

PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION
AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Janet Landis Summers
1962





RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

2302
OCT 25 1985

~~4-11-85~~
0507

~~SEP 1 1985~~

154

MAR 12 2000

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

by Janet Landis Summers

This study analyzed the relationship between perceived parental rejection and scholastic achievement within a theoretical framework of deprivation and compensation. Data obtained by the administration of paper-pencil questionnaires to a sample of 293 undergraduates enrolled in basic social science courses at a large state university were analyzed to test three major hypotheses:

1. There will be a low positive relationship between certain of the background items--namely, socio-economic status, religion, parental valuation of education--and scholastic achievement.
2. There will be an inverse association between perceived parental acceptance and scholastic achievement.
3. The inverse relationship between perceived parental acceptance and scholastic achievement will be more definite when socio-economic level is controlled, and will be strongest in the high socio-economic group.

The findings yielded support for the first hypothesis; in addition, a low positive association resulted between sex and achievement with females being the higher achievers, and a positive relationship between year in school and achievement with freshmen being the higher achievers. Hypothesis two was refuted: there was a tendency for perceived parental acceptance to relate to high scholastic achievement, and for perceived parental rejection to relate to low achievement. These tendencies were stronger for mother acceptance than for father, and were especially strong among females. In light of the findings in relation to hypothesis two, the third hypothesis was inapplicable. Perceived parental acceptance and scholastic achievement were unrelated in the high socio-economic group; in the low socio-economic group there was a low positive association between the two variables.

The findings were analyzed from a deprivation and compensation framework. It was concluded that a large state-supported university, such as that used for this study, is not the type of institution which would tend to draw a preponderance of academically oriented students--students whose orientation is other than academic would tend to compensate for feelings of parental rejection by seeking gratification in areas other than high scholastic achievement. At a school with a high proportion of academically oriented students, it is expected that perceived parental rejection would be related to high scholastic achievement. The results from the present sample seem to suggest that perhaps one factor in adequate performance is a feeling of acceptance in the family of orientation.

PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION
AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

By

Janet Landis Summers

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1962

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my indebtedness to my husband, Worth, and to my parents, Judson and Mary Landis, for their encouragement and moral support throughout the various stages of my graduate training. I want to thank my brother, Judson R. Landis, for suggesting the topic of this study. I want also to indicate my gratitude to Dr. Melvin Segal, Dr. Golda Ross, Dr. Orden Smucker, Dr. Ruth Useem, and Dr. Arthur Vener for their assistance and cooperation in the gathering of data for the study. Finally, I wish to thank the members of my guidance committee, Dr. Wilbur Brookover, Dr. Charles Ramsey, and especially Dr. David Gottlieb who, as thesis advisor, has given generously of his time and advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM.	1
II. METHODOLOGY	19
III. FINDINGS: BACKGROUND ITEMS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT	31
IV. FINDINGS: INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT.	40
V. FINDINGS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL, INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT . . .	55
VI. SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS . .	64
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIXES	76
APPENDIX A	77
APPENDIX B	82
APPENDIX C	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Marginals for Integration with Parents Categories Obtained by Method 1 and by Method 2	23
2. Pattern of Childhood-Adolescent Happiness and Integration with Parents	26
3. Socio-Economic Status and Scholastic Achievement	32
4. Socio-Economic Status and Scholastic Achieve- ment for Males and Females	33
5. Religious Preference and Scholastic Achievement	34
6. Parental Valuation of Education, and Scholastic Achievement	36
7. Scholastic Achievement for Males and Females . .	38
8. Year in School and Scholastic Achievement . . .	38
9. Integration with Parents and Scholastic Achievement	41
10. Integration with Parents and Scholastic Achieve- ment for Freshmen and Sophomores	43
11. Integration with Parents and Scholastic Achieve- ment for Males and Females	44
12. Patterns of High Integration with Father and with Mother for Males and Females	46
13. Father Integration in Relation to Mother Integration	47
14. Integration with Father and High Achievement, Integration with Mother and High Achievement, for Males and Females	48

Table		Page
15.	Pattern of Childhood-Adolescent Happiness and Scholastic Achievement.	52
16.	Socio-Economic Status and Integration with Father for Males and Females.	56
17.	Socio-Economic Status and Integration with Mother for Males and Females.	58
18.	Integration with Parents and Scholastic Achievement by Socio-Economic Level	60
19.	Socio-Economic Status and Parental Valuation of Education	62
20.	Integration with Father for Males and Females.	83
21.	Integration with Mother for Males and Females.	83
22.	Integration with Father and Scholastic Achievement for Males and Females	84
23.	Integration with Mother and Scholastic Achievement for Males and Females	84

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Nye Scale of Perceived Parental Rejection with Response Values	21
2.	Integration with Parents Scores Yielded by Methods 1 and 2.	24
3.	Breakdown of Integration and Achievement Variables versus Combined Variables . . .	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to examine certain relationships which may exist between perceived parental rejection and scholastic achievement as measured by expressed grade point average.

Our theoretical framework is that of deprivation and compensation: when an individual is deprived in one area he will seek out gratification in another area. The key point is that unsatisfactory interpersonal relations in childhood produce insecurity and anxiety which are compensated for by a quest for power, recognition, and success.

The expected institution for the initial satisfaction of the individual's needs for acceptance and recognition is the family of orientation. Because this is the initial group to which one relates himself, a lack of a feeling of security and acceptance within this group is an especially vital factor in the development of the individual. The need for acceptance and recognition is developed in children to the extent that they feel anxiety when they sense that there is a lack of love and acceptance from the family. The individual who feels unaccepted will strive to overcome his anxiety, will strive to

be accepted and recognized elsewhere. Horney,¹ in particular, has suggested that the quest for power is frequently used as a compensatory means of attaining reassurance against the anxieties produced by unhappy childhood experiences.

Because of the widespread acceptance of high aspiration and high achievement as values in American society today, becoming a high achiever (at least in some socially accepted area) is one legitimate means to obtaining gratification and of compensating for the emotional deprivation felt in the family. It is recognized that there are avenues to gaining acceptance other than that of high academic achievement, however, our concern is only with the latter. Further, we are saying nothing about how much this compensatory seeking of gratification is internalized or recognized by the individual, rather, we are only interested in the external manifestations of deprivation in interpersonal relations leading to a seeking out of gratification in other areas.

Several investigations have been conducted which bear on some of the assumptions of this operational framework. Lasswell hypothesized that power is pursued as a means of compensation against deprivation--"power is expected to overcome low estimates of the self, by changing either the traits of the self or the environment in which it functions."² He

¹Karen Horney, The Neurotic Personality of Our Time (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1937), pp. 162-187.

²Harold D. Lasswell, Power and Personality (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1937, p. 39.

points out that the self includes symbols of identification, so in this sense grades in school would be included as a part of the self. His sub-hypothesis is that power is resorted to when it is expected to contribute more than any alternative value to overcoming or obviating deprivations of the self. He expects this to be especially the case in middle-class homes--"we know that middle-class homes are hothouses of ambition, holding their children to high standards of achievement, thus providing the tension between indulgence and deprivation so congenial to the accentuation of power."³ His major hypothesis is supported.

The intensive study of infancy and childhood . . . has underlined the decisive importance of the early years in shaping the structure of personality. . . . The data go in the direction toward which we have been pointing. The accentuation of power is to be understood as a compensatory reaction against low estimates of the self. . . . At the same time adverse estimates of the self must not be overwhelming, or the resort to power will be blocked by sentiments of utter hopelessness. . . .⁴

Kausler and Trapp, on the other hand, found results which conflict with those of Lasswell. They tested the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between level of achievement motivation and level of manifest anxiety drive. The null hypothesis was rejected--"the results clearly reflect a significantly negative relationship between

³Ibid., p. 47.

⁴Ibid., pp. 52-53.

the two sets of scores. . . ."⁵ That is, high manifest anxiety drive was related to low achievement motivation, and low manifest anxiety, to high achievement motivation.

Further, in line with the assumption that excessive ambition is a way of compensating for a low level of self-esteem, that power is sought as insurance against an underlying feeling of worthlessness, Cohen⁶ investigated goal-level setting within a level-of-aspiration framework by studying feelings of adequacy and self-acceptance. He found that both very high goal setting and very low goal setting were related to self-rejection, to a basic feeling of insecurity.⁷

Along this same line, Wylie⁸ reviews numerous studies on level of self-esteem and achievement, some of which have conflicting results. Some investigators reported no relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement; others found none between self-regard and Achievement (i.e. achievement motivation). Where relationships were found between self-esteem and achievement, they were usually direct rather than inverse.

⁵D. H. Kausler and E. P. Trapp, "Relationship Between Achievement Motivation Scores and Manifest Anxiety Scores," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22: 448-450.

⁶Louis D. Cohen, "Level-of-Aspiration Behavior and Feelings of Adequacy and Self-Acceptance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49: 84-86.

⁷Ibid., p. 86.

⁸Ruth C. Wylie, The Self Concept (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 224-246.

The conflicting results of the above investigations indicate a need for some measure which would discriminate between two types of individuals: (1) those whose level of anxiety is so high or who have such extremely adverse estimates of self that they are incapacitated, or, in Lasswell's words, are blocked from pursuit of power by feelings of utter hopelessness; and, (2) those who have a high level of anxiety and a low estimate of self but not so low that it prevents them from attempting to attain power and recognition.

There has been an abundance of research in recent years on the relationships between child-training practices and achievement motivation. The results of these investigations are in general agreement that severity of independence training in childhood is significantly related to achievement. That is, the earlier and more severe the independence training in childhood, the higher the n Achievement.⁹ These findings

⁹See, for instance; Elizabeth M. Drews and John E. Teahan, "Parental Attitudes and Academic Achievement," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13: 328-332; G. A. Friedman, "A Cross-Cultural Study of the Relationship Between Independence Training and n Achievement as Revealed by Mythology" (unpublished A. B. thesis, Harvard University, 1950), cited in McClelland, Studies in Motivation (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955), pp. 411-413; David C. McClelland, "Measuring Motivation in Phantasy," Studies in Motivation, ibid., pp. 401-413; F. L. Strodbeck, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement" in D. C. McClelland, et al, Talent and Society (New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958), pp. 135-194; M. Winterbottom, "The Sources of Achievement Motivation in Mothers' Attitudes Toward Independence Training," in McClelland, et al, The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953), pp. 297-304.

tend to confirm the assumption that unsatisfactory interpersonal relations in early childhood produce insecurity and anxiety which are compensated for by a seeking of power, recognition, and success.

In the present study, rather than being concerned directly with what training practices are related to later achievement, we are interested in what feelings of the subject about the interpersonal relations in his family are related to later achievement. Research has been conducted by some investigators whose approach is directly relevant to ours. Dynes, Clarke, and Dinitz¹⁰ initiated a project to find if individuals with high aspirations are characterized by greater difficulty in their interpersonal relations within the family of orientation than are those with lower aspirations. They found a positive relationship between unsatisfactory interpersonal relationships (as perceived by the subject) in the family of orientation and high occupational aspiration.

Ellis,¹¹ testing the hypothesis that a sense of inadequacy develops early in life during a childhood lacking in warmth and affection, studied sixty unmarried career women, comparing the successful with the unsuccessful. She found that the most successful women indicated that they felt

¹⁰Russell R. Dynes, Alfred C. Clarke, and Simon Dinitz, "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable," American Sociological Review, 21: 212-215 (1956).

¹¹Evelyn Ellis, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, 17: 558-563 (1952).

rejected both by their parents and by their community.

Evidence is consistent with the theory that upward social mobility is likely to be an outgrowth of basically neurotic drives resulting from unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that mobility leads to a continuation of superficial, impermanent primary group relations and other overt manifestations of emotional maladjustment . . . A comparison of mobile and non-mobile [successful and nonsuccessful] women reveals that significantly larger proportions of mobile individuals had experienced both rejection by parents and by the over-all community during childhood.¹²

One of the most comprehensive studies of family relationships and achievement is reported in The Achievement Motive.¹³ As a part of their investigation the authors examined the child-rearing practices attributed to parents by sons with varying n Achievement. The most significant finding is that perceived severity of upbringing or "felt lack of love" is associated among college male students with high n Achievement. The largest single correlation involves the rejection attributed to the fathers by their sons; that is, sons who felt their fathers had rejected them had higher n Achievement scores than those who felt their fathers had loved and accepted them. The authors point out that, "these data may have more bearing on the ways sons with high achievement motivation perceive their parents than on the way in which they were actually brought up."¹⁴ The authors sum up their findings as follows:

¹²Ibid., p. 563.

¹³McClelland, et al., The Achievement Motive, pp. 275-318.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 280. (Underlining this author's.)

College males who give evidence of being very "close" to their parents in their admiration of them and perception of them as particularly loving and helpful do not for the most part score high on n Achievement. On the contrary, it is the students who see their parents as "distant"--unfriendly, severe, unsuccessful--who have high n Achievement scores.¹⁵

Similar studies by McClelland are reported in Studies of Motivation¹⁶ with results which support the above findings.

Robinowitz¹⁷ examined the ways in which a group of high school students with high achievement-relative-to-ability differed from three control groups on several variables, two of which were the subject's perception of his acceptance by his family and by his peers. His data suggest a relationship between achieving beyond the level of expectancy and holding an ambivalent evaluation of one's own family and peer acceptance. He infers from this that the subjects who are unsure of their own acceptance by family and peers seem to be seeking a more secure status by means of academic achievement beyond the level of expectancy.

Friend and Haggard, with a sample of 80 men and women between the ages of 16 and 36, found that family integration and attitude toward father are important in occupational adjustment but make little difference in achievement--that is, those high in adjustment had closely knit, strongly unified

¹⁵Ibid., p. 281.

¹⁶McClelland, et al., Studies in Motivation, pp. 389-397.

¹⁷Ralph Robinowitz, "Attributes of Pupils Achieving Beyond Their Level of Expectancy," Journal of Personality, 24: 308-317 (1956).

families and more affection for the father. On the other hand, antagonism for the mother was positively associated with both occupational adjustment and achievement.¹⁸ Those high in adjustment and achievement had a more positive feeling for the mother and less sense of rejection than did the lows. Although these findings conflict with those of other investigators, Friend and Haggard make the important point that, "whether or not a worker makes special demands of the job or needs special appreciation and status, depends upon the amount of deprivation during his early life: that he goes after the identical and specific satisfactions in his work which were denied him years before."¹⁹

A preliminary investigation was made of those relationships which might exist between interpersonal relationships within the family and scholastic achievement with a sample of 60 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory and advanced sociology courses at a large state university. The instrument and methods of analysis differed from those in the present study. The sample was divided into a high achievement group (reported grade average of A or B) and a low or average achievement group (reported grade average of C, D, or F), and into a group who perceived their relationships with the family as being satisfactory (i.e., feeling close to, accepted by the parents, and remembering childhood and adolescence as being happy), and a group who perceived

¹⁸Anne Roe, The Psychology of Occupations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956), pp. 128-29.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 129.

the relationships as being unsatisfactory. Additional factors in the social milieu of the subjects were examined such as sex, religion, year in school, social class, and value the family places on education, and these showed no relationship to achievement. When the "satisfaction with family relationships" groups were examined for their levels of achievement, the high satisfaction group had significantly more low achievement (76%) than high achievement (24%) whereas the low satisfaction group showed an equal amount of high and of low achievement. These results might be interpreted to mean that in a family which provides emotional support and acceptance, the need to seek gratification and recognition elsewhere is not developed.

The present study is intended to examine further the relationship between perceived parental rejection and scholastic achievement. The three purposes, with the second and third being the major ones, are:

1. To examine certain factors in the subject's social milieu--such as, socio-economic status, religion, parental valuation of education, sex, year in school--for their influence on achievement.
2. To examine the relationship between perceived parental acceptance or rejection and scholastic achievement.
3. To make the same examination as in number (2), within each socio-economic group.

For the purposes of this investigation it is hypothesized that:

1. There will be a low positive relationship between some of the background items--namely, socio-economic status, religion, and parental valuation of education--and scholastic achievement.
2. There will be an inverse relationship between feeling accepted by parents and high scholastic achievement.
3. The inverse relationship hypothesized in number (2) will be (a) more definite when socio-economic status is held constant, and, (b) strongest in the high socio-economic group.

The rationale behind hypothesis 2 has been discussed. The general hypothesis in most studies of social class and achievement is that academic performance will be positively related to social class--that more high achievement will occur in the middle class than in the lower class. We hypothesize, however, that at the college level, if a relationship between socio-economic status and achievement exists, it will be slight. Anne Roe states,

It is still not literally true that anyone who wishes to can get a college education in this country, but it is more nearly true than it used to be Expectation of college attendance varies with the social class position of the family. . . . after students get to college the percentage graduating is very similar in all groups except for those from farm homes. College students, after all, comprise a limited group and are already selected on a social class basis to a considerable extent.²⁰

²⁰Ibid., pp. 104-107.

Washburne found that socio-economic status, as measured by education and occupation(s) of parents, was not significantly related to the academic performance of college students. He concludes that "perhaps the part played by socio-economic status as regards higher education is limited to the determination of opportunity to attend school, and the development of levels of aspiration such that the student is motivated to attend when the opportunity is offered."²¹ Washburne's results seem to indicate that once the student gets to college, the social class of his family has very little to do with his achievement.

With a sample of high school sophomores, Rosen²² found that members of the middle class tend to have considerably higher need achievement scores than individuals in the lower social strata, and that the middle class is characterized by a larger proportion of persons with achievement oriented values than are the lower social strata. Subjects with high achievement motivation scores were proportionately more likely to achieve grades of "B" or better than were those with low motivation scores, whereas achievement value orientation was not related to academic achievement but was related to educational aspiration. [Rosen concludes that the relationship between academic achievement and social class reflects to a

²¹Norman F. Washburne, "Socio-economic Status, Urbanism, and Academic Performance in College," Journal of Educational Research 53: 137 (1959).

²²Bernard C. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, 21: 203-211 (1956).

considerable extent social class differences in achievement motivation.

Finally, Strodbeck, from a study of 1,151 boys of pre-college age, reports a definite positive relationship between being an over-achiever and being of higher socio-economic status.²³

The latter two investigations cited indicate a positive relationship between social class and achievement at the pre-college level. They seem to get at the way in which and the level at which this relationship operates. Middle class individuals are likely to be both higher aspirers and higher achievers than are those in the lower class. This difference is especially evident at the pre-college level because a college sample is a select one in terms of motivation and value orientation. Only those individuals, regardless of socio-economic status, who are both high aspirers and high achievers can go to college. So, although the middle class is characterized as having higher levels of aspiration and achievement than is the lower class, we could assume that the lower socio-economic level students who are in college have high levels of aspiration in order to be there, and will, therefore, achieve at almost as high a level as the higher socio-economic level.

It is expected that the extent to which a subject's parents value education (i.e. encouraged him to attend college)

²³Strodbeck, op. cit., pp.135-194.

will vary with socio-economic level. An investigation by Gottlieb in which the question was asked, "Who would you say played the most important role in helping you to decide to attend college?", reveals that middle and upper class boys were more likely to mention parents than were lower class boys and lower class boys selected teachers and guidance counselors more frequently than did middle and upper class boys.²⁴ However, we might expect that the lower socio-economic status college students gained at least some of their motivation through encouragement to attend college received from their parents. Gottlieb found that in each social class it was the high achievers who had received parental encouragement to attend college.²⁵ In light of this, we would expect a relationship between parental valuation of education and scholastic achievement, however, because of the relationship between socio-economic status and parental valuation of education, and of the only slight relationship between socio-economic status and achievement at the college level, perhaps the relationship will not be strong.

Although we would not expect a strong relationship between socio-economic status and achievement, because of the differing behavioral patterns at different socio-economic levels--these patterns influencing the subject's perception of

²⁴David Gottlieb, "Social Class, College Students and the Ideal College Professor" (paper read at the Annual Meetings of the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, April 21, 1961). (Forthcoming School Review, The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

²⁵Ibid., p. 5.

his acceptance or rejection by his parents--we expect to find a stronger relationship between perceived rejection and scholastic achievement when socio-economic level is controlled.

[Allison Davis cites research on child training practices which supports the view that "the middle-class child undergoes in his cultural training a more depriving attack upon his sources of organic and emotional support than does the lower-class child."²⁶ Middle-class parents "who have been taught by their own parents to strive for early and fast attainment as an absolute 'good' in their part of society, very often sacrifice their children's happiness, their basic adequacy in facing the realities of later life, by training them too early and too severely for 'achievement'."²⁷] Following this line of argument, we expect the relationship between perceived parental rejection and scholastic achievement to be stronger in the higher socio-economic groups.

Most discussions of the relationship between religion and achievement are based upon Max Weber's study of the influence of a religious ethic upon social activity. Following Weber's hypothesis that the spirit of modern capitalism is intimately connected with the Protestant Ethic, McClelland, Rindlisbacher, and DeCharms hypothesized that there will be an association between "the new 'spirit of capitalism,' 'the irrational sense of having done his job well' with an increase in achievement motivation (n Achievement) and the Protestant

²⁶Allison Davis, Social Class Influences Upon Learning (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 18-19.

²⁷Ibid., p. 22.

emphasis on 'self-help' for salvation with an increased stress on independence training for young children."²⁸ That is, they hypothesize that Protestants will have higher achievement motivation than Catholics and that Protestant families will emphasize independence training more. Winterbottom²⁹ and McClelland and Friedman³⁰ have demonstrated an empirical connection between emphasis on independence training and Achievement. In addition to their main hypothesis, McClelland et al., test Weber's suggestion that Jews like Protestants will have a more rational acquisitive approach to the world, with the expectation that Jewish parents also will emphasize independence training more than Catholic parents. Their findings indicate that Protestant and Jewish parents do expect independence earlier on the part of their children than do Irish- or Italian-Catholics.³¹

Strodtbeck, however, in a similar study, found three items in particular which were related to achievement:

- (1) A belief that the world is orderly and amenable to rational mastery, that, therefore, a person can and should make plans which will control his destiny;
- (2) A willingness to leave home to make one's way in life; and
- (3) A preference for individual rather than collective credit for work done.³²

²⁸McClelland et al., Studies in Motivation, p. 391.

²⁹Winterbottom, op. cit., pp. 297-304.

³⁰Friedman, op. cit., pp. 401-413.

³¹McClelland et al., Studies in Motivation, p. 395.

³²Strodtbeck, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

These values correspond to Weber's characterization of the Protestant Ethic, but, Strodbeck states,

Our concern differs from Weber's in that the orientation in question is not presumed to affect all categories of Americans equally. Some elements are believed to be widely held, but the particularly dynamic element of substituting achievement for interpersonal gratification is believed to develop only in adult years, and only in people who have been in some sense specially prepared. Not only is it necessary that they hold certain beliefs about the nature of the external system, but the implication of performance in it for interpersonal relations may also be involved. It is in search for leads in this connection that we turn to . . . those [items] relating to early training as a motivational preparation for achievement.³³

In the latter analysis, Strodbeck found that sons' achievement was related to the power balance in the family (i.e. democratic family--relatively powerful mother--yields sons with higher achievement motivation), which was in turn related to social class. "Socio-economic status affects socialization and the power balance in the family, both of which are related to subsequent achievement."³⁴ Thus, it appears that what is often characterized as the Protestant Ethic is in fact the middle class ethic--this ethic or set of values being more determined by social class than by religious background. It is because of this, as with socio-economic status, that we do not expect a strong relationship between religion and achievement.

³³Ibid., pp. 143-144

³⁴Ibid., p. 185.

In summary, this chapter has included an introduction to the problem of the study--the theoretical background, a review of the relevant literature, and a statement of our purposes and hypotheses.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire containing 35 items. (A copy of the questionnaire can be found in the Appendix A.) Twelve of the items were intended to obtain objective data on background information, the remaining items, to elicit subjective responses on feelings of parental acceptance or rejection and on feelings of happiness in childhood and adolescence.

The major variable in the study, other than scholastic achievement, is parental acceptance or rejection of the child as perceived by the child. Throughout the rest of this paper, this "perceived parental acceptance/rejection" variable will be referred to as "integration with parents." Level of integration may be defined, then, as the degree to which the subject feels accepted or rejected by his parents.

Nye¹ originated a two-part scale to measure feelings of acceptance and rejection between parents and children. The first part of the scale consists of a group of items to determine to what extent the child accepted or rejected his parents, and the second part, a group of items to determine to what

¹F. Ivan Nye, Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 77-78.

degree the child felt that his parents had accepted or rejected him. The latter group of items is the one used to determine integration in this study. Figure 1 presents these items.

Ten of the items elicit responses indicative of perceived paternal acceptance, and 10 of perceived maternal acceptance. Three scores were obtained from the scale: (1) integration with father, (2) integration with mother, and (3) integration with parents. The first score was derived by totaling the response values on the 10 "father items" and terming those with scores from 15-20, highly integrated with father; those from 10-14, middle integrated with father; and those from 0-9, low integrated with father. The second score was obtained in the same manner and with the same range of possible values for each integration group using the total response values from the 10 "mother items." Two methods were used for determining the integration with parents score. First (Method 1), the response values for the total scale (all twenty items) were totaled with a possible score of 0-40. Those who scored 30-40 were classified as highly integrated with parents, those from 20-29 as middle integrated with parents, and those from 0-10 as low integrated with parents. By the second method (Method 2), those subjects who scored from 15-20 on the ten "father items" and who also scored from 15-20 on the ten "mother items" were called highly integrated with parents, those who scored from 10-14 on the "father items"

FIGURE 1

NYE SCALE OF PERCEIVED PARENTAL REJECTION
WITH RESPONSE VALUES

1. My father is interested in what I do: (1) Always 2;
(2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0;
(5) Never 0.
2. My mother is interested in what I do: (1) Always 2;
(2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0;
(5) Never 0.
3. My father ridicules my ideas: (1) Always 0; Usually
0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.
4. My mother ridicules my ideas: (1) Always 0; Usually
0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.
5. My father encourages me to discuss my problems with him:
(1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0;
(4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
6. My mother encourages me to discuss my problems with her:
(1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0;
(4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
7. I think my father has my best interests at heart:
(1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0;
(4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
8. I think my mother has my best interests at heart:
(1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0;
(4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
9. I think my father shows more interest in my brothers and
sisters than he shows in me: (1) Always 0; (2) Usually
0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2;
(6) Usually shows more interest in me 2; (7) I'm an
only child 1.
10. I think my mother shows more interest in my brothers and
sisters than she shows in me: (1) Always 0; (2) Usually
0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2;
(6) Usually shows more interest in me 2; (7) I'm an
only child 1.
11. Other fathers tend to show more interest in their children
than my father shows in me: (1) Completely agree 0;
(2) Partially agree 0; (3) Undecided 1; (4) Partially
disagree 2; (5) Completely disagree 2.

FIGURE 1--Continued

12. Other mothers tend to show more interest in their children than my mother shows in me: (1) Completely agree 0; (2) Partially agree 0; (3) Undecided 1; (4) Partially disagree 2; (5) Completely disagree 2.
13. My father praises me when I do my work well: (1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
14. My mother praises me when I do my work well: (1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
15. Does your father ever seem to wish that you were a different type of person? (1) Always 0; (2) Often 0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.
16. Does your mother ever seem to wish that you were a different type of person? (1) Always 0; (2) Often 0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.
17. Do you think that your father tries to understand your problems and worries? (1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
18. Do you think that your mother tries to understand your problems and worries? (1) Always 2; (2) Usually 1; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 0; (5) Never 0.
19. My father says and does things that make me feel that I am not trusted: (1) Always 0; (2) Often 0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.
20. My mother says and does things that make me feel that I am not trusted: (1) Always 0; (2) Often 0; (3) Sometimes 0; (4) Seldom 1; (5) Never 2.

and also scored from 10-14 on the "mother items," middle integrated with parents, and those who scored from 0-9 on the "father items" and from 0-9 on the "mother items," low integrated with parents. Figure 2 illustrates the possible combinations of scores on the father items and scores on the mother items which would yield a certain integration with parents score by Methods 1 and 2.

The total range of possible father score-mother score combinations which would fall into a given integration with parents category is greater by Method 1 than by Method 2. Thus, Method 2 yields purer categories, including only those respondents in a given integration with parents group who are of the same level of integration with one parent as they are with the other. As is obvious from Figure 2, this is not necessarily the case when Method 1 is used.

The marginals which result using Method 1 and using Method 2 are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
MARGINALS FOR INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS CATEGORIES
OBTAINED BY METHODS 1 AND 2

Method 1			Method 2		
Integration With Parents	N	Per Cent	Integration With Parents	N	Per Cent
High	91	31	High	75	26
Middle	129	44	Middle	54	15
Low	73	25	Low	47	16
Totals.	293	100	Totals.	176	57

FIGURE 2

INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS SCORES YIELDED BY METHODS 1 AND 2

Integration with Parents	Method 1			Method 2		
	Possible Father Score	Possible Mother Score	To Yield a Total of	Possible Father Score	Possible Mother Score	Total
High	10.....20 +	10.....20 =	30.....40	15.....20 +	15.....20 =	30.....40
Middle	0.....20 +	0.....20 =	20.....29	10.....14 +	10.....14 =	20.....28
Low	0.....19 +	0.....19 =	0.....19	0.....09 +	0.....09 =	0.....18

Clearly, Method 2 is the more exact one, however, throughout most of the analysis, it was necessary to use Method 1. Had Method 2 been used, only 57% of the sample would have been included, with the result that, in most of the analyses, the numbers in each cell would have been too small to warrant legitimate examination. In the analysis of one variable (achievement), we were able to use the second method; in effect, Method 2 acted as a check on Method 1, and the two methods yielded very similar results. Although there is no way to state with certainty, we would hope that similar results would be obtained by the two methods on the remaining variables. Finally, the method used throughout most of this study (Method 1) is the one used by Nye.

Our use of the Nye scale to determine perceived parental acceptance and rejection is grounded on the assumption that it gets at the expressive content of long term behavior patterns rather than at that of specific, momentary behavioral acts. As a partial check of this assumption, the respondent's rating of his childhood and of his adolescent happiness were combined into an index of childhood-adolescent happiness. Assuming that happiness in childhood and in adolescence is in part related to interpersonal relationships in the family, if our assumption about the Nye scale is true, we would expect a strong relationship between this index and the integration index. These two indices were examined (Table 2) and they are significantly related. This tends to lend support to our assumption about the type of information gained from the Nye scale.

TABLE 2

PATTERN OF CHILDHOOD-ADOLESCENT HAPPINESS
AND INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS

Pattern of Happiness			High		Middle		Low	
Childhood	Adolescent		Integrated		Integrated		Integrated	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Happy	Happy	(N=207)	81	39	95	46	31	15
Happy	Unhappy	(N= 35)	5	14	19	54	11	32
Unhappy	Happy	(N= 12)	1	9	4	33	7	58
Unhappy	Unhappy	(N= 30)	2	7	7	23	21	70

$$\chi^2 = 57.86, df, 6, p = < .001.$$

Respondents were classified on socio-economic status in terms of father's occupation. In doubtful cases, father's education was also considered. The index used for classification of occupations into socio-economic status groupings was taken from a study by Davis et al.,² and is as follows:

- A. Low status : Garbage collectors, janitors, ordinary seamen, truck drivers.
- B. Respectable working class: Postmen, barbers, mechanics, bus drivers, clerks in retail stores, machine operators.
- C. Working class elite--
bottom middle : Plumbers, carpenters, owners of small retail stores, foremen, white collar supervisors, farmers.
- D. Middle-middle : Secondary teachers, morticians, pharmacists, wholesale salesmen, middle managers.
- E. Elite : Major professionals, presidents of medium-large firms, top management in large firms.

²James Davis, David Gottlieb, and Joel Spaeth, Stipends and Spouses (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

Occupations of the respondents' fathers were classified into the socio-economic status index on separate occasions by two individuals with almost complete agreement.

As did the authors noted on the preceding page, we worked with two cells; low socio-economic group (A, B, and C) versus high socio-economic group (D and E). The occupational groups were represented as follows: A-9, B-62, C-102, D-94, and E-26.

Respondents were asked to report their over-all college grade average and were divided into achievement groups as follows:

<u>College Grade Average</u>	<u>Achievement Group</u>
A, B+, or B . . .	High
B-, C+, or C . . .	Middle
C-, D, or F . . .	Low

Reported college grade average is perhaps a rough measure of achievement motivation, however, it correlates positively³ with both the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (PPS) (A. L. Edwards, New York: Psychological Corporation, 1954), and with the TAT developed by McClelland and others, reported in The Achievement Motive. Rosen found that subjects with high motivation scores are proportionately more likely to achieve grades of "B" or better than are adolescents with low

³Peter Weiss, Michael Wertheimer, and Byron Groesbeck, "Achievement Motivation, Academic Aptitude, and College Grades," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 19:663-666 (1959).

motivation scores.⁴ We recognize, however, that in a study of achievement a measure of intelligence might seem to be a necessary variable. Due to an administrative conflict, we were unable to obtain such a measure for the subjects in the present investigation, therefore, this must be considered as an exploratory study.

Although we recognize that having no indication of the intelligence of the respondents is a shortcoming of the study, there are a number of factors which make us think that the range of variation in intelligence in the sample is not great and that the variations in achievement are due to other factors than IQ. First, a college population is a select one in terms of ability; individuals from lower levels of ability are not able to enter college. The subjects in our sample are all in college, they are all in the same university, at which two-thirds of the entering freshmen come from the top one-third of their high school classes, and they are all at the same level in the university (50% freshmen, 47% sophomores). In addition, the figures on freshmen achievement and sophomore achievement do not support the view that there is a high freshmen drop-out rate due to low achievement. On the contrary, there are fewer low achieving freshmen than there are low achieving sophomores. Finally, since IQ is often reported to vary with social class, if achievement was a direct consequence of intelligence, we would expect a strong

⁴Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," 21: 208-209.

relationship between social class and achievement. The figures on socio-economic status and achievement show this not to be the case. Although there is slightly more high achievement in the high socio-economic groups than in the low socio-economic groups, the two variables are not significantly related.

In order to determine to what extent subjects' parents valued education, each respondent was asked to indicate which of the following alternatives best described the situation in his family when he was in high school:

1. It was naturally assumed that you would go to college.
2. If you wanted to go to college you were encouraged to do so by one or both parents, but it was not assumed that you would go.
3. It was not assumed that you would go to college and you received no encouragement from either parent when you decided to do so.

The marginals were (1) 219, (2) 67, and (3) 7. Respondents who indicated the first alternative were said to have parents who placed high value on education; respondents who chose the second or third alternatives were classified as having parents who placed low value on education.

The sample is composed of 293 students who were enrolled in basic social science courses at a large state university during the spring of 1961. All students at this university are required to take a series of basic courses; the social science courses in which the questionnaires were administered are a part of this series. The sample consists not of a select group of students who chose the field of social science

over other fields of study, but is instead a sample of undergraduates from many fields of interest. It is not a random sample of college students, however, it is felt that the sample is sufficiently representative of the freshmen and sophomore population at the university in which the sample was taken to enable us to draw some conclusions and to make some predictions from the data for such a population.

The questionnaires were administered during regular class periods by the professor offering the course. Only those respondents were included in the final sample who were single undergraduates between the ages of 17 and 22, who were United States citizens, and who answered all items on the Nye scale and reported their college grade average.

The relationships between the variables will be examined by the chi-square test of significance. Percentages will be used in many cases to show the distributions.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS: BACKGROUND ITEMS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

The results of this investigation will be presented in three sections: the first will be concerned with the background items as they relate to achievement, the second, with the relationships between integration with parents and achievement, and the third, with the relationships between integration with parents and achievement within each socio-economic group. The first section will be discussed in this chapter.

The hypothesis pertinent to this section of the analysis is that there will be low positive relationship between certain of the background items--namely, socio-economic status, religion, parental valuation of education--and scholastic achievement. The relationships which may or may not exist between sex and achievement, and between year in school and achievement also will be examined.

Table 3 shows the achievement patterns in each socio-economic group. There is a tendency toward higher achievement in the high socio-economic group, however, the achievement differences between the two groups are not significant.

Low achievement appears to be more related to low socio-economic status than high achievement does to high socio-economic status.

TABLE 3
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Socio-Economic Status	Per Cent Achievement		
	High	Middle	Low
High (N = 120)	28	59	13
Low (N = 173)	23	56	21

$$\chi^2 = 2.61, \text{ df, } 2, \text{ NS.}$$

Although there appears to be some relationship between socio-economic status and achievement, it is not surprising that the differences are small. In a study of college students from each socio-economic group, Gottlieb found that the lower class contained the highest proportion of students who had graduated in the top third of their high school class. It seems that the student who comes from a lower socio-economic group is a special one in terms of motivation and achievement. College attendance is not such an accepted course of action in the lower socio-economic groups as it is in the higher ones and the lower class student must be exceptional in terms of motivation and achievement in order to reach the college level.

When socio-economic status and achievement are examined separately for males and for females, in Table 4, the picture

remains approximately the same, however, several interesting differences in the achievement patterns are revealed. There appears to be more of a relationship between socio-economic status and achievement among females than among males; the discrepancy between male and female high achievement is greatest at the higher socio-economic level. Perhaps this is evidence of the "gentleman's C" norm operating in the higher socio-economic groups whereas a "gentlewoman's C" norm does not exist. Females, regardless of socio-economic level, tend to be better students than males. Since college going is more selective among females than among males, the former are likely to be the better students.

TABLE 4
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT
FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Socio-economic Status	Per Cent				Per Cent			
	Male Achievement				Female Achievement			
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N= 65	26	58	16	N=55	32	58	10
Low	N=110	22	57	21	N=63	25	54	21
Males: $X^2 = 1.86$, df, 2, NS.					Females: $X^2=2.45$, df,2, NS			

The over-all picture of socio-economic status and achievement is that there is a slight tendency for more high achievement to occur in the high socio-economic group and more low achievement, in the low socio-economic group. This tendency is stronger among females than among males.

Respondents were asked to state their religious preference from five alternatives: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other, and None. Because of the small number of respondents indicating "other" as their preference (4), that category is excluded from this analysis.

The expected order for most high achievement among the religion groups is Jewish and Protestant first, and Catholics second. The data in Table 5 indicate that this is not necessarily the case. Our expectations hold for the Protestants and Catholics, with the former tending to have more high achievement than low achievement, and more high achievement and less low achievement than Catholics. Catholics have an equal proportion of high and low achievers.

TABLE 5
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Religious Preference	N	Per Cent Achievement		
		High	Middle	Low
Protestant	N=187	27	56	17
Catholic	N= 60	23	55	22
Jewish	N= 19	21	68	11
None	N= 23	17	57	26

$$\chi^2 = 4.90, df, 6, NS.$$

The Jewish group deviates from our expectations. That the least amount of low achievement occurs in this group is not surprising, however, there are fewer Jewish high achievers

than either Protestant or Catholic, and the Jewish respondents tend to be disproportionately grouped in the middle achievement category. Although the differences are insignificant, we can speculate about the reason for the low proportion of Jewish high achievers: the school in which our sample was drawn might not be the kind of institution to which a good Jewish student would go. On the other hand, our findings could be indicative of acculturative changes among Jews: perhaps they can no longer be characterized as having higher achievement and aspiration standards than other groups. Or perhaps there becomes less and less variation in achievement between groups, with the standardization of education. The number of Jewish respondents in our sample is quite small, however, and perhaps we obtained a distorted picture of the achievement patterns in this group.

An interesting finding is that those respondents who stated that they had no religious preference were lower in achievement than any other group. Having no religious preference might indicate alienation from the social environment, low integration with family and peers. These respondents might be at the low end of the continuum of adjustment to their social environment, having no area in which they "fit." Again, the number of respondents in this group is quite small.

Our findings on religion and achievement did not conform to the usual expectations; instead, the order of high achievement was Protestant, Catholic, Jewish. There were no significant differences between religious preference groups on achievement.

Table 6 shows the relationship between achievement and the extent to which parents value education. There is a relationship between the two variables, however, the differences are not significant. Those respondents whose parents place high value on education are more likely to be high achievers, those respondents whose parents place low value on education, to be low achievers. Comparing Tables 3 and 6 achievement tends to be more related to the attitude of parents' toward education than to socio-economic status. Students from lower socio-economic groups have more obstacles to overcome in order to attend college; they are a special group in terms of motivation to be in college. Our results lead us to believe that their incentive is due, in part, to encouragement they have received from their parents. Parental valuation of education will be discussed further, in the section containing the results on integration with parents and achievement within each socio-economic group.

TABLE 6
PARENTAL VALUATION OF EDUCATION
AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Parental Valuation of Education	N	Per Cent Achievement		
		High	Middle	Low
High	N=219	27	58	15
Low	N= 74	19	55	26

$$\chi^2 = 4.99, df, 2, NS \text{ at } .05 \text{ level. } (p < .10)$$

Much of the research on achievement motivation has been conducted with male rather than with male and female subjects. Perhaps the reason for this is that many investigators in this area have used the method developed by McClelland (a TAT using achievement-oriented pictures)¹ for measuring achievement motivation, and his method does not yield scores for females comparable to those obtained on males. Robinowitz, working with both male and female subjects, used grades-relative-to-scores on intelligence tests as an index of achievement motivation; his results were comparable to those of studies using only males as subjects.² In studies of achievement, rather than achievement motivation, the data quite consistently show that there do exist definite differences in the achievement levels of males and females at all levels of school,³ that at the college level, females are usually higher achievers than males, and that females tend to utilize their measured academic ability more effectively than do males.⁴

Table 7 shows the relationship between sex and achievement. There tends to be slightly more high achievement and less low achievement among the females than among the males.

¹McClelland et al., The Achievement Motive.

²Robinowitz, op. cit., pp. 308-317.

³Merville E. Shaw and John T. McCuen, "The Onset of Academic Underachievement in Bright Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 103-108 (1960).

⁴O. Lee Duff and Laurence Siegel, "Biographical Factors Associated with Academic Over- and Under-Achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 43-46 (1960).

The differences are not significant. As was pointed out earlier, since college attendance is more selective among females than among males, we might expect females to be the higher achievers.

TABLE 7
SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR MALES AND FOR FEMALES

Sex	N	Per Cent Achievement		
		High	Middle	Low
Males	N = 175	23	58	19
Females	N = 118	27	57	16

$$\chi^2 = 0.84, df, 2, NS.$$

Table 8 shows the relationship between year in school and achievement. Because of the small number of juniors (7), they are not included in this analysis. There is a significant difference on achievement between freshmen and sophomores, with freshmen being significantly higher in achievement. This indicates that our sample does not contain a large group of freshmen who would fail at the end of their first academic year.

TABLE 8
YEAR IN SCHOOL AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Year in School	N	Per Cent Achievement		
		High	Middle	Low
Freshman	N=147	35	51	14
Sophomore	N=139	14	63	23

$$\chi^2 = 17.5, df, 2, p < .001.$$

Secondly, it appears that in the type of institution in which our sample was drawn, the longer a student is in college the less important achievement becomes. We might speculate here that at a large state supported institution, as opposed to a school like Oberlin, Antioch, or Reed, social relationships and peer gratification become more important than scholastic achievement--by the second year, the gratification resulting from successful peer relationships has become more important than that resulting from a successful scholastic record.

Freshmen have significantly more high achievement than do the sophomores in our sample. Year in school will be controlled when we examine other variables in relation to achievement in the following chapters.

This chapter includes an examination of the background variables as they are related to achievement. Our hypothesis gained some support--achievement tended to vary with socioeconomic status, with religion, with parental valuation of education, and with sex, but only insignificantly so. Achievement varied significantly with year in school, with more high achievement occurring among freshmen. This relationship will be examined further in the next section of the analysis.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

The concern of this chapter is with the relationship between integration with parents and scholastic achievement. An inverse relationship between the two variables has been hypothesized. We will examine integration with parents and scholastic achievement for the total sample, for freshmen and sophomores, and for males and females, and integration with each parent and scholastic achievement for males and females.

In Chapter II, the two methods for determining integration with parents were discussed (see pages 20-23). The analysis in which we are able to use Method 2 is in that of integration with parents and scholastic achievement for the total sample. By comparing the results obtained using Method 1 to determine integration with those using Method 2, we can check the validity of the former method. Table 9 shows this comparison. It appears that the two methods yield similar results, the only difference being that slightly stronger percentage differences obtain using Method 2.

The hypothesis that integration with parents and achievement will be inversely related is not supported. On the

TABLE 9
INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Method 1			Method 2		
Integration with Parents	N	Per Cent Achievement High Middle Low	Integration with Parents	N	Per Cent Achievement High Middle Low
High	N=91	25 58 17	High	N=75	24 57 19
Middle	N=129	27 57 16	Middle	N=54	28 57 15
Low	N=73	21 58 21	Low	N=47	19 55 26

$\chi^2 = 1.73$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 1.57$, df, 4, NS.

contrary, there is a tendency for the least high and the most low achievement to occur among those who are low integrated with parents; high achievement tends to occur most in the middle and high integration with parents groups.

In Chapter III, we found that there was significantly more high achievement among freshmen than among sophomores. When we control year in school and examine integration with parents and achievement, as in Table 10, the picture remains approximately the same as that for the total sample; there is a tendency among both freshmen and sophomores for the most high achievement to occur among those who are highly or middle integrated. Although the differences on integration and achievement are not significant for either freshmen or sophomores, low integration seems to make more of an achievement difference among freshmen than among sophomores. This would seem to be evidence in favor of the assumption that it is the degree of integration with parents which influences level of achievement rather than achievement influencing integration. We would speculate that low integration with parents has a greater effect upon achievement among freshmen than among sophomores, because by the second academic year peer interaction has become more important than family acceptance, and social relationships more important than scholastic achievement.

Table 11 shows the relationship between integration with parents and achievement for males and for females. Among males, middle integration with parents tends to be most related

TABLE 10

INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND ACHIEVEMENT
FOR FRESHMEN AND SOPHOMORES

Integration with Parents	Per Cent				Integration with Parents	Per Cent			
	Freshmen Achievement					Sophomore Achievement			
	N	High	Middle	Low		N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=45	36	56	8	High	N=44	16	59	25
Middle	N=70	36	51	13	Middle	N=57	16	63	21
Low	N=32	31	47	22	Low	N=38	11	68	21

$\chi^2 = 3.57$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 9.33$, df, 4, NS.

TABLE 11
INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND ACHIEVEMENT
FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Integration with Parents	Per Cent Male Achievement			Integration with Parents	Per Cent Female Achievement		
	N	High	Middle Low		N	High	Middle Low
High	N=36	19	64 17	High	N=55	30	54 16
Middle	N=85	26	55 19	Middle	N=44	30	59 11
Low	N=54	22	56 20	Low	N=19	30	42 26

$\chi^2 = 1.48$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 2.92$, df, 4, NS.

to high achievement. Integration with parents appears not to effect high achievement among females but does seem to have an influence upon low achievement. It seems that for males, a relationship of relative independence, neither too close to nor too distant from parents, is the one most conducive to high achievement. For the female, the relationship with parents which has the most negative effect upon achievement appears to be one in which she feels distant from, rejected by her parents. We speculate that these results are related to the dependence patterns of males and females upon the family. Males tend to be more independent of parents than do females; females remain dependent upon the family for a longer period of time. Because females tend to be more dependent, low integration with parents would have more severe consequences for them than it would for males. Since males are normally relatively independent from parents, this would seem logically to be the best relationship for other autonomous behavior.

Table 12 shows the patterns of high integration with father and mother for males and females. (The figures in this table are extracted from Tables 20 and 21, which appear in Appendix B.) Both males and females are more likely to be highly integrated with mother than with father. We would expect this because in our society it is predominately the mother who has the role of socializing and training the children; it is the mother who is with the children most of the time, who cares for them and satisfies their needs. Although both males and females are more likely to be highly

integrated with mother than with father, there is greater over-all integration among females. A significantly larger number of females than males feels accepted by father and by mother. These results bear out the notion that females feel more dependent upon, and males more independent from, their parents.

TABLE 12
PATTERNS OF HIGH INTEGRATION WITH FATHER AND MOTHER
FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Sex	N	Per Cent High Integration with:	
		Father	Mother
Male	N=175	23	31
Female	N=118	40	64
F > M		17	33

Table 13 shows the relationship between father integration and mother integration for the total sample. It appears that knowledge of integration with one parent is a fairly good predictor of integration with the other parent. If the child is highly integrated with the father, there is a very good chance that he will be highly integrated with the mother, and if the child feels rejected by the mother, that he also will feel rejected by the father. On the other hand, if the child feels accepted by the mother, he does not necessarily feel accepted by the father, and if he feels rejected by the father, he does not necessarily feel rejected by the

mother. Thus, a knowledge of perceived father acceptance or of perceived mother rejection would be a fairly reliable indicator of perceived integration with parents.

TABLE 13
FATHER INTEGRATION IN RELATION TO MOTHER INTEGRATION

Father Integration	N	Per Cent Mother Integration		
		High	Middle	Low
High	N=87	84	16	0
Middle	N=104	38	53	9
Low	N=102	15	39	46

$$\chi^2 = 154.61, df. 4, p < .001.$$

Table 14 shows the relationship between integration with father and high achievement, and with mother and high achievement for males and females. (The figures in this table are extracted from Tables 22 and 23 which appear in Appendix B.) For both males and females, the relationship with father seems not to effect the level of achievement; relationship with mother, however, tends to have an influence on achievement among both males and females. It seems that it is not a question of how much integration with mother the individual perceives but rather one of feeling some integration versus feeling none. In the tables where there is a relationship between integration and achievement, middle and high integration tend to go together in contrast to low integration.

TABLE 14

INTEGRATION WITH FATHER AND HIGH ACHIEVEMENT, INTEGRATION WITH MOTHER
AND HIGH ACHIEVEMENT, FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Integration	Per Cent High Achieving Males		Per Cent High Achieving Females		
	N	Father	N	Mother	
High	N=40	20	N=55	25	N=47 26 N=75 28
Middle	N=65	26	N=77	25	N=39 30 N=30 30
Low	N=70	23	N=43	18	N=32 28 N=13 15

Although the differences on integration with either parent and achievement are not significant among males, middle or high integration with mother, and middle integration with father tend to relate somewhat to high achievement. Feeling too close to the father, or too distant from the mother seems to be most detrimental to male high achievement. Rosen states that in order for strong achievement motivation to develop, the boy seems to need more autonomy from his father than from his mother. He reasons that the authoritarian father may crush his son and in so doing destroy the boy's achievement motive, whereas the dominating mother does not seem to have the same effect, possibly because she is perceived as imposing her standards on the boy, while a dominating father is perceived as imposing himself on his son.¹ An intensely involved mother appears to promote the development of achievement motivation in boys and it is the authoritarian father, not the mother, who represents a greater threat to the boy and inhibits the development of achievement motivation.² Although the tendencies are very slight, it appears that our results might indicate such a relationship among the high achieving males.

Among females, achievement is significantly related to integration with mother; there is significantly more high achievement among those who feel either middle or highly integrated than among those who feel low integrated with mother.

¹Bernard C. Rosen, "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," American Sociological Review, 26: 575 (1961).

²Ibid., p. 577.

This is an expected result. Of all the parent-child relationships, that between the mother and daughter is the closest--the atmosphere of this relationship, then, would be expected to be most influential in the behavior of the female.

A basic assumption in this investigation is that it is the degree of integration which influences level of achievement rather than level of achievement determining integration. Some investigators have argued that there is a causal relationship in the other direction, that it is the level of achievement which determines degree of integration with family and peers. Strodbeck, in a study of business executives, suggests that high achievement brings depersonalization of relationships which may cause anxiety, and,

The fact that status, power, and related rewards exist as positive inducements to achievement makes possible a resolution to the dilemma: the chronic achiever expiates depersonalization with more achievement. Perhaps, non-achievers reduce anxiety over low achievement by the cultivation of more gratifying interpersonal relations.³

Our hypothesis that high achievement may be a response to unsatisfactory interpersonal relationships--a seeking of gratification in the area of achievement to overcome feelings of deprivation gained in the family--is in contrast to this. Although the hypothesis that there will be an inverse relationship between integration with parents and achievement has not been confirmed, an attempt has been made to pinpoint the causal factors in the relationship which has tended to result. As

³Strodbeck, op. cit., p. 142.

will be recalled from the discussion of the research instrument, childhood and adolescent happiness ratings were significantly related to integration with parents. In order to determine the causal factors in the relationship between integration with parents and achievement, we have examined the patterns of childhood and adolescent happiness as they relate to achievement. Logically, there are four possible patterns:

	<u>Childhood</u>	<u>Adolescence</u>
A.	Happy	Happy
B.	Happy	Unhappy
C.	Unhappy	Happy
D.	Unhappy	Unhappy

According to our original hypothesis, we would expect that those highest in achievement would be found in groups C and D, however, in light of our findings as revealed here, we now would expect the high achievement to occur in groups A and B.

Table 15 shows the relationship between pattern of childhood-adolescent happiness and scholastic achievement. Group C will not be discussed, because of the small number of respondents it contains. Respondents in groups A and B are more likely to be high achievers than low; the achievement percentages for group A are exactly the same as those for the high integrated with parents group in our previous analysis. At first glance, the results for group D appear to conflict with our previous findings, however, in addition

to there being the largest percentage of high achievers in this group, there is also the greatest per cent of low achievers. Although the differences are not significant, we would speculate that the per cent of both high achievers and of low achievers being greatest in group D suggests that consistent unhappiness may effect different people differently; some seek out academic gratification, while others sacrifice grades and seek recognition in some other area. In addition, we would speculate that perhaps our results reveal that unhappiness in childhood and adolescence arouses anxiety which causes the individual to seek power and recognition, but at the same time, "adverse estimates of the self must not be overwhelming, or the resort to power will be blocked by sentiments of utter hopelessness. . . ." ⁴

TABLE 15

PATTERN OF CHILDHOOD-ADOLESCENT HAPPINESS AND ACHIEVEMENT

Pattern of Happiness					Per Cent Achievement		
Childhood		Adolescence	N		High	Middle	Low
A. Happy	Happy	N=207	24	57	19		
B. Happy	Unhappy	N=35	20	74	6		
C. Unhappy	Happy	N=12	25	58	17		
D. Unhappy	Unhappy	N=30	30	40	30		

$$\chi^2 = 9.74, df, 6, NS.$$

⁴Lasswell, op. cit., p. 153.

We feel that the results for group D in Table 15 give us some support for our original hypothesis that unsatisfactory interpersonal relations in childhood produce insecurity and anxiety which are compensated for by a quest for power, recognition, and success. Students differ, our hypothesis appears to be true of some students and not of others. From our results on year in school and achievement, we speculate that the school at which our sample was drawn, is not the type of institution which has a preponderance of academically oriented students, and that the low integrated students would tend to compensate for feelings of insecurity and to seek gratification in areas other than scholastic achievement. There may be campuses at which a greater proportion of academically oriented students would be found, at at such institutions we would expect to find more of a relationship between low integration and high achievement.

Why does the relationship between unhappy childhood and adolescence and achievement differ from that between low integration with parents and achievement? The difference in the number of respondents included in each group must be ruled out as a reason for the disparity, because, although there are only 30 in the unhappy childhood-adolescence group, there are only 47 in the low integration with parents group when integration is determined by Method 2. One factor which might account for the variation in results is that the intent of the items in the integration index is not quite so obvious as is that of the items on childhood and adolescent happiness;

knowing the purpose of the items may have influenced the respondents. Secondly, although pattern of childhood-adolescent happiness is significantly related to the integration index, both childhood-adolescence happiness and integration with parents are undoubtedly influenced by other factors. The factors which the two measures do not have in common are apparently related in different ways to scholastic achievement.

This chapter includes an examination of the relationships between integration with parents and scholastic achievement for the total sample, for freshmen and sophomores, and for males and females. In addition, the patterns resulting between integration with each parent and achievement for males and for females were discussed. Subsidiary analyses included in the chapter showed the patterns of male and of female integration with father and with mother, the relationship of integration with father to integration with mother, and the ways in which patterns of childhood-adolescent happiness are related to achievement.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL, INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS, AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

Our primary concern in this chapter is with the relationships between integration with parents and scholastic achievement within each socio-economic group. First, we will examine the patterns of integration with father and with mother for males and females within each socio-economic group, and second, the relationships between integration with parents and achievement at each socio-economic level.

Table 16 shows the patterns of father integration for males and females at each socio-economic level. Male integration with father varies with socio-economic level--males in the high socio-economic group are much more likely to be highly integrated with father than are males in the low socio-economic group. High socio-economic level males are about equally distributed among the three levels of integration with father, whereas low socio-economic level males are much more likely to be middle or low integrated with father than to be highly integrated with him. We would interpret this to mean that low socio-economic level college males do not want to be like their fathers, that in attending college, they are attempting to move away from the occupational status of their

TABLE 16
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND INTEGRATION WITH
FATHER FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Socio-economic Status	Per Cent Male Integration with Father				Per Cent Female Integration with Father			
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=65	32	32	36	N=55	38	38	24
Low	N=110	17	40	43	N=63	41	29	30

$\chi^2 = 4.99$, df, 2, NS. ($p < .10$)

$\chi^2 = 1.53$, df, 2, NS.

fathers. Among females, integration with father varies only slightly by socio-economic level. We would speculate that female integration with father does not relate to socio-economic level, because father's occupational status does not pose the threat to mobility among females that it does among males.

Table 17 shows the patterns for integration with mother for males and females in each socio-economic group. High socio-economic level males are more likely to be highly integrated with mother and less likely to be low integrated with her than are low socio-economic level males, however, those in both socio-economic groups are more likely to be high than low integrated with mother. Both high and low socio-economic level females are much more likely to be highly integrated than low integrated with mother, however, in the low socio-economic group, there is slightly less high integration than in the high socio-economic group and slightly more low integration. We would speculate that integration with mother does not vary as much with socio-economic status as does integration with father, because the low socio-economic level mothers have high aspirations for their children, they are encouraging their children to rise above the parental socio-economic level; high integration with mother, then, would not be a handicap to mobility.

Ideally, now, we would examine the relationships between integration with each parent and achievement for males and females within each socio-economic group. Because of the size

TABLE 17
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND INTEGRATION WITH
MOTHER FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Socio-economic Status	Per Cent Male Integration with Mother				Per Cent Female Integration with Mother			
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=65	36	45	19	N=55	67	27	6
Low	N=110	29	44	27	N=63	60	24	16

$\chi^2 = 1.61$, df, 2, NS.

$\chi^2 = 3.13$, df, 2, NS.

of our sample, however, we are unable to make such an analysis--the numbers in each cell would be too small. In the analysis of integration and achievement in which socio-economic status is controlled, it is necessary to use integration with both parents, rather than with each parent, and achievement for the total sample, rather than for males and for females. Combining these variables will obscure to some extent the differences we have obtained in patterns of father and of mother integration and patterns of achievement for males and females at each socio-economic level. It is important to keep this point in mind when examining the results.

The hypothesis pertinent to the examination of integration with parents and achievement within each socio-economic group, is that the relationship between integration and achievement will be more definite when socio-economic status is controlled and that it will be strongest in the high socio-economic group. When this hypothesis was formulated, it was done so in relation to the one that there would be an inverse relationship between integration with parents and achievement. In light of our findings in Chapter IV, the hypothesis which we thought would be pertinent here is not applicable.

Table 18 shows the relationship between integration with parents and scholastic achievement for each socio-economic group. In the high socio-economic group, there seems to be no relationship between integration with parents and achievement; in the low socio-economic group, however, achievement tends to

TABLE 18

INTEGRATION WITH PARENTS AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

Integration with Parents	Per Cent High Socio-Economic Status Achievement				Per Cent Low Socio-Economic Status Achievement			
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=45	31	58	11	N=46	19	59	22
Middle	N=50	24	60	16	N=79	29	54	17
Low	N=25	28	60	12	N=48	17	56	27

$\chi^2 = 1.82$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 4.58$, df, 4, NS.

vary with level of integration. In the latter group, the highly integrated respondents are slightly more likely to be low achievers, the middle integrated, much more likely to be high achievers, and the low integrated, much more likely to be low achievers.

Apparently education is so much a part of the value system in the high socio-economic group that this value overrides some other considerations which might be thought to influence achievement so that, regardless of level of integration with parents, respondents in this group are much more likely to be high than low achievers. In the low socio-economic group, we would speculate that education is not such a main part of the value system and that there is less likelihood of contacts and experience and "know-how" which would be conducive to high achievement. Table 19 shows parental valuation of education by socio-economic status. High socio-economic status parents are significantly more likely to place high value on education than are those in the low socio-economic status. This lends some support to our interpretations thus far.

The question which remains to be answered is, why do we obtain tendencies toward varying achievement patterns among integration levels within the low socio-economic group? First, since it is not as likely that education will be highly valued by parents of the low socio-economic status respondents, we would speculate that for a subject to be highly integrated with his parents might also mean that he is more highly influenced

TABLE 19

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND PARENTAL VALUATION OF EDUCATION

Socio-Economic Status	N	Per Cent Parental Valuation of Education	
		High	Low
High	N=120	83	17
Low	N=173	69	31
		H > L 14	-14

$$\chi^2 = 9.00, df, 1, p < .01.$$

by their values; thus, the low socio-economic status respondents who are highly integrated with parents are slightly more likely to be low achievers than high achievers. If this were strictly the case, however, we would expect the most high achievement in the low socio-economic group to occur among those respondents who are low integrated with parents. As we have seen, this is not the case; those respondents who are of the low socio-economic group and who are low integrated with parents tend to have more low achievement than do those in any other status-integration group. Perhaps there is a second factor operating here. These respondents have two major strikes against them for high achievement: they are low socio-economic class individuals competing in a middle class system, and they feel unaccepted by their parents. It seems that they have too many handicaps which prevent them from being high achievers. Finally, it appears that the relationship with parents most

conducive to high achievement in the low socio-economic class is one of middle integration--a relationship in which the respondent feels accepted by his parents but is not so close to them that he is overly influenced by their values, one in which he feels accepted by but remains autonomous from his parents.

In this chapter we have dealt with socio-economic status, integration, and achievement. The patterns of integration with father and with mother were examined for males and females in each socio-economic group. The results on integration with parents and achievement by socio-economic level were presented. In an attempt to interpret the findings, the relationship between socio-economic status and parental valuation of education was examined. Our final interpretations and conclusions will appear in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of perceived parental rejection upon academic grade achievement. The theoretical framework used is that of deprivation and compensation, with emphasis upon the impact of unsatisfactory interpersonal relations in childhood on later aspects of behavior. More specifically, the position is taken that early parent-child tensions will produce insecurity and anxiety which may be expressed or compensated for by a quest for power, recognition, and success. Either implicitly or explicitly, investigators have examined the implications for achievement of relationship with parents and/or level of self-esteem. Numerous investigators report a relationship between high achievement and feelings of rejection and low level of self-esteem. This study represents a further effort to examine the effect of perceived parental acceptance or rejection (i.e. integration with parents) upon scholastic achievement as measured by reported grade point average.

Data for the results reported here were obtained by the administration of paper-pencil questionnaires to a sample of 293 undergraduate students enrolled in basic social science courses at a large state university.

We took the position that (1) there will be a low positive relationship between certain of the background items--namely, socio-economic status, religion, and parental valuation of education--and scholastic achievement; (2) there will be an inverse relationship between integration with parents and scholastic achievement; and (3) the inverse relationship between integration with parents and achievement will be more definite when socio-economic level is controlled and will be strongest in the high socio-economic group.

The results obtained from the sample of college undergraduates in relation to the hypotheses may be summarized as follows:

1. The prediction set forth in the first hypothesis found some support in our analysis. There was a tendency for more high and less low achievement to occur in the high socio-economic group; this tendency was stronger among females than among males. Achievement varied slightly among the different religious groups, however, the expected order (i.e. Jewish, Protestant, Catholic) did not hold in all cases. The order for high achievement was Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and the order for low achievement, Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic. The group stating "none" as their religious preference had the least high and the most low achievement. There was a low positive relationship between achievement and parental valuation of education; this relationship was stronger than that

between socio-economic status and achievement. Finally, a greater proportion of females reported high achievement and lesser rates of low achievement than did males, and freshmen were significantly more likely to be high achievers than were sophomores.

2. The prediction in the second hypothesis was not upheld; on the contrary, there were tendencies for the most high achievement to occur among those who were middle and highly integrated with parents, and the most low achievement, among those who were low integrated. In particular, trends appeared among both males and females for middle and high integration with mother to relate to high achievement, and low integration with mother, to low achievement. This relationship was significant among females. Father integration appeared not to influence achievement among either males or females.
3. In light of the results thus far, the predictions in the third hypothesis were inapplicable. The results for integration with parents and achievement by socio-economic level showed no relationship between the two variables in the high socio-economic group. In the low socio-economic group there was a tendency for the most high achievement to occur among those who were middle integrated with parents and the most low achievement among those who were low integrated. As a part of the analysis, the relationship between socio-economic level and parental valuation education was examined with the result that the two are significantly related.

The tendencies which resulted between integration with parents and achievement are surprising in terms of the relationships reported by previous investigators. We hypothesized that the two variables would be inversely related; and the results indicated slight tendencies for them to be positively related. A difference in the indices used to determine perceived relationship with parents must be ruled out as a possible reason for our results conflicting with those of others; some investigators¹ reporting an inverse relationship between perceived parental acceptance and achievement have used items quite similar to the ones used in this study. Many of the studies in this area have used achievement motivation (n Achievement) rather than actual achievement, for their dependent variable. This cannot account for the difference in results, however, because other investigators have worked with actual achievement and have reported results similar to those obtained using achievement motivation. In addition, a relationship between achievement motivation and actual achievement has been established.²

A more likely interpretation for the discrepancy of our findings with those of other investigators lies in the nature of the sample. We would speculate that a large state

¹Dynes et al., op. cit., pp. 212-215; McClelland et al., The Achievement Motive; Robinowitz, op. cit., pp. 308-317.

²McClelland et al., The Achievement Motive; Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," pp. 203-211.

supported university, such as that used for this study, is not the type of institution which would tend to draw a preponderance of academically oriented students. Students whose orientation is other than academic and who perceive parental rejection would tend to compensate for feelings of insecurity and to seek gratification in other areas--for example, in peer relationships. At a school such as Oberlin, Antioch, or Reed which has a high proportion of academically oriented students we would expect to find a relationship between low integration with parents and high scholastic achievement.

If we can generalize from the tendencies revealed in this study, our findings seem to indicate that among respondents at the type of institution in which our sample was drawn, one necessary prerequisite for future adequate performance is feeling accepted in the family of orientation. It appears that the crucial relationship is that with the mother; perceived maternal acceptance influences level of achievement whereas perceived paternal acceptance does not, and this is especially true among females. It seems that rather than reacting against and trying to compensate for the treatment one has received and the attitudes one feels others hold about him, the individual tends to react in terms of the picture he has of himself--this picture being formed initially in the family, and continuously through interaction with others. In light of this, the result that relationship with mother is more important than that with father is easily understandable. At this point in our society, it is

predominately the mother who has the job of child care and socialization; she is the one, rather than the father, who is in continuous interaction with the children and satisfies their needs. Because of the role of the mother, both male and female children tend to feel closer to her. Thus, it is not surprising that perceived maternal acceptance has a greater effect upon performance than does that for father.

We offer two different interpretations for the results obtained on integration with parents and achievement by socio-economic level. The first is strictly in terms of the findings on integration with parents and achievement within each socio-economic group, without reference to previous results or to the methods of analysis used. The second interpretation is in reference to the methods of analysis we found it necessary to use, with emphasis upon the male-female patterns of integration with father and with mother in each socio-economic group which resulted in the previous analysis.

We would speculate that a relationship between integration with parents and achievement does not result in the high socio-economic group for the reason that education is such a part of the value system that this value overrides the influence which parental integration might have upon achievement. In the low socio-economic group the value of education is not influential or pervasive enough to override the influence of perceived parental acceptance; thus, a tendency results for integration with parents and achievement to be related. Those subjects in the low socio-economic group who are highly

integrated with parents are more likely to be low achievers than high. We speculate that perhaps this indicates that being highly integrated with parents also means being more highly influenced by their values. Gottlieb,³ in a study of social class and college students, reports that only one-third of the lower class boys mentioned that parents had encouraged and helped to influence them to attend college; two-thirds mentioned non-familial sources of support and encouragement. If our interpretations thus far were strictly the case, we would expect the most low socio-economic level high achievement to occur in the low integrated group. That this is not so suggests that there is a second factor operating here. It appears that the low socio-economic, low integrated with parents group has too many strikes against them for high achievement. They are low socio-economic status individuals competing in a middle class system and they feel unaccepted by their parents. Thus, in the low socio-economic group, it seems that a relationship in which the subject feels accepted by, yet autonomous from his parents is the one which most conduces to high achievement.

Although we offer the above interpretation of the results obtained for integration with parents and achievement within each socio-economic group, we cannot help but feel that the results were influenced to some extent by the methods of analysis we found it necessary to use. It will be recalled that in the analysis of integration and achievement our results

³Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 4.

became much clearer as we broke the total sample down into males and females, and as we broke integration with parents down into integration with father and integration with mother. When the relationships between integration with father and integration with mother and achievement for males and females were examined, definite patterns emerged. Further, when this same examination was made within each socio-economic group, these patterns varied with each of the four groups. When we looked at integration and achievement within each socio-economic group, it was necessary, because of the size of the sample, to combine the four groups into one, as in Figure 3. Instead of determining the relationship between integration with father and with mother and achievement for males and females within each socio-economic group, it was only possible to obtain that between integration with parents and achievement

FIGURE 3

BREAKDOWN OF INTEGRATION AND ACHIEVEMENT VARIABLES
VERSUS REQUIRED COMBINED VARIABLES

		<u>Socio-economic Status</u>	
<u>Integration</u>	<u>Achievement</u>	<u>Integration</u>	<u>Achievement</u>
Father . . .	Male	Parent . . .	Combined male- female
Father . . .	Female		
Mother . . .	Male		
Mother . . .	Female		

for the total high socio-economic group and for the total low one. By combining these groups into one, the differences between the groups were obscured; some of these differences were

quite substantial. Had we been able to analyze the four groups separately, our results might have been quite different.

In conclusion, we suggest that a large public university, such as that used for this study, might not be the type of institution which would tend to draw an abundance of academically oriented students--those whose orientation is other than academic would tend to compensate for feelings of rejection by seeking gratification in areas other than scholastic achievement. Among academically oriented students, we expect that perceived parental rejection would be related to high scholastic achievement.

Perhaps the major findings which can be abstracted from this study is that among students at a large state-supported school, a feeling of maternal acceptance is a factor in high scholastic achievement. This suggests that one prerequisite for future adequate performance is perceived acceptance in the family of orientation. There remain many unanswered questions, some of which might point the way for further research into the influence of interpersonal relations within the family and levels of self-esteem upon achievement. We might ask, what are the types of interaction, or factors in interaction, which most influence evaluation of self; in what way is evaluation of self related to levels of aspiration and achievement; how do these relationships vary by social class. This study indicates the need in research for a measure of factors which could predict success.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, Louis D. "Level-of-Aspiration Behavior and Feelings of Adequacy and Self-Acceptance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49: 84-86 (1954).
- Davis, Allison. Social Class Influences Upon Learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Davis, James, David Gottlieb, and Joel Spaeth. Stipends and Spouses. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Douvan, Elizabeth. "Social Status and Success Strivings," in John K. Atkinson, Motives in Fantasy, Action, and Society. New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1958.
- Drews, Elizabeth M. and John E. Teahan. "Parental Attitudes and Academic Achievement," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 13: 328-332 (1957).
- Duff, O. Lee and Laurence Siegel. "Biographical Factors Associated with Academic Over- and Under-achievement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 43-46 (1960).
- Dynes, Russell R., Alfred C. Clarke, and Simon Dinitz, "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable," American Sociological Review, 21: 212-215 (1956).
- Ellis, Evelyn. "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, 17: 558-563 (1952).
- Friedman, G. A. "A Cross-cultural Study of the Relationship Between Independence Training and Achievement as Revealed by Mythology." Unpublished A. B. Thesis, Harvard University. 1950. Cited in McClelland, Studies in Motivation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955, pp. 411-413.
- Gottlieb, David. "Social Class, College Students and the Ideal College Professor." Paper read at the Annual Meetings of the Ohio Valley Sociological Society, April 21, 1961. Forthcoming School Review, The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

- Horney, Karen. The Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1937.
- Kausler, D. H. and E. P. Trapp. "Relationship Between Achievement Motivation Scores and Manifest Anxiety Scores," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22: 448-450 (1958).
- Lasswell, Harold D. Power and Personality. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1948.
- McClelland, David C. "Measuring Motivation in Phantasy," Studies in Motivation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- McClelland, David C., John W. Atkinson, Russell A. Clark, and Edgar L. Lowell. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- McClelland, David C., A. Rindlisbacher, and Richard DeCharms. "Religious and Other Sources of Parental Attitudes Toward Independence Training," Studies in Motivation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Nye, F. Ivan. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- _____. "Adolescent-Parent Adjustment--Socio-economic Level as a Variable," American Sociological Review, 16: 341-349 (1951).
- Robinowitz, Ralph. "Attributes of Pupils Achieving Beyond their Level of Expectancy," Journal of Personality, 24: 308-317 (1956).
- Roe, Anne. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Rosen, Bernard C. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-cultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, 21: 203-211 (1956).
- _____. "Family Structure and Achievement Motivation," American Sociological Review, 26: 574-584 (1961).
- Rosen, Bernard C. and Roy D'Andrade. "The Psychosocial Origins of Achievement Motivation," Sociometry, 22: 185-218 (1959).

- Shaw, Merville C. and John T. McCuen. "The Onset of Academic Underachievement in Bright Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51: 103-108 (1960).
- Strodtbeck, F. L. "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," in D. C. McClelland, Alfred L. Baldwin, Urie Bronfenbrenner, and Fred L. Strodtbeck, Talent and Society. New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958.
- Taylor, Ronald G. "Personality Factors Associated with Scholastic Achievement." Paper presented at the 1961 American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention.
- Washburne, Norman F. "Socio-economic Status, Urbanism and Academic Performance in College," Journal of Educational Research, 53: 130-137 (1959).
- Weiss, Peter, Michael Wertheimer, and Byron Groesbeck. "Achievement Motivation, Academic Aptitude, and College Grades," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 19: 663-666 (1959).
- Winterbottom, M. "The Sources of Achievement Motivation in Mothers' Attitudes Toward Independence Training," in David C. McClelland, et al., The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.
- Wyllie, Ruth C. The Self Concept. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

A study is being made of college students at this state university. As a part of this study we would appreciate receiving certain information from you about your background and some of your attitudes. This questionnaire is to be filled out anonymously and your full cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Please read each of the following questions carefully and check the one item in each question which best applies to you. In questions where there is no choice given but a space is provided, please answer as accurately as possible in this space. For questions 13 through 35, there are no "right" answers; in these please check (X) the one item in each question which best describes the way you feel.

1. What is your age? _____
2. Sex: (1) Male _____, (2) Female _____.
3. Year in School: (1) Freshman _____, (2) Sophomore _____,
(3) Junior _____, (4) Senior _____, (5) Grad _____.
4. Marital status: (1) Single _____, (2) Married _____,
(3) Divorced _____, (4) Widowed _____.
5. What is (or will be) your college major? _____.
6. Your approximate grade average in college is: (1) A _____,
(2) B+ _____, (3) B _____, (4) B- _____, (5) C+ _____,
(6) C _____, (7) C- _____, (8) D _____, (9) F _____.
7. Your religious preference: (1) Protestant _____, (2) Catholic _____,
(3) Jewish _____, (4) Other (specify) _____,
(5) None _____.
8. Are you a United States citizen? (1) Yes _____, (2) No _____.
9. Where do you live now while attending college?
(1) Dormitory _____, (2) Fraternity or sorority _____,
(3) At home with my family _____, (4) Off-campus apartment _____,
(5) Married housing _____.
10. What is (or was) your father's occupation? _____.
11. Which one of the following best describes the number of years of school completed by your father: (1) Grade school or less _____, (2) High school _____, (3) Attended college but did not graduate _____, (4) Graduated from college _____, (5) Obtained a graduate or professional degree beyond college _____.

12. Which one of the following best describes your family:
 (1) Both of my parents are alive and living together today _____, (2) My father is living _____, (3) My mother is living _____, (4) My parents are divorced or separated and I live with my father _____, (5) My parents are divorced or separated and I live with my mother _____.
13. Which of the following best describes the situation in your family when you were in high school: (1) It was naturally assumed that you would go to college _____, (2) If you wanted to go to college you were encouraged to do so by one or both parents, but it was not assumed that you would go _____, (3) It was not assumed that you would go to college and you received no encouragement from either parent when you decided to do so _____.
14. How would you rate the happiness of your parents' marriage: (1) Very happy _____, (2) Happy _____, (3) Neither happy nor unhappy _____, (4) Unhappy _____, (5) Very unhappy _____.
15. a. How would you rate your childhood: (1) Very happy _____, (2) Happy _____, (3) Neither happy nor unhappy _____, (4) Unhappy _____, (5) Very unhappy _____.
- b. How would you rate your adolescence: (1) Very happy _____, (2) Happy _____, (3) Neither happy nor unhappy _____, (4) Unhappy _____, (5) Very unhappy _____.

Which of the items in each of the following questions best describes the way you feel in your family?

16. My father is interested in what I do: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
17. My mother is interested in what I do: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
18. My father ridicules my ideas: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
19. My mother ridicules my ideas: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
20. My father encourages me to discuss my problems with him: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.

21. My mother encourages me to discuss my problems with her:
 (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____,
 (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
22. I think my father has my best interests at heart:
 (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____,
 (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
23. I think my mother has my best interests at heart:
 (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____,
 (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
24. I think my father shows more interest in my brothers and sisters than he shows in me: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____, (6) Usually shows more interest in me _____, (7) I'm an only child _____.
25. I think my mother shows more interest in my brothers and sisters than she shows in me: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____, (6) Usually shows more interest in me _____, (7) I'm an only child _____.
26. Other fathers tend to show more interest in their children than my father shows in me: (1) Completely agree _____, (2) Partially agree _____, (3) Undecided _____, (4) Partially disagree _____, (5) Completely disagree _____.
27. Other mothers tend to show more interest in their children than my mother shows in me: (1) Completely agree _____, (2) Partially agree _____, (3) Undecided _____, (4) Partially disagree _____, (5) Completely disagree _____.
28. My father praises me when I do my work well: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (2) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
29. My mother praises me when I do my work well: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
30. Does your father ever seem to wish that you were a different type of person: (1) Always _____, (2) Often _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
31. Does your mother ever seem to wish that you were a different type of person: (1) Always _____, (2) Often _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
32. Do you think that your father tries to understand your problems and worries: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.

33. Do you think that your mother tries to understand your problems and worries: (1) Always _____, (2) Usually _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
34. My father says and does things that make me feel that I am not trusted: (1) Always _____, (2) Often _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.
35. My mother says and does things that make me feel that I am not trusted: (1) Always _____, (2) Often _____, (3) Sometimes _____, (4) Seldom _____, (5) Never _____.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX B

TABLE 20
INTEGRATION WITH FATHER FOR MALES AND FOR FEMALES

Sex	N	Per Cent Father Integration		
		High	Middle	Low
Male	N=175	23	27	40
Female	N=118	40	33	27

$$\chi^2 = 10.43, df, 2, p < .01.$$

Females are significantly more likely to be highly integrated with father than are males.

TABLE 21
INTEGRATION WITH MOTHER FOR MALES AND FOR FEMALES

Sex	N	Per Cent Mother Integration		
		High	Middle	Low
Male	N=175	31	44	25
Female	N=118	64	25	11

$$\chi^2 = 30.74, df, 2, p < .001.$$

Females are significantly more likely to be highly integrated with mother than are males.

TABLE 22

INTEGRATION WITH FATHER AND ACHIEVEMENT FOR MALES AND FOR FEMALES

Integration with Father	Per Cent Male Achievement			Per Cent Female Achievement				
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=40	20	60	20	N=47	26	55	19
Middle	N=65	26	57	17	N=39	30	57	13
Low	N=70	23	57	20	N=32	28	56	16

$\chi^2 = 1.14$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 1.20$, df, 4, NS.

84

TABLE 23

INTEGRATION WITH MOTHER AND ACHIEVEMENT FOR MALES AND FOR FEMALES

Integration with Mother	Per Cent Male Achievement				Per Cent Female Achievement			
	N	High	Middle	Low	N	High	Middle	Low
High	N=55	25	59	16	N=75	28	57	15
Middle	N=77	25	55	21	N=30	30	63	7
Low	N=43	18	63	18	N=13	15	38	46

$\chi^2 = 1.60$, df, 4, NS.

$\chi^2 = 12.44$, df, 4, $p < .02$.

There is a significant relationship between integration with mother and achievement among females.

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Sex	N	Per Cent
Male	125	60
Female	118	40

Year in College	N	Per Cent
Freshman	147	50
Sophomore	139	47
Junior	7	3

Religious Preference	N	Per Cent
Protestant	187	64
Catholic	60	20
Jewish	19	7
Other	4	1
None	23	8

Father's Education	N	Per Cent
Grade school or less	39	13
High school	98	33
College, 1-3 years	45	15
College graduate	65	23
Grad. or professional degree beyond college	46	16

Age	N	Per Cent
17	3	1
18	79	27
19	135	46
20	61	21
21	7	3
22	7	3

Grade Average	N	Per Cent
A	11	4
B+	37	13
B	25	9
B-	49	16
C+	65	23
C	54	18
C-	45	15
D or F	7	3

Place of Residence	N	Per Cent
Dormitory	200	68
Frat. or Sorority	25	8
Parent's Home	40	14
Off-campus apartment	28	10

Father's Occupation	N	Per Cent
A. Low status	9	3
B. Respectable working class	62	21
C. Working class elite	102	35
D. Middle-middle	94	32
E. Elite	26	9

Parental Attitudes About College Attendance	N	Per Cent
Assumed child would attend	219	75
Encouragement if child wanted to go, but didn't assume he would	67	23
Did not assume nor encourage	7	2

Parent's Marital Status	N	Per Cent
Married and together	264	90
Father living only	3	1
Mother living only	12	4
Divorced or separated, child with father	2	1
Divorced or separated, child with mother	11	4
Both deceased	1	0

Self-Happiness During Childhood	N	Per Cent
Very happy	133	45
Happy	117	40
Neither happy nor unhappy	35	12
Unhappy	6	2
Very unhappy	1	0

Parent's Marital Happiness	N	Per Cent
Very happy	136	46
Happy	111	38
Neither happy nor unhappy	11	4
Unhappy	14	8
Very unhappy	11	4

Self-Happiness During Adolescence	N	Per Cent
Very happy	88	30
Happy	131	45
Neither happy nor unhappy	50	17
Unhappy	11	4
Very unhappy	4	1

ROOM USE ONLY

~~FEB 11 1964~~

~~FEB 25 1964~~

~~MAR 10 1964~~

~~MAR 21 1964~~

~~MAY 22 1964~~

~~OCT 26 1964~~

~~NOV 22 1964~~

~~DEC 10 1964~~

~~DEC 20 1964~~

~~DEC 31 1964~~ 187

~~ROOM USE ONLY~~

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293105412559