberg, Louis. "Rearing Children for Educational Achievement in Fatherless Families," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 288-301.

Kronovet, Esther and Meyer Barash. "The Parent-Student Relationship: A Challenge to the College," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 1024-1025.

Lavin, David E. The Prediction of Academic Performance: A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Lipsman, Claire K. "Conflicting Parental Goals," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 277.

McGillivray, Robert Hilker. "Differences in Home Background Between High Achieving and Low Achieving Gifted Children: A Study of One Hundred Grade Eight Pupils in the City of Toronto Public Schools," Ontario Journal of Educational Research, Spring, 1964, 6, 99-106.

Mueller, William J. "Need Structure and the Projecting of Traits onto Parents," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 63-72.

Mutimer, Dorothy, Leo Loughlin and Marvin Powell. "Some Differences in the Family Relationships of Achieving and Underachieving Readers," The Journal of Genetic Psychology, September, 1966, 109, 67-74.

Nichols, Robert G. "Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Intelligent Adolescents and Creativity of their Children," Child Development, 1964, 35, 1041-1049.

Nisbet, J. D. and N. J. Entwistle. "Intelligence and Family Size, 1949-1965," The British Journal of Educational Psychology, June, 1967, 37, 188-193.

Norman, Ralph D. "The Interpersonal Values of Parents of Achieving and Non-achieving Gifted Children," Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 49-57.

Perrodin, Alex F., and Walter T. Snipes. "The Relationship of Mobility to Achievement in Reading, Arithmetic, and Language in Selected Georgia Elementary Schools," The Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 315-317.

Ramsey, Robert R., Jr. "A Subcultural Approach to Academic Behavior," Journal of Educational Sociology, 1962, 35, 355-376.

Richardson, Roy Lewis. "Parent-Child Relationships and the Divergent Student," Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 26 (9) 5542-5543.

Ridder, Joyce Marion. "Pupil Opinions and the Relationship of Television Viewing to Academic Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 57, 204-206.

Roberts, Helen Erskine. "Factors Affecting the Academic Underachievement of Bright High School Students," Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 175-183.

Rolcik, John W. "Scholastic Achievement of Teenagers and Parental Attitudes toward Interest in School Work," The Family Life Coordinator, 1965, 14, 158-160.

Sampson, Edward E. "Birth Order, Need Achievement and Conformity," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 155-159.

Sanford, C. T., M. E. Couper and A. Griffin. "Class Influences in Higher Education," British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 35, 183-194.

Shaw, Merville C. "Note on Parent Attitudes Toward Independence Training and the Academic Achievement of their Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 371-374.

Shore, Milton C. and Alan H. Leiman. "Parental Perceptions of the Student as Related to Academic Achievement in Junior College," Journal of Experimental Education, 1965, 33, 391-394.

Smith, Leland. "Significant Differences Between High Ability Achieving and Nonachieving College Freshmen as Revealed by Interview Data," The Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 59, 10-12.

Teahan, J. E. "Parental Attitudes and College Success," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 104-109.

Tibbits, John Ralph. "The Role of Parent-Child Relationships in the Achievement of High School Pupils: A Study of the Family Relationships Associated with Underachievement and High Achievement of High School Pupils," Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 15, 232.

Unruh, Glenys G. "Parents Can Help their Children Succeed in School," NEA Journal, December, 1966, 55, 14-16.

Wade, Durlyn E. "School Achievement and Parent Employment," Journal of Educational Sociology, 1962, 36, 93-95.

Warriner, Clell C., Dorothy A. Foster and David K. Trites. "Failure to Complete as a Family Characteristic: A College Sample," The Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 59, 466-468.

Watson, Charles G. "Cross-Validation of Certain Background Variables as Predictors of Academic Achievement," The Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 59, 147-148.

Wellington, C. Burleigh and Jean Wellington. The Underachiever: Challenges and Guidelines. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, Undated.

Williams, Eugene I., Jr., and Carl D. Williams. "Relationships between Authoritarian Attitudes of College Students Estimation of Parents' Attitudes and Actual Parental Attitudes," The Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 43-48.

Worley, Stinson E. "Parents are also Teachers," Childhood Education, 1967, 43, 341-344.

APPENDIX A

FRESHMAN INTERVIEW

1. Where did you live during your elementary school days? High school days?
2. What kind of play did you enjoy most when you were a small child?
3. What activities did you like best while growing up?
4. How have the likes and interests of your older brothers and sisters compared with yours?
5. How did you and your older brothers and sisters get along together?
6. Did you want to be like them?
7. While you were growing up, did you have many casual friends, a few intimates, or were you more of a lone wolf? Did you belong to a clique or a gang?
8. Can you describe just what your father's work is like? How large a business? Name of company. (Own father's occupation?) If farm--what crops? How large a farm? Own or rent?
9. Do your parents have time to be active in P. T. A., church, lodge, etc.? (What specific organizations?)
10. What things did your mother keep after you about? (Rules)
11. What things did your father keep after you about? (Rules)
12. How did you feel about your parents' rules when you were growing up?
13. What does your father feel about your doing well in school?
14. What does your mother feel about your doing well in school?
15. How did you feel about your parents' supervision when you were growing up?
16. How were important decisions affecting you made when you were home? Who made them? (going out of town for games) (taking summer jobs, etc.)
17. While growing up, how free did you feel to talk things over with your mother?
18. Did she encourage and welcome your questions?

19. How free do you feel to talk things over with her now?

20. Do you think your mother was more interested in how you behaved outwardly or in how you felt about things? (Why do you think this?)

21. While growing up, how free did you feel to talk things over with your father?

22. Did he encourage and welcome your questions?

23. How free do you feel to talk things over with him now?

24. Do you think your father was more interested in how you behaved outwardly or in how you felt about things? (Why do you think this?)

25. How does dormitory life differ from rules at home as far as restrictions and freedom are concerned?

26. How does dormitory life differ from what you had expected? Have you been homesick?
    (a) Have parents visited you?
    (b) Have you gone home?

27. How do the behavior and attitudes (toward dating, petting, smoking, drinking, study habits, etc.) of the other girls at the dorm compare with that to which you are accustomed?

28. What does a good mother do?

29. What does a good father do?

30. What does a good child do?

31. Do you think your father has a sense of humor?

32. Do you think your mother has a sense of humor?

33. What sort of person is your mother? (Feelings for parents, and reasons)

34. What sort of person is your father?

35. How about study efforts--have you had to rearrange your schedule for that?

36. How do college courses and teachers, amount of studying, extra curricular activities differ from what you had expected?

37. Have you become acquainted with any new ideas from assembly speakers, teachers (outside of subject-matter) and other students? What are they?

38. What significant new experiences have you had since coming to college?

I

To be Written*

Please write answers to the following questions:

1. What does your father like to do in his leisure time?

2. What does your mother like to do in her leisure time?

3. What do you like to do in your leisure time?

4. Does your family subscribe to any newspapers? Which ones?

   What sections of the newspapers do you read?

5. Does your family subscribe to any magazines? List them.

   What magazines do you read?

6. Is there a public library accessible to the residents of your community?
   Do members of your family check out books?
   Which members?

7. Do you like to read? Yes_____ At times _____ Not too much _____ No _____
   If yes, what books have you read lately that you enjoyed?

*Cultural Interest Questionnaire

8. Does your father have time to read books?
   If so, what books has he read lately?

   What books has your father especially enjoyed?

9. Does your mother have time to read books?
   If so, what books has she read lately?

   What books has she especially enjoyed?

10. Has your family ever belonged to a book club such as the Book of the Month or Literary Guild?

11. Does your family have television?
    Does your father watch television?
    What are his favorite programs?

12. Does your mother watch television?
    What are her favorite programs?

13. Do you watch television?
    What are your favorite programs?

14. Do you _____ and/or your family _____ have a record player?
    What records do you like?

15. Give titles or composers of some musical selections you like.

16. If you have any favorite paintings, what are they?

17. If you have any favorite painters, who are they?

18. Has your family attended concerts or plays recently? Which ones?

19. Do you select your own clothing? Completely _____ Partially _____ Not at all _____.

20. Do you make your own plans for spending the money you have available?

21. Do you ask permission to attend the social activities of your choice? Whom do you ask?

22. If not, how long has it been since you did?

23. If you had time, would you be interested in joining and working in an organization dedicated to community improvement?

24. Are you interested in the current election campaign in Kansas? Yes, indeed _____ Slightly _____ Find politics boring _____

25. Do you try to keep up with important national and international happenings? Yes, indeed _____ Slightly _____ Find them boring _____

PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Fall, 1959

1. How many children do you have?
2. What are their ages?
3. What are they doing now?
4. How do you feel about your daughter going to the university?
5. Why do you feel this way?
6. Looking back on your daughter's childhood, what things did you try especially hard to get her to do? (What rules, what stressed most?)
   a. At grade school age
   b. At high school age
7. Same question--your (wife) (husband)
8. How did your daughter react to these rules?
9. What did you have the most trouble getting her to do?
10. What things, if any, did she do that you disliked or worried about?
11. How much do you feel parents should supervise their children's activities? (much, moderate, a little)
12. How much did you supervise your children?
13. What was your method of discipline when your daughter was in grade school? In high school?
14. How did your (husband's) (wife's) methods differ from yours?
15. Why?
16. Which of you did the most disciplining?
17. What seems to have been the most effective discipline?
18. What do you think parents should do when their children disagree with them or contradict them?

19. When your daughter was growing up what things did she do that made you feel proud of her?

20. What made your (husband) (wife) feel proud of her?

21. Some parents feel they should show their children they are fond of them. Others feel this may harm the child. What do you think?

22. How did you show your daughter you were fond of her?

23. What is your idea of a good child?

24. How do you think children usually behave these days?

25. What are the best ways to encourage good behavior in children?

26. When your daughter was growing up did you feel close to each other?

27. What is your idea of a good mother--what does a good mother do?

28. What is your idea of a good father--what does a good father do?

29. If you had it to do over, would you change or modify any of the things you did in bringing up your daughter?

30. What kind of life would you like your daughter to have? (your expectations and hopes for her?)

APPENDIX B

CODE FOR STUDENT INTERVIEW

Column	Item	Code
1-4	Identification Code	Card number 5000
5	Initial label	0. Honors 1. Low scoring
6-8	Subject Code Number	
9	1. Grade School Residence	0. Farm 1. City
10	2. High School Residence	0. Farm 1. City
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	3. Activities enjoyed as a child (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Dolls, dress-up, house 2. Housekeeping, sewing, cooking, etc. 3. Organizations (4-H, Scouts, etc.) 4. Church activities 5. Games, cowboys and Indians 6. Sports 7. Chores, care of animals 8. Reading
19	5. Relationship with sibling	0. Positive 1. Positive with some, negative with others 2. Negative
20	7. Friends while growing up	0. Few intimates, clique or gang 1. Casual friends 2. Lone wolf 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
21	9a. Father's participation in organizations	0. Very active 1. Moderately active 2. Not active 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
22	9b. Mother's participation in organizations	0. Very active 1. Moderately active 2. Not active 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know

STUDENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (1) -- Card 5000

Column	Item	Code
23	10a. Mother's stress of rules	0. Yes 1. No or few rules 2. No "keeping after," I knew the rules 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
24 25 26 27 28 29 30	10b. Mother's rules (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other
31	11a. Father's stress of rules	0. Yes 1. No or few rules 2. No "keeping after," I knew the rules 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
32 33 34 35 36 37 38	11b. Father's rules (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other
39	12. Feelings about parents' rules	0. Agreed 1. At first disagreed, now agree 2. Disagreed 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
40	13. Father's feelings about school	0. Concerned about personal satisfaction of daughter 1. Concerned with effort 2. Concerned with grades 3. Unconcerned 4. Unaware of attitude 5. Question not asked or answered

STUDENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (2) -- Card 5000

Column	Item	Code
41	14. Mother's feelings about school	0. Concerned about personal satisfaction of daughter 1. Concerned with effort 2. Concerned with grades 3. Unconcerned 4. Unaware of attitude 5. Question not asked or answered
42	16. Decision making	1. By mother 2. By father 3. By joint decision of parents 4. By student and one or both parents 5. By student 6. Question not asked or answered
43	17-18. Freedom to talk to mother while growing up	0. Very free 1. Fairly free 2. Not free 3. Question not asked or answered
44	19. Freedom to talk to mother now	0. More free 1. Same 2. Less free 3. Question not asked or answered
45	20. Mother's interest in child	0. Outward behavior 1. Behavior and feelings 2. Inward feelings 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
46	21-22. Freedom to talk to father while growing up	0. Very free 1. Fairly free 2. Not free 3. Question not asked or answered
47	23. Freedom to talk to father now	0. More free 1. Same 2. Less free 3. Question not asked or answered

STUDENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (3) -- Card 5000

Column	Item	Code
48	24. Father's interest in child	0. Outward behavior 1. Behavior and feelings 2. Inward feelings 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
49	26. Incidence of home-sickness	0. Yes 1. No 2. Question not asked or answered
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	28. Characteristics of a good mother (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Helps children get along with others 2. Makes her children good (Character) 3. Disciplines her children 4. Takes care of her children physically 5. Provides for her children's mental growth 6. Shows love and affection to children 7. Trains her children to regular habits 8. Guides her children with understanding 9. Sees to her children's emotional well-being 10. Is a good cook and housekeeper 11. Is good wife, creates happy family
61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71	29. Characteristics of a good father (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Seeks to understand his children 2. Earns a good income for his family's support 3. Answers his children's questions frankly 4. Participates in recreational activities with his children 5. Develops habits of obedience in his children 6. Encourages his children to grow up in their own ways 7. Decides what is best for his children 8. Works with his wife and children on home tasks 9. Disciplines his children 10. Gives presents to, and does things for child 11. Is good husband, creates happy marriage and family

STUDENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (4) -- Card 5001

Column	Item	Code
1-4	Identification Code	Card Number 5001
5	Initial label	0. Honors 1. Low scoring
6-8	Subject Code Number	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	30. Characteristics of a good child (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Obeys and respects adults 2. Loves and confides in his parents 3. Shares and cooperates with others 4. Is eager to learn 5. Respects property, takes care of his things 6. Keeps clean and neat 7. Enjoys growing up 8. Works hard at home and school 9. Is honest, courteous 10. Is happy, contented
19	33. Description of mother	0. Positive 1. Fairly positive 2. Negative 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know
20	34. Description of father	0. Positive 1. Fairly positive 2. Negative 3. Question not asked or answered 4. I don't know

CODE FOR BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION -- Card 5001

24	State	1. Kansas 2. Other
25	Age	1. 0-16.49 2. 16.5-17.49 3. 17.5-18.49 4. 18.5-19.49

CODE FOR BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION, Continued -- Card 5001

Column	Item	Code
		5. 19.5-20.49 6. 20.5-21.49 7. 21.5-22.49 8. 22.5-23.49 9. 23.5 +
26	Religious affiliation	1. Protestant 2. Catholic 3. Other 4. Not marked
27	Size of hometown	1. Less than 1,000 2. 1,000 to 2,500 3. 2,500 to 10,000 4. 10,000 to 25,000 5. More than 25,000
28	Mother's years of school	1. Less than 9 2. 9, 10, 11 3. 12 4. 13 or 14 5. 15 or 16 6. More than 16
29	Father's years of school	1. Less than 9 2. 9, 10, 11 3. 12 4. 13 or 14 5. 15 or 16 6. More than 16
30	Father's occupation	1. Deceased or unmarked 2. Miscellaneous 3. Semi and unskilled 4. Skilled occupation 5. Agriculture related 6. Farming 7. Service 8. Clerical and sales 9. Professional, managerial, executive and semi-professional

CODE FOR BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION, Continued (2) -- Card 5001

Column	Item	Code
31	Mother's occupation	1. Unmarked 2. Housewife 3. Semi skilled 4. Skilled occupation 5. Clerical and sales 6. Professional
32	Curriculum enrolled in	1. Art 2. Clothing and Textiles 3. Family and Child Development 4. Family Economics 5. Foods and Nutrition 6. General 7. Nursing 8. Teaching 9. Journalism 0. Elementary Education
33	Older brothers	(Specify Actual Values)
34	Younger brothers	
35	Older sisters	
36	Younger sisters	
37	Number of siblings	
38-40	GPA at end of first KSU semester	
41-43	GPA at end of second semester	
44-46	GPA when left school	
47	Status when left school	1. Dismissal 2. Probation 3. Good standing
48-50	Hours completed	
51	Semesters completed	

CODE FOR CULTURAL INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE (to be Written)

Column	Item	Code
1-4	Identification Code	Card 5003
5	Initial label	0. Honors 1. Low scoring
6-8	Subject code number	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	1. Father's leisure time activities (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Read 2. Participant sports 3. Games, puzzles, collecting 4. Organizations, community activities 5. Spectator sports 6. Activities with children 7. Rest, watch television 8. Visit friends 9. Work around home
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	2. Mother's leisure time activities (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Read 2. Participant sports 3. Games, puzzles, collecting 4. Organizations, community activities 5. Spectator sports 6. Activities with children 7. Rest, watch television 8. Visit friends 9. Work around home
27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	3. Student's leisure time activities (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Read 2. Participant sports 3. Games, puzzles, collecting 4. Organizations, community activities 5. Spectator sports 6. Activities with children 7. Rest, watch television 8. Visit friends 9. Work around home
36	4. Newspaper subscriptions	1. Major city paper 2. Local paper 3. Both

CODE FOR CULTURAL INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE, Continued (1) Card 5003

Column	Item	Code
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	4b. Sections read	1. News 2. Editorial 3. Woman's page 4. Society 5. Sports 6. Comics 7. Scan entire paper 8. Want ads
45	5a. Magazine subscriptions	1. None 2. 1 to 3 3. 4 or more
46 47 48 49 50 51 52 60	5b. Type of magazine subscriptions	1. Literary 2. Women's 3. Farm 4. News 5. Sports 6. Church 7. Reader's Digest 8. Technical
53	5c. Magazines read by student	1. None 2. 1 to 3 3. 4 or more
54	6a. Public library accessible	1. Yes 2. No
55 56 57 58	6b. Family check out books	1. Father 2. Mother 3. Student 4. Siblings
59	7. Student enjoy reading	1. Yes 2. At times 3. Not too much 4. No
60	8. Father reads	1. Yes 2. No

CULTURAL INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE, Continued (2) -- Card 5003

Column	Item	Code
61	9. Mother reads	1. Yes 2. No
62	10. Family in book club	1. Yes 2. No
63	11a. Family had television set	1. Yes 2. No
64	11b. Father watches television	1. Yes 2. No
65	12. Mother watches television	1. Yes 2. No
66	13. Student watches television	1. Yes 2. No
67	14. Family has record player	1. Yes 2. No
68	18. Family attend concert or play recently	1. Yes 2. No
69	19. Student selects own clothes	1. Yes 2. No
70	20. Student decides how to money	1. Yes 2. No
71	21. Ask permission to attend social activities	1. Yes 2. No
72	22. How long since asked	1. Still ask 2. 1 year 3. 2 to 3 years 4. 4 to 6 years 5. Never asked
73	23. Join community organi-zation	1. Yes 2. No

CULTURAL INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE, Continued (3) -- Card 5003

Column	Item	Code
74	24. Interest in state politics	1. Yes 2. Slightly 3. Find politics boring
75	25. Interest in national events	1. Yes 2. Slightly 3. Find them boring

CODE FOR PARENT INTERVIEW

Column	Item	Code
1-4	Identification Code	5004, Fathers; 5006, Mothers
5	Initial label	0. Honors 1. Low scoring
6-8	Subject Code Number	
9	Parent Interviewed	1. Mother 2. Father
10	1. Number of children	1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five or more
11 12 13 14 15 16	2. Placement of children	1. Pre-school 2. Elementary 3. Jr.- Sr. high school 4. University 5. Working 6. Married
17	4. Feelings about daughter at University	1. Positive 2. Fairly positive 3. Negative 4. Question not asked or answered 5. I don't know
18	5. Reason for feelings	1. Security for daughter 2. Financial 3. Value education 4. Other 5. Not asked or answered
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	6. Rules stressed (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other

PARENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (1) -- Card 5004 (6)

Column	Item	Code
26 27 28 29 30 31 32	7. Rules stressed by mate (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other
33	8. Daughter's reaction to rules	1. Accept 2. Partially accept 3. Rebel verbally 4. Rebel physically 5. Don't know 6. Not asked or answered
34	9. Most trouble getting daughter to do	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other 8. Nothing 9. Not asked or answered
35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	10. Student worried parents (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other 8. Nothing 9. Not asked or answered
44	11. Parental supervision advocated	1. Much 2. Moderate 3. Little 4. Not asked or answered
45	12. Amount of supervision given	1. Much 2. Moderate 3. Little 4. Not asked or answered

PARENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (2) -- Card 5004 (6)

Column	Item	Code
46	13a. Discipline in elementary school	1. Physical punishment 2. Deprivation 3. Discussion 4. Scolding 5. Very little necessary 6. Other 7. Not asked or answered
47	13b. Discipline in high school	1. Physical punishment 2. Deprivation 3. Discussion 4. Scolding 5. Very little necessary 6. Other 7. Not asked or answered
48	14. Mate's methods of discipline	1. Physical punishment 2. Deprivation 3. Discussion 4. Scolding 5. Very little necessary 6. Other 7. Not asked or answered
49	16. Did most disciplining	1. Mother 2. Father 3. About equal 4. Not asked or answered
50	17. Most effective discipline	1. Physical punishment 2. Deprivation 3. Discussion 4. Scolding 5. Very little necessary 6. Other 7. Not asked or answered
51	18. Action when children disagree with parents	1. Ignore 2. Punish 3. Discuss 4. Not asked or answered

PARENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (3) -- Card 5004 (6)

Column	Item	Code
52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	19. What made proud of daughter	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other 8. Nothing 9. Not asked or answered
61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69	20. What made mate proud	1. Achievement 2. Grades and study 3. Relationships with others 4. Dating regulations 5. Moral development 6. Housekeeping responsibilities 7. Other 8. Nothing 9. Not asked or answered
70	21. Demonstration of affection recommended	1. Attention and interest 2. Physical affection 3. Neutral 4. Strict 5. I don't know 6. Not asked or answered
71	22. Parental display of affection	1. Attention and interest 2. Physical affection 3. Neutral 4. Strict 5. I don't know 6. Not asked or answered

---

1-4	Identification Code	Card 5005, Fathers; 5007, Mothers
5	Initial label	0. Honors 1. Low scoring
6-8	Subject Code Number	

PARENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (4) -- Card 5005 (7)

Column	Item	Code
9	Parent interviewed	1. Mother 2. Father
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	23. Characteristics of a good child (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Obeys and respects adults 2. Loves and confides in his parents 3. Shares and cooperates with others 4. Is eager to learn 5. Respects property, takes care of his things 6. Keeps clean and neat 7. Enjoys growing up 8. Works hard at home and school 9. Is honest, courteous 10. Is happy, contented
20	24. Impression of children's behavior	1. Usually good 2. Usually bad 3. Good and bad 4. Not asked or answered
21	25. Encourage good behavior	1. Reward 2. Punish
22	26. Feel close to daughter	1. Yes 2. No 3. I don't know 4. Not asked or answered
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	27. Characteristics of a good mother (0, mentioned; 1, not mentioned)	1. Helps children get along with others 2. Makes her children good (character) 3. Disciplines her children 4. Takes care of her children physically 5. Provides for her children's mental growth 6. Shows love and affection to children 7. Trains her children to regular habits 8. Guides her children with understanding 9. Sees to her children's emotional well being 10. Is good cook and housekeeper 11. Is good wife, creates happy family

PARENT INTERVIEW CODE, Continued (5) -- Card 5005 (7)

Column	Item	Code
34 35	28. Characteristics of a good father	1. Seeks to understand children 2. Earns a good income for his family's support
36	(0 mentioned;	3. Answers his children's questions frankly
37	1, not mentioned)	4. Participates in recreational activities with his children
38		5. Develops habits of obedience in his children
39		6. Encourages his children to grow up in own ways
40		7. Decides what is best for children
41		8. Works with wife and children on home tasks
42		9. Disciplines his children
43		10. Gives presents to, and does things for child
44		11. Is good husband, creates happy marriage and family
45	29. Would change methods of child rearing	1. Yes 2. No 3. I don't know 4. Not asked or answered
46 47 48 49 50 51	30. Desire for daughter	1. Financial security 2. College graduate 3. Marriage 4. Happiness 5. Uphold values 6. Other

COMPARISON OF FAMILY BACKGROUNDS OF HONORS AND LOW POTENTIAL HOME ECONOMICS MAJORS

by

VIRGINIA MUNSON MOXLEY

B. S., Kansas State University, 1968

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Students come to the university from a great variety of backgrounds. The present study is a comparison of family backgrounds of two groups of students differing in scholastic potential.

The subjects selected for the investigation were female home economics majors at Kansas State University. The honors group had all scored in the top 10 percent of students taking the entrance examination and were included in the College of Home Economics Honors Program. The group showing low potential for graduation comprised the lower 10 percent of students entering the College of Home Economics. Data for the present study were taken from investigations conducted in two previous research projects under the auspices of the Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University. The subjects chosen for the present study (36 honors and 23 low potential students) were ones on whom complete data files were available.

As previous studies have indicated, few differences were found between the honors and low potential groups with regard to physical background. More honors than low potential students came from small town or rural backgrounds, had mothers who were full time homemakers, and had college-educated parents. However, these differences were not significant at the .05 level. Family size was similar, but significantly more honors than low potential students were oldest daughters with younger sisters. Low potential subjects tended to be youngest daughters.

Honors students' families frequently engaged in intellectual pursuits while low potential families preferred social activities. Honors students'

enjoyment of reading was significantly greater than that of low potentials'. Mothers and fathers of honors students read significantly more in their leisure time than did parents of low potential students. Significantly more honors than low potential families belonged to a book club and had recently attended a play or concert. Low potential family members spent leisure time in participant sports and television viewing.

Low potential parents emphasized more rules and provided significantly more supervision than did honors parents. Low potential parents stressed significantly more rules in the areas of dating regulations and housekeeping responsibilities. Low potential parents were significantly more interested in the child's behavior than were honors parents who were more concerned with the child's feelings. Honors students were significantly more involved than low potential in decisions made about them while growing up. Honors parents most frequently used discussion to discipline, while low potential parents used deprivation.

The findings indicate that the academically superior group came from homes where intellectual activities were encouraged and enjoyed and where parents helped the child develop self-confidence and self-initiative through participation in decision making. With this background and their superior ability such students are better able to succeed in the university environment.