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ABSTRACT

Status attainment research has shown that there is a positive association between the educational expectations of parents and their children. Survey data from a nationwide sample of families was used to examine the effects of social structural conditions and patterns of family interaction on parent-child agreement on educational expectations, an indicator of parents' ability to influence their child's expectations.

Agreement was hypothesized to be greatest in white families, in families where parents had high levels of education, and among parents and daughters. Empirical results showed that girls were more likely than boys to have expectations above those of their parents. Parents with at least four years of college were more likely to agree than less educated parents. Minority adolescents were also less likely to agree; this effect was not explained by racial differences in parents' education.

The quantity and quality of parental defining behaviors, or effort, were also expected to be positively related to agreement. Concrete forms of parental effort fulfilled these expectations. The greater efforts of well educated parents and parents of daughters helped to explain gender and class differences in agreement. Despite minority
parents' greater efforts, their children remained less likely to agree.

Alienated adolescents were predicted to be more likely to have expectations below those of their parents. Adolescents whose extra-familial roles were more salient than their familial roles were also expected to be less likely to agree. Both hypotheses were supported.

This study contributes to status attainment research by showing how social psychological and social structural factors jointly affect a crucial link in the process: parent-child agreement on educational expectations. Future research should seek to disentangle the effects of these processes, and explain why persistent race differences in agreement exist.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Research on the status attainment process has consistently shown that there is a positive association between the expectations of significant others, such as parents, and an individual's own educational or occupational expectations. This correspondence is due, in part, to parental influence. However, the dynamics of family life which are responsible for this association have only been investigated in a cursory way. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the conditions under which parents and their adolescent children agree about educational expectations; agreement is assumed to reflect parental influence. More specifically, this study investigates some of the structural conditions which may help or hinder parents' attempts to influence their child's educational expectations. This study also explores the various patterns of family interaction which are more or less successful for transmitting parental attitudes to offspring.

The goals of this chapter are threefold. First, to place the issue of parental influence within the broader framework of the sociological study of social structure and personality. Second, to review the literature in two areas which are directly relevant to parental influence: the
status attainment and value-transmission literature. The focus here will be to ground the current research in the intellectual traditions of these areas, and to show what role educational expectations play in the larger process of status attainment. A review of the literature in these areas will also help to identify some of variables which are likely to affect the correspondence between parental and adolescent expectations. Third, to develop a coherent theoretical framework which adequately describes the process of parental influence, and suggests a set of mechanisms through which social structural variables may help or hinder parents' attempts to influence their children.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND PERSONALITY

This project may be conceptualized as a study of the effects of social structure on individual personality and social action. That is, this study is concerned with the shaping of one component of the self, expectations, via the social actions of some agents, in this case, parents. This conception is useful for two reasons. First, it may help to clarify some of the concepts which are central to this study. Second, the ideas that have been generated by theorists in this area yield some important clues as to how to approach the questions addressed in the present study.
First, consider what the notion of educational goals entails. One component of educational goals is ambition. Spenner and Featherman conceptualize ambition as:

An attitude or a complex of attitudes about self in relation to specific sets of objects in achievement situations. The notions of orientations and objects encompass (a) the cognitive categories that individuals use in perceiving role residing [sic][i.e., role incumbency] and performance (i.e., status, financial reward, intelligent, competent, fulfilling), (b) the affective states that may be associated with role residing and performance (pride, shame, fear, anxiety), and (c) the behavioral intentions (going to school, entering the labor force, raising children) associated with attitudes (1978, p. 374).

In a somewhat similar vein, House, in his discussion of social structure and personality, defines personality as "a generic label for relatively stable and enduring individual psychological attributes (values, attitudes, motives, needs, beliefs, and so forth)" (1981, p. 527).

In light of these definitions, educational expectations may not be an aspect of personality, per se. It may be more accurate to say that an individual's personality helps to shape specific educational expectations, and, as Kohn (1969, 1977), Bernstein (1971) and others have pointed out, the fulfillment, or lack of fulfillment of those expectations, will, in turn, shape personality. Clearly, educational expectations are behavioral intentions and therefore, are in part, an expression of ambition. Expectations also encompass all three categories listed by
Spenner and Featherman. Moreover, the commonalities in the definitions of personality and ambition suggest that parental attempts at influence, if they hope to be successful, may involve attempts to shape an offspring's values, or appeals to some underlying core set of values which a child may already hold. In the sense that "values are standards of desirability, criteria of preference," (Kohn 1977, p. 18) and "values serve as criteria for selection in action" (Williams 1968, p. 283), parents may attempt to tap into, or shape an offspring's values, such that children will see a given level of education attainment as attainable and thus, will choose a given course of action.

The main point here is that when parents attempt to influence their offspring's ambitions, they are faced with a relatively intricate task. They may be attempting, in part, to shape a complex, multi-dimensional aspect of their child's personality, or component of self. As a result, the task itself is multi-dimensional. When parents attempt to influence their child's educational expectations, they may ultimately be attempting to cast their child in a developing role-identity, or definition of self, and provide support for that role - that is, the role of an educated, competent individual, with all the expectations, obligations, and
potential rewards which accompany that role. (McCall and Simmons 1978; Heiss 1981; Meyer 1977).1

How do parents go about this complex task? The persistent finding of a correlation between the expectations of parents and their offspring, suggests that, in general, two processes, which are the primary concerns of this study, are at work. Parents act as "models" - intentionally, and often unintentionally, conveying information to children via example, and "definers" - conveying information to children via word of mouth (Woelfel and Haller 1971, p. 76). An important point here is that while defining is a deliberate, conscious action on the part of parents, modeling may be as much an unconscious behavior as a conscious one.

The processes of modeling and defining suggest that for influence to occur, there must be some regular and persistent patterns of behavior and interaction between parents and their children. This is clearly the case with regard to defining, less so in the case of modeling. At the very least, as Bandura (1977) points out, if parents are to be effective models for their children, children need to be aware of, and attend to models before they can emulate them.

---

1 Meyer (1977, p.60) discusses the notion of education as a role: "On the basis of their education, individuals are expected to treat themselves, and others are expected to treat them, as having expanded rights and competencies."
The point here is that "regular and persistent patterns of behavior and interaction" is precisely the definition of social structure used by House (1981). Explaining the connection then, between parents' expectations for their children, and children's own expectations, and attempting to understand the regularized patterns of interaction, and the social-psychological processes through which the messages of parents are transmitted, can best be conceptualized as a problem linking social structure and the educational ambitions of offspring. More concretely, regular and specific patterns of interaction between parents and children is a necessary prerequisite for successful influence.

Approaching the issue of parental influence from this perspective suggests that specific questions about the link between parents and children need to be addressed. As House (1981) writes:

Very simply, the analysis of social structure and personality requires that we understand the nature of social structure (really social systems) and of personality (really individual psychology), and of the linkages between them (especially micro-social interaction and small group processes).

House's guidelines provide direction for the present study. They suggest that in order to understand the process of parental influence, it is necessary to consider, in some detail, the nature of macro and micro social processes which
are relevant to the process. For the purposes of this study, two bodies of research - one dealing with a more macro-level social process, and the other dealing with a more micro-level social process - are particularly important. Following House's direction, an examination and critique of status attainment and value transmission research will be examined for insights regarding the parental influence process.

STATUS ATTAINMENT RESEARCH

Ever since Pitirim Sorokin first developed his typology of social mobility processes in 1927, the study of social mobility has been a major area of inquiry in sociology. Sociologists have been primarily concerned with vertical, intergenerational mobility. In the space of the last half century, a model of occupational status and income attainment has been developed and analyzed. In its simplest form, the model suggests that parental social status has a major effect on the occupational status of offspring, both directly, and indirectly via educational attainment. More complex models of status attainment have built upon this simple model by including academic ability, educational and occupational aspirations, and variations by race and sex. Taken together, the expanded status attainment model has provided sociologists with a basic understanding of the social mobility process, and such models typically explain a
substantial proportion of the variation in occupational status and income among American adults.

The study of the status attainment process was preceded by, and ultimately developed out of the study of occupational mobility. Defining fathers' occupational categories as "origins," researchers working within this framework typically investigated the occupational "destinations" of sons, given fathers' occupational origins. Researchers interested in occupational mobility have generated a voluminous literature of empirical findings (c.f. Hurst 1979). However, Blau and Duncan's landmark 1967 study provides the best and most succinct summary of major trends in intergenerational occupational mobility in the United States. Blau and Duncan's study found that: (1) substantial occupational mobility occurs in the United States, (2) much of the mobility which occurs is upward mobility involving short jumps and (3) despite this, the amount of occupational inheritance that occurs - that is, the occupational destination of sons being the same as the occupational origins of fathers - is greater than one would expect from chance (Blau and Duncan 1967, pp. 28-41).

The Blau and Duncan study went one step further, however. In addition to specifying the amount of occupational mobility that occurs in the U.S., they also
attempted to specify the social mechanisms which drive the mobility process forward. As Hotchkiss and Borow write:

Prior to 1967, theoretical speculation about causes of occupational mobility had been confined to somewhat imprecise verbal statements, and measurement of occupational status had been limited primarily to rough classification of occupations into broad status groups... The chief contribution of the work of Blau and Duncan was to collect the primary elements of the existing theory of individual mobility into a formal model of occupational attainment (1984, p. 141).

Using the method of path analysis, Blau and Duncan specified a formal status attainment model, examining the links between parental status and the subsequent occupational status of male offspring. In the model, parental status variables have a positive influence on a son's occupational status indirectly via son's education. The model also suggests that sons can never quite leave their origins behind them - the model includes a direct path from father's occupation to son's first job, and to son's subsequent job (Blau and Duncan 1967, p. 170).

The "Wisconsin model" of status attainment, developed by William Sewell and his colleagues, and empirically tested on a longitudinal sample of Wisconsin youth, expanded the basic Blau- Duncan model of status attainment (Sewell, Haller and Portes 1969; Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf 1970; Sewell and Hauser 1975; Sewell and Hauser 1980). The model yields a conclusion similar to that
of Blau and Duncan, namely, that an individual's occupational and educational status is largely dependent upon the social class background of his or her parents. The Wisconsin model differs from that of Blau-Duncan chiefly in that the Wisconsin model includes a set of social-psychological processes as intervening variables between family socio-economic status and the educational attainment of offspring. Most important, from the viewpoint of this study, is the inclusion of significant others in the model. These significant others are viewed primarily as definers, who communicate their status expectations to the individual. The inclusion of significant others in the model as definers adds two social psychological variables to the status attainment model: "the status aspirations individuals hold for themselves, and the expectation levels individuals' definers hold for them" (Haller 1982, p. 13). The assumed order of causality is from significant others, to the aspirations of youth. Thus, significant others, such as parents, teachers and peers, are seen as having a direct impact on the educational and occupational aspirations of youth.

The Wisconsin model is quite complex, and it is the product of a range of studies spanning better than twenty years, from the mid-1960's, through the 1980's. However, the
main features of the model which are relevant for this study are as follows:

(1) According to the Wisconsin model, an individual's own aspirations are largely a product of their own ability and their social class background, particularly parents' educational and occupational attainment, as filtered through the influence of significant others (Sewell and Hauser 1980, p. 60).

(2) The origin of significant others' influence depends largely upon the significant other in question. While the amount of encouragement or influence a teacher gives to a student appears to be dependent upon a student's level of academic ability, the research of Sewell, Hauser, and their colleagues has consistently found that parents' expectations, and their encouragement or influence are primarily dependent upon their social class background. That is not surprisingly, high SES parents have higher aspirations for their children than low SES parents, and are more likely to encourage college attendance for their children (Sewell and Hauser 1980, p. 67).

(3) Most of the research on the Wisconsin model has found that the effects of parents' encouragement on adolescent aspirations is greater than any direct effect of parents' class status, or students' abilities, on aspirations. (Sewell and Hauser 1980, p. 67). Sewell and
Hauser also write that: "We believe that the failure of many lower status children to have high aspiration levels is at least as likely to result from the student's perception of lack of encouragement by parents and teachers as it is to the lack of financial resources" (p. 65).

Parents' influence equals, if not outweighs, the influence of any other group of significant others. Sewell and Hauser suggest that while parents and peers have about equal influence, that influence is at least twice as large as that of teachers. Davies and Kandel (1981, p. 370) found that parents' influence is actually greater than that of teachers, and greater than that of peers as well.

(4) The vast majority of "Wisconsin model" research suggests that aspirations are important for actual educational and occupational attainment. Sewell and Hauser (1980, p. 70) write that adolescents' aspirations have a "strong" effect on ultimate level of educational attainment, above and beyond its effect as a mediator of social class background and ability! In 1975, Sewell and Hauser went so far as to say that "the effects of social background on later educational attainment are largely explained by social psychological experiences during the high school years" (p. 103). Davies and Kandel (1981) reiterate this, writing that: "the most important effect of [socio-economic background] is through parents' aspirations for their
children, [and] those in turn determining adolescents' aspirations for themselves."

In addition, there is some evidence to suggest that in the absence of the support of significant others, an individual, even one with high aspirations, is less likely to be successful at attaining high levels of education than an individual whose own efforts were supported by the influence and encouragement of significant others. Gasson, et.al. report that: "individuals high in both [their own aspiration and significant other influence] achieve more than would be expected from a sum of the individual effects and those low in both achieve less than would be predicted from an additive model" (1968 p. 25).

Four points may be made from this brief review. First, significant others, parents in particular, play a crucial role in the status attainment process. Second, the messages that parents communicate to their children are likely to vary, depending on parents' background characteristics. This suggests that parents' education, and other aspects of social status correlated with education (such as race) may have an important effect on the relative ability of parents to influence their offspring. Third, while the impact of parents is clear, the Wisconsin model says relatively little about the context in which this influence occurs, neglecting, as Schulenberg, et.al write,
"the developmental process" in favor "of an empirical focus on vocational outcomes" (1984, p. 129). That is, for a variety of reasons, some parents are likely to be better at influencing their children than others. The status attainment research suggests that the present study can help to determine precisely what some of those reasons may be. Moreover, status attainment research suggests that if the processes which makes parental influence more or less successful can be sufficiently understood, the process may be amenable to intervention. Sewell, Haller and Portes made this point when they wrote: "Besides being a powerful explanatory factor, significant others' influence should be amenable to manipulation. It thus suggests itself as a point at which external agents might intervene to change educational and occupational attainment levels" (1969, p. 89).

Last, both aspirations and expectations have been used in status attainment models. However, for reasons of data availability, expectations will be used in this study. Furthermore, focusing on expectations rather than aspirations has theoretical advantages as well. Spenner and Featherman write that, "Aspirations are assumed to be more idealistic statements of desired objects of achievement, while expectations are interpreted as more realistic" (1978, p. 383). There is also some evidence that expectations are
more powerful predictors of future behavior than aspirations (Duncan, Featherman and Duncan 1972), due to the fact that they are more realistic assessments of the possible and the probable - what individuals actually expect will happen to them in the future, rather than what they ideally would like to see happen. It has been shown that the relationship between attitudes and subsequent behavior is strengthened by the specificity of the attitude, and the increased probability of the behavior (Hill 1981). If adolescents are strongly influenced by the expectations of their parents, this suggests that adolescents are incorporating these expectations into their definition of their future selves - how they perceive their future identity.

A CRITIQUE OF STATUS ATTAINMENT: ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS FOR THE SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL PATH IN THE WISCONSIN MODEL.

Thus far, the focus of this study has been to view the link between parents' educational expectations for their children and children's expectations for themselves as the result of two processes: parents' modeling ability and parents' defining ability. That has been the primary focus of the research conducted by Sewell, Hauser and their colleagues as well. However, in an effort to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework which can be used to explore this parent-child relationship, it is worthwhile to consider, in somewhat greater detail, exactly what these
processes entail. Furthermore, it is worthwhile to consider three alternative explanations (other than random chance) for the parent/child link. Indeed, there may be solid theoretical and empirical reasons to believe that these other processes may explain more variance in the parent-child link than the processes of modeling or defining.

First, the most serious critique of status attainment and parental influence must be considered. That is, rather than viewing parents as an influence on their children, the alternative views children as an influence on their parents. It is worthwhile to assess, theoretically and empirically, each of these viewpoints in turn.

First, consider the traditional perspective that parents influence children. Common sense notions from popular culture have generally reinforced the notion of the awesome power, influence, and hence, responsibility, of parents. Traditionally, the socialization literature, from Freud (1933) to the present, has maintained a similar view—that is: "The parent is the initial agent of culture, the child is the object." (Bell 1968)

With regard to modeling, it is certainly clear that while parents can act as educational models for their children, children cannot act as educational models for their parents. At least this is the case until later in the
lifecycle. As Sewell and Hauser argue: "Parents serve as models to be emulated and they are constantly revealing their overt and covert evaluations and expectations through interactions with their child" (1980, p. 65). Similarly, evidence for parental influence comes from adolescents' self-reports. That is, survey research reveals that adolescents actually say that their parents act as both models and definers for them (Saltiel 1985; Scritchfield and Picou 1982). While adolescents name other individuals - peers, friends, teachers, other relatives - as sources of influence, consistent with the status attainment literature, by far, parents are more likely to be named as a significant source of influence than any other individuals.

A second source of evidence for the view that parents influence the educational expectations of their children may be found in the status attainment literature itself. As will be seen presently, Davies and Kandel (1981), as well as Looker and Pineo (1983) found that parents' educational aspirations have an effect on adolescents' aspirations, independent of adolescents' perceptions of parents' aspirations, suggesting that parents are indeed a source of influence.

In their research, Sewell, Hauser and their colleagues assumed a priori a recursive relationship between parents' aspirations and children's aspirations. That is,
they did not assume that there is a feedback loop from children's aspirations to parents' aspirations. More recent work has recognized that this a priori assumption may be incorrect - that in fact, there may be a significant non-recursive path from children's aspirations to parents' aspirations in the status attainment model. However, usually, researchers have been unable to estimate this path due to the statistical limitations imposed by covariance structure models, the class of statistical models which have been used to describe status attainment processes. On the occasions where it has been possible to estimate a non-recursive path from children's aspirations to parents' aspirations and encouragement, the path coefficients have been non-significant (Hout and Morgan 1975, p. 368), suggesting that Sewell and Hauser's a priori assumptions are tenable.

What other theoretical reasons are there for concluding that parents are a source of influence on their children? Glass, et.al. (1986, p. 687) suggests that if parent-child interaction is viewed from a social exchange perspective, parents have relatively greater resources and rewards to bring to an interaction than do children, adolescents, or even young adults. As a result, parents act as a source of influence for their children.
Indeed, considering the five bases of social power outlined by French and Raven (1959), it would seem that parents, at least during an offspring's childhood and adolescence, have greater power, and hence, greater influence. French and Raven have outlined five bases of social power:

(1) Reward power - An individual's power is based on his/her ability to reward others.

(2) Coercive power - An individual's power is based on his/her ability to punish others, or withhold rewards.

(3) Legitimate power - An individual's power is based on other's view that the individual in question has the right to exercise power.

(4) Referent power - An individual's power is based on other's desire to identify with, or be like the individual who is exercising power.

(5) Expert power - An individual's power is based on another's view that the individual is an expert.

Parents are probably more powerful than adolescents, regardless of the basis of social power in question. While few parents probably resort to coercion in an effort to influence the educational expectations of their children, it seems much more plausible that parents use some combination of the other bases of power to influence their children. In particular, the process of modeling may be viewed as a form of referent power. The process of defining filter categories for adolescents may be based on parents' expert power -
their greater knowledge about educational issues. Smith
(1983) echoes this view of the greater power of parents, and
their subsequent ability to influence their offspring, and
points out that even if parents' legitimate and expert power
begins to erode as their children move through adolescence,
at least with regard to many areas of adult life, such as
educational and occupational expectations, adolescents view
parents as experts and sources of legitimate influence.
Furthermore, as already noted, even in the face of competing
sources of influence, parents have a greater impact on the
educational expectations of their children than any other
agent of socialization.

Despite the theoretical arguments and the empirical
evidence discussed above, the alternative view, that
children influence their parents, is worth considering. For
instance, Bell writes:

Parents do not have fixed techniques for
socializing children. They have a repertoire
of actions to accomplish each objective.
Activation of elements in the repertoire
requires both cultural pressures and
stimulation from the object of
acculturation. Characteristics that most
infants and children share... evoke
responses. ... The repertoire changes as a
function of cultural demands and also as a
result of stimulation and reinforcement
received from the child (1968, p. 88).

That is, children do not passively accept parental
influence. As any parent well knows, they react to it as
well. And, via their reactions, children may serve as a powerful influence on parental behavior.

Furthermore, consider French and Raven's bases of social power once again. Children may have considerable reward and coercive power. Children's expressions of love, or more concretely, success in school, may serve as rewards for parents. Conversely, the ability of adolescents to cause trouble, and generally make life difficult or uncomfortable for their parents may be a form of adolescents' coercive power. Additionally, adolescents may have a great deal of expert power, at least with regard to certain areas of expertise. Adolescents' exposure to guidance counselors, vocational testing, college catalogs and advertising, may make them the experts on educational opportunities (MacCorquodale 1989). Although, this suggests that parents' expert power, or lack thereof, may be dependent upon parents' level of education. Parents with greater levels of education may be more conversant and knowledgeable about high school and college related issues than less educated parents.

Lastly, Glass, et.al. (1986, p. 694) suggest that the direction of influence in value transmission may vary depending upon three factors. The stage of a family's life cycle may determine direction of influence. Children who have reached adulthood may, in fact, be in a position to
exert considerable influence over their parents. The attitude in question and the degree to which children have competing sources of influence may determine the direction of influence as well.

Most of the empirical evidence and theoretical arguments weigh in favor of the perspective that parents influence the educational expectations of their children, rather than the other way around. However, it is equally clear that some degree of reverse influence cannot be ruled out. Children, and adolescents in particular, are not empty vessels, waiting to be filled; they are not passive. Children do, in fact, influence their parents. Subsequently, parents not only act, but they react. However, this does not make the present study untenable. Rather, what it suggests is that the fact of reverse influence, from child to parent, must be taken into consideration. The present study cannot hope to resolve the issue of the direction of influence. But, in light of the likely possibility of reverse influence, the analysis undertaken for this project may yield important clues as to the conditions under which adolescents are likely to influence their parents' behavior.

When parents do influence their children, precisely what processes are at work? Woelfel and Haller suggest that attitude formation, in particular, the formation of
educational and occupational expectations, is a process whereby an individual, ego, compares his or her conception of self with his/her conception of some object or set of objects. They write:

The process of forming a conception, on a most general level, can be seen as a process of categorization. Thus, one may define an occupation (like doctor, lawyer, professor, etc.) by placing it into a series of categories such as "good paying job," "high status," "humanitarian," etc. Similarly one defines himself by a process of categorization; he places himself into categories like "intelligent person," "student," "wife," etc. These categories - insofar as they exert a "filtering" effect on one's perception of the objects classed within them - once formed, we term 'filter categories'(1971, p. 75).

In some sense then, the formation of educational or occupational expectations is a "goodness of fit" test between the filter categories for self and the filter categories for an object or set of objects. Significant others, such as parents, to the extent that they have expectations for ego (the child), may influence the categorization process by providing information about the filter categories for self and for the object in question. More specifically, significant others provide this information in two ways. They may act as models such that:

Models may exert influence by serving as (1) examples for ego (insofar as ego considers the others to be a member of the same category as himself, the other's actions help define that category and consequently his conception of himself), (2) examples of
the object or the object filter categories (as a doctor defines medicine for ego simply by practicing medicine where ego can see him), or (3) both (Woelfel and Haller 1971, p. 76).

Thus, with regard to educational expectations, parents with a given level of education provide a model of an individual with that level of education. Furthermore, parents are models such that their own personality characteristics provide a model of the attributes associated with an individual who has attained a given level of education. That is, parents may be a model for various filter categories associated with a given level of education.

Similarly, parents may act as definers such that:

Those who hold expectations for ego may [influence ego] by (1) communicating definitions of ego's self-filter categories (and thus one's self), (2) communicating definitions of the object filter categories, and thus the object of the attitude, or (3) both (Woelfel and Haller 1971, p. 76).

Thus, parents who act as definers may communicate to their children their ideas about their children's educational capabilities and talents. Parents, in the process of defining, may provide a set of filter categories for the adolescent - ideas about the adolescent's self image. As a result of this process of reflected appraisal, or, from a dramaturgical perspective, altercasting (McCall and Simmons 1978, p. 135), adolescents may come to view
themselves as their parents see them. Or, at the very least, depending upon the accuracy of adolescents' perceptions of parents' defining behavior, adolescents may come to define themselves as they believe their parents see them.

Furthermore, parents may communicate information about the filter categories for the object (i.e., the educational level) in question: the skills needed to attain a particular level of education, as well as the occupational benefits which may be derived from a particular level of education. Last, in the process of defining, parents may attempt to convince their children of a match (or lack thereof) between a set of filter categories for self (the child) and a set of filter categories for the object (educational level) in question.

Thus far, defining has been viewed as an explicit, intentional process on the part of parents. However, a third explanation for the link between parents' and adolescents' expectations should be considered. That is, parents may engage in a wide variety of, oftentimes subtle, defining behaviors which convey messages to children about filter categories for the self. However, while not all these defining messages may have an explicit relationship to educational expectations, the messages may still have an (unintentional) impact on adolescents' educational expectations. By providing a set of filter categories for
self, parents may help their adolescent children to develop expectations, even if parents have not explicitly communicated their own expectations to their children. For instance, if parents discuss financial matters in the presence of their children, this may communicate to an adolescent the message that higher education is simply out of the financial reach of the family.

The research of Davies and Kandel (1981, p. 376) found evidence that these implicit defining processes are at work. They found that parents' aspirations for their children had a positive effect on adolescents' aspirations for themselves, even when the effect of adolescents' perceptions of their parents' aspirations on their own aspirations was controlled. If parents' defining behavior was restricted to explicit messages about educational aspirations, there would be no independent effect of parents' aspirations on adolescents' aspirations. That is, adolescents' perceptions of their parents' aspirations would wholly account for any link between parents' aspirations and adolescents' aspirations. Similarly, if the link between parents' and children's aspirations was the result of adolescents' attempts to influence their parents, rather than the reverse, adolescents' perceptions of their parents' aspirations would simply be a function of their own aspirations; there would be no direct effect of parents'
aspirations on adolescents' aspirations, net of adolescents' perceptions of parents' aspirations.

Since a direct effect does occur in Davies and Kandel's data, they conclude: "These findings are important, for they document that the interpersonal influences of parents are exerted in subtle ways and not necessarily with the awareness of the adolescents being influenced. Parental aspirations have substantial direct effects beyond those mediated by the adolescents' perceptions of them" (p. 376).

Another explanation for the link between parents' and children's expectations is that the link is the result of both parties' similar position in the social structure, rather than the direct result of parent/child interaction. However, there is considerable disagreement as to the extent to which similar positions in the social structure - that is, race, social class, gender and religion, among others - are experienced similarly by adults and adolescents.

The view that the adolescent environment and experience is qualitatively and quantitatively different from the world of adults has been expressed by writers such as Coleman, who, in his book, *The Adolescent Society*, argued that the adolescent is:

Cut off from the rest of society ... With his fellows, he comes to constitute a small society, one that has most of its important interactions within itself, and maintains only a few threads of connection with the outside adult society (1961, p. 3).
In a somewhat different vein, Glass, et. al. (1986, p. 687) suggests that adolescents have simply not yet attained the social statuses that shape one's beliefs.

Similarly, Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978) argue that social class has a smaller impact on the lives of children and adolescents than it does on adults. They suggest that "a social structural variable, such as social class, may signify a radically different set of social experiences and may be endowed with entirely different psychological meanings for individuals of unequal maturity" (p. 54). Rosenberg and Pearlin were primarily concerned with the impact of social class on individual self-esteem, rather than expectations. However, self-esteem may conceivably act as an independent variable (Rosenberg 1981), affecting an adolescent's expectations to the extent that self-esteem acts as a filter category for self. Furthermore, with regard to the relative impact of social class variables on self-esteem, adolescents, who are the focus of this study, occupied an intermediate position between children and adults in Rosenberg and Pearlin's research. That is, the relationship between social class and self-esteem was stronger among adolescents, than among children, but somewhat weaker than the association for adults. Additionally, Wiltfang and Scarbecz (1990), in an extension of Rosenberg and Pearlin's work, show that several different
measures of social class have a substantial impact on adolescent self-esteem. This suggests that the adult world does, in fact, intrude upon the lives of adolescents. That is, the threads of connection between the adult world and the world of adolescents are probably more numerous than Coleman maintains.

Others have also maintained that adult and adolescent culture are similar. Damon (1983), for instance, severely criticizes Coleman's work on both methodological and theoretical grounds and concludes that Coleman's views of an independent adolescent subculture have been largely refuted. Offer (1969), cited in Damon, writes that the "peer" culture is "largely a reflection of the adult culture, rather than a divergence from it." Furthermore, in contrast to the view offered by Glass and her colleagues, some aspects of social structure seem inescapable. A vast body of literature demonstrates, for instance, the enormous impact of gender on an individual's personality, attitudes, behavior and life chances at every stage of the life cycle (Weitzman 1984; Richardson 1988). Lastly, Acock (1984) points out that, often, parents may actually choose the social milieus to which a child is exposed, for the express purpose of insuring that a child has the opportunity to experience the same socio-cultural influences as those of the parents. A parent's choice of school, daycare center,
neighborhood, or religious institution are all examples of this.

Thus, the theoretical and empirical evidence seems to be suggest that certain components of social structure and culture will effect adolescents and their parents in similar ways. The magnitude of the effects may differ, and they may be filtered through the a prism of adolescent social structure, but, in the event that parents and adolescents form educational expectations independent of the others' influence, those expectations may be more similar than dissimilar because both parents and their adolescent children occupy similar positions in the social structure. Thus, at the conclusion of this study, some proportion of the variance in the likelihood of parent/child agreement on educational expectations will be explained by modeling and defining processes - that is, parents' efforts to help their children transcend or go beyond parental social origins. However, some proportion of the unexplained variance in agreement is likely to be due to the fact that parents and children are similarly placed in the social structure.

THE VALUE TRANSMISSION RESEARCH

It is clear that there are solid theoretical reasons to believe that parents act as both intentional, and unintentional models and definers for their children, such
that parents' expectations have a major impact on children's expectations. Because one purpose of this study is to explain the relative success, or lack of success, of parents' defining behavior, the task now is to develop a comprehensive theory of defining. Therefore, a review of the value transmission literature may yield valuable clues as to the correlates of successful value transmission.

The relationship between parents' and children's values (regardless of the type of values under consideration) has often been considered to be a "given." Recently, however, researchers such as Melvin Kohn have questioned that assumption:

The very idea of socialization seems to imply that parents succeed in getting their children to accept their values. We have every reason to believe that the socialization process is more complex than that. Parent-to-child value transmission is embedded in a larger social context ... Rather than assuming a high correlation between parents' and children's values, we should treat the magnitude of this correlation as problematic, itself a function of social-structural conditions (1983, p. 3).

Kohn's warning is particularly relevant to this review of the value-transmission literature. Much of the interest in parent/child value congruence over the past two decades stems from the controversy surrounding the concept of the "generation gap" in the 1960's (Troll and Bengston 1979). As a result, the bulk of the literature in this area
centers on the transmission, or lack thereof, of political values and ideologies of one type or another across generations. This research, although not directly related to educational expectations, yields some important clues about the general process of value transmission. Moreover, some of the research on parent/child value transmission does, in fact, deal with the transmission of values centering on aspirations, expectations, work and achievement.

Most of the studies reviewed by Troll and Bengston report substantial parent/child agreement regarding the level of achievement motivation and similar measures. In particular, a study of adolescents in both Denmark and the United States, conducted by Kandel and Lesser (1972), found substantial concordance between mothers' educational plans for their children, and children's own educational plans. Furthermore, Kandel and Lesser reported that a higher level of concordance existed between mothers and their children than between children and their best friends.

Similarly, Furstenberg (1971) examined the transmission of mobility orientation inside the family, conceptualized as a three category ordinal index of mobility.

---

2 In Kandel and Lesser's study, the Tau-beta correlation equaled +.50 for American mothers and their children.
orientation, and found a Tau-beta correlation of +.243 between parents' orientations and those of their children.

Kandel and Lesser and Furstenberg both report gender differences in parent/child congruence. Kandel and Lesser found that concordance of educational plans was greater between mothers and daughters than between mothers and sons. Furstenberg's results are more complex. Among those children who reported spending a great deal of time with their families, parent/child congruence on mobility orientation was greater among sons than among daughters. Among children who reported spending only some time with their families, the relationship was reversed: daughter-parent congruence was greater than son/parent congruence. A third study, Youniss and Smollar (1985), reports that daughters more often reported choosing to discuss career plans with their mothers than with their fathers, whereas for sons, the reverse was true. This suggests that gender is likely to be one important component of social structure affecting the transmission of educational expectations from parent to child.

There is considerable disagreement in the literature as to the effects of family dynamics, interaction styles, and the affective quality of the parent-child relationship on the effectiveness of parent-child value transmission. Troll and Bengston (1979), as well as Smith (1982), conclude
that in general, the quality of the parent-child relationship has little effect on the transmission of values from parents to children, regardless of the values studied. Kandel and Lesser report similar results; in their study, congruence between mothers and children was independent of degree of closeness between mother and child. Congruence was also independent of family structure. The research of McBroom, et.al. (1985), which looked at values related to drug use and premarital sex, also failed to find affective factors (such as degree of closeness with parents) important in the value transmission process. However, they found that family composition and family decision making style were important influences. In certain instances, parents from intact families (both parents present) and parents in families which had a more democratic decision making style, were more effective transmitters of values than parents from families where those characteristics were absent. Similarly, Furstenberg (1971) reports that transmission of mobility orientation was less successful in families with a high level of conflict, and more successful in families with lower levels of conflict. Whitbeck and Gecas (1988) reported that parents who were supportive of their children in general, and who used inductive control techniques, tended to be more successful in transmitting a wide range of values.
to their children, than were parents who did not use such techniques.

This brief review of a vast literature suggests several components of both family and broader societal social structure are likely to be important influences on the parent-child value transmission process, particularly in this case, parental attempts to influence educational expectations. Gender appears to be a critical factor in value transmission. Parental support, low levels of conflict and the use of inductive control techniques have all been shown to be related to social class; high SES parents are more likely to use these techniques than low SES parents (Gecas 1979). This suggests then, that social class may also be a factor in value transmission.

The closeness of the parent/child relationship, however, does not appear to be important for successful value transmission. Within the literature, this disparity between theory and empirical evidence has generally been dealt with in two ways. The most obvious is Smith's approach: he suggests that despite the theoretical appeal of affective ties in value transmission, "we must face the possibility that such variables ... have little or no effect upon offspring agreement with particular parental orientations" (1982, p. 673). Alternatively, Acock (1984) maintains that the inadequacy of measurement and statistical
techniques may be responsible for the lack of association, and issues the standard call for future research.

Taken in total, what these results suggest for this study is that the style and content of parents' defining techniques are important for value transmission. In addition, the degree to which the family successfully functions as a unit (i.e., level of conflict within the family, parental control techniques), are expected to be more important for successful value transmission than affective solidarity. This suggests that less deliberate modes of value transmission, such as modeling, and other implicit forms of defining, which may operate independently of affective ties, are also important for successful value transmission. Overall, the value transmission literature provides useful clues as to how the process of value transmission proceeds. This body of empirical evidence serves as a guide and a basis of comparison for the present research. However, a coherent theory of defining is lacking in the literature.

A COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF DEFINING: STRYKER AND SERPE

A set of principles developed by Stryker and Serpe (1981, 1983) provides a theory of defining for this study. Their theory relies heavily on the conceptual framework of self, society and interaction provided by the symbolic
interaction perspective. More specifically, Stryker and Serpe draw on the basic tenets of role or identity theory (McCall and Simmons 1978; Stryker 1980; Burr, et al. 1979). Role or identity theory views the self as composed of a structure of identities (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 52). Interaction "both shapes and is built upon the personal identities which enter the structure of the self which in turn constrains interaction" (p. 53). The quality and quantity of interaction between parent and child affects the degree to which parents' socialization efforts successfully impact upon children. To put it succinctly, "the greater the effort expended by a parent in socialization behaviors directed at a child, and the more likely the child to respond in terms appropriate to the child role-identity, the greater the successful impact of parent on child" (p. 64). Note that this is a theory of explicit defining. The assumption is that parents have every intention of influencing their children.

For the purposes of discussion, it may be best to begin at the micro level - the point of impact - and work outward, towards a consideration of more macro-level structures. Successful socialization is defined as "the degree of influence or impact [their emphasis], by which we mean the extent to which families - parents - achieve correspondence between their definitions of appropriate
behavior and the behavior of their offspring" (pp. 56-57).

Proceeding backwards along the causal chain from the point of impact, the first task is to identify the types of interaction between parent and child which may lead to successful socialization. Second, the ways in which role identities of parents and children affect the extent of that interaction will be considered. Third, how networks in which parents and children are embedded influence their role identities and the interaction between parents and children in those roles will be discussed.

Impact, Effort and Opportunity

Stryker and Serpe suggest that socialization impact is dependent on opportunity and effort. By effort, Stryker and Serpe refer to the "degree to which energy directed towards achieving a particular impact is mobilized and expended" (p. 57). For the purposes of this study, successful impact is defined as congruence between parents' and children's expectations, which is from parents' attempts to influence their children. Effort, then, is the extent to which parents and children engage in interaction during which they discuss educational expectations, or other issues which may be directly related to the formation of educational expectations, such as school grades, programs of study, areas of interest and the like. That is, explicit efforts at defining which are unambiguous, concrete, and
clearly related to a particular issue, such as educational expectations, are likely to lead to successful value transmission. Conversely, the frequency of general, non-specific parent/child interaction, by itself, has been shown to be unrelated to successful value transmission (Acock 1984).

Of course, for this type of interaction to occur, effort may be exerted by one or both parties. That is, parents may make an effort to seek out their children and discuss these issues with them, and similarly, children may make an effort to seek out their parents for guidance and discuss these same issues.

Stryker and Serpe (1981, p. 57) suggest that effort is dependent upon opportunity. That is, opportunities for these types of parent/child interactions must exist in the first place. To the degree that those opportunities do not exist, effort cannot be exerted. Without going into great detail at this point, it should be noted that opportunity is not constant, but is a function of institutional constraints, social structural variables, and the role identities of parents and children.

Identity Correspondence

The term "child" is used here to refer to a role identity which includes a particular form of relationship to one or more significant others in the role identity as
"parent." With this in mind, the second component in Stryker and Serpe's causal chain is identity correspondence. "Other things being equal, to the degree that a child's identity structure is restricted to that of son or daughter, parents will be effective socialization agents. This is so because the child will not have identities anchored in nonfamilial relationships to act as a barrier to parent influence processes or to filter these processes" (Stryker and Serpe 1981, p. 55). Correspondingly, the degree to which parents are effective socialization agents also is dependent on the degree to which a parent's identity structure is similarly restricted to that of the role of parent. Of course, in today's society, individuals have multiple roles and statuses. However, every specific interaction episode consists of at least two individuals, "ego" (the self) and "alter" (the other). What the principle of identity correspondence says is that parents must act as "parents" and children must act as "children" for successful parent/child interaction to occur. Parents must successfully cast themselves ("ego") in the role of parents, and present themselves as such. In addition, parents must cast "alter," the other in the interaction - in this case, their child, in the role of receptive child. (McCall and Simmons 1978, p. 136) The same processes apply to children as they interact with their parents.
The concept of identity correspondence makes sense from a power and exchange perspective as well. Parents can only hope to use their "legitimate power" successfully in an influence attempt when the two principals in the interaction are playing the roles of "parent" and "child."

Role Salience

The extent to which identity correspondence between parent and child occurs depends upon the extent to which the roles of parent and child are salient for each of them:

Identities ... are conceived as being organized into a salience hierarchy. This hierarchical organization of identities is defined by the probabilities of each of the various identities within it being brought into play in a given situation. Alternatively, it is defined by the probabilities each of the identities have of being invoked across a variety of situations. [An] identity's location in a salience hierarchy will affect its' threshold for being invoked in situations and thus the likelihood behavior called for by an identity will ensue (Stryker and Serpe 1981, p. 206).

One might assume that parents and children, when engaged in interaction with one another, always invoke the role of parent and child as their respective guides to successful interaction. However, many situations may be envisioned where this does not necessarily have to be the case. Youniss and Smollar (1985) demonstrate that parents and their adolescent children talk about a wide range of issues. Frequently, depending on the topic of conversation,
parents and children may engage in mutual disclosure and reciprocal understanding. In such situations, it seems that parent and child may be invoking friendship or confidant roles. Similarly, an adolescent who may be straining against parental constraints, and makes the familiar complaint, "You never treat me like an adult!" clearly is not viewing his or her role in the interaction as that of a child.

Thus, it is assumed that parents are individuals who have a hierarchy of identities which include parent, plus a number of others (husband/wife, employee, neighbor, etc.), and the position of parent in that hierarchy of identities (salience) will affect the degree to which individuals who are parents (among other things) act as parents. Similarly, it is assumed that adolescents have a hierarchy of identities which include child, plus a number of others (student, boyfriend/girlfriend, team-mate, etc.), and the salience of that identity, child, will effect the extent to which adolescents act as children who are receptive to parental influence. "Persons whose identities as parents have high salience will choose to behave [as] parents more frequently [across a variety of situations] than will persons whose parental identity has low salience" (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 62). An analogous statement may be made for children.
To summarize, the frequency and content of the interaction between parents and children is expected to affect the extent to which parents can intentionally influence their children's values. The greater the frequency of parent/child interaction which is explicitly directed towards discussion of values, or issues related to those values, the greater the impact, (i.e., value correspondence between parents and children). The degree to which parents and children are in agreement about these values is dependent on the salience of parents' and children's role identities, which in turn, influence the opportunities available for interaction and the effort expended in interaction.

THE PLAN OF THIS STUDY

Stryker and Serpe have provided a coherent framework for understanding the process of explicit defining. However, before proceeding further, several points should be made. First, it will not be possible to look at all of the variables included in their theory in the present study. Second, the process of influence, as outlined by Stryker and Serpe, may not be entirely linear. That is, since interaction is a dynamic process, one might expect that parents and children may react to their interactions such
that role salience, and further effort, and opportunities for effort are subsequently affected.

Third, and most importantly for the purposes of this study, components of social structure - parent's education, race and gender - may intervene at various points in this defining process. Indeed, it is the purpose of this study to examine how social status variables, modeling and defining processes are all interwoven such that they increase or decrease the likelihood of parent-child agreement. That is, this study is concerned with more than just the process of defining, per se. As such, House provides a set of three broad principles which, first, suggest how these processes may be interwoven, and second, provide a coherent plan for empirical analysis.

(1) The components principle: We must adequately understand the nature of the social structure, position or system in question. Such social phenomena almost always have multiple aspects, dimensions, or components, and we must be clear about what they are... We need to be clear which of these aspects or components [of social structure] are most relevant for understanding hypothesized or observed ... differences in particular attitudes or behavior (1981, p. 540).

For the purposes of this study, the components principle suggests exploring those aspects of family and societal social structure which produce variance in parental influence. The discussion in this chapter suggests that gender, parent's education and race (Sewell and Hauser 1980;
Schulenberg, et al. 1984; Gecas 1981), components of social structure, are worth consideration. These variables may affect the influence process by affecting the quantity and quality of the interaction between parents and children, and the opportunities available for interaction. Social structural variables may also affect the ability of parents to act as educational models for their children. The precise theoretical relevance of each of these variables will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

(2) The proximity principle: We must recognize that the effects of social structures, positions or systems are transmitted to individuals through stimuli that impinge directly on the individual... Thus a major theoretical task is to trace how macro-social structures and processes affect increasingly smaller social structures and ultimately those micro-social phenomena that directly impinge on the individual (House 1981, p. 540).

According to this principle, if analysis shows that components of social structure do in fact produce variance in the extent to which parents can influence their children, the next logical step is to identify the ways in which social structure impinges on parents and children so as to produce that variation. In other words, the problem will be to identify the ways in which larger social-structural components actually affect the quality and quantity of day-to-day interaction between parent and child. More specifically, this involves examining the ways in which
social structure may affect the ability of parents to act as definers.

(3) The psychological principle: We must understand individual psychology adequately so that we can specify and test when, how, and to what extent macro-social phenomena and the proximal micro-social phenomena and stimuli they produce influence individual personality or behavior (House 1981, p. 541).

This last principle suggests that it may not be sufficient to examine the quantity and quality of parent-child interaction, and the constraints imposed on that interaction by larger social structures. To fully understand the process by which parents influence their children, the psychological principle suggests that the psychological states of both the messenger (parents) and the recipients of the message (children), may be important, as well as the message strategies which parents use as they attempt to influence their children (deTurck and Miller 1983). Furthermore, to the degree that role salience is both a sociological and a psychological process, this principle, in conjunction with Stryker and Serpe's focus on role salience, suggests that a successful outcome (parent-child agreement) is dependent upon the role salience of both parents and children. The greater the salience of the role of parent and child, respectively, the greater the likelihood of a successful outcome.

The rest of this study is organized as follows:
Chapter 2 is devoted to methodological issues. The chapter includes: (1) A discussion of the data set used to investigate parental attempts to influence children's educational expectations: a nation-wide survey of adolescents and their parents called High School and Beyond. (2) A discussion and justification of the dependent variable to be used in the study. Parents' success in influencing the educational expectations of their offspring will be operationalized in this study as parent-child agreement on educational goals. (3) A more general discussion of some of methodological problems which are likely to be encountered in any study of parent-child value transmission. (4) A discussion of the statistical techniques to be used in this study.

Chapter 3 focuses on House's components principle. Chapter 3 derives several specific hypotheses which relate social structural components to parents' ability to influence their child's educational expectations. Then, this chapter discusses the empirical tests of these hypotheses before assessing the relative effects of modeling on the influence process.

Chapters 4 and 5 focus on House's proximity and psychological principles, respectively. Chapters 4 and 5 attempt to explain why the relationships between social structural variables and successful parental influence
exists. The focus will be on empirically testing the effects of effort and role-salience variables, as mediators in the relationship between social structure components and parental influence.

Lastly, Chapter 6 is devoted to summarizing the results of the study, and discussing their relevance for future research.
CHAPTER 2
METHODS

This chapter describes the data set to be used in this study. Also included is a discussion of the operationalization of the dependent variable, and a description of the statistical techniques to be used in the analysis of the data.

THE DATA

The data used in this study is the High School and Beyond data set. High School and Beyond is a longitudinal data set, prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC).

In the Spring of 1980, NORC collected survey data from sophomores and seniors in a random sample of high schools across the United States. Also in 1980, NORC collected survey data from a sub-sample of parents whose sons or daughters were included in the survey. In 1982, 1984 and 1986, NORC collected follow-up survey data from both cohorts, the 1980 sophomores and the 1980 seniors. Unfortunately, no follow up data was collected on parents.

The High School and Beyond survey asked students questions about their educational experiences, their educational and occupational aspirations and expectations for the future, and various social-psychological attitudes,
including self-esteem and alienation. Parents were surveyed on their aspirations and expectations for their child, family finances, and possible strategies for financing their child's college education.

This study utilizes the data from the high school sophomores surveyed in 1980, and the corresponding parent data. Sophomores may be more receptive to parental influence than older students. However, they may have less well formed educational expectations than their older classmates. By the spring of their senior year in high school, the educational expectations of adolescents are likely to be crystallized, given spring deadlines for college admissions applications. The greater malleability of sophomores' expectations is not without cost. Kerckhoff (1976, p. 371) notes that the expectations of ninth and tenth graders are less strongly related to later attainment than the expectations of twelfth graders. In that sense, the selection of the sophomore cohort for this analysis represents a compromise. There is a probable trade-off between the likelihood of being influenced, and the predictive ability of their expectations for later attainment.

Sophomores, when compared to younger cohorts, may have more realistic perceptions of society and the potential opportunities, or lack thereof, available to them (Spenner and Featherman 1978, p. 384). For instance, Rosenberg and
Pearlin (1978) found that adolescents fifteen years old or older had a greater awareness of social class than younger children. They also found a stronger relationship between subjective and objective class standing among older adolescents than among younger children. Significantly, fully 99% of the High School and Beyond sophomores were fifteen years old or older in the spring of 1980.

Thus, the analysis in the present study is limited to those sophomores for which there is corresponding parent data: 3,055 adolescents and one of their parents, since only one parent was interviewed in each household. To further simplify the analysis, the sample is limited to those sophomores whose biological or adoptive parents were interviewed. No grand-parents, step-parents, or other legal guardians are included, since relationships between adolescents and these surrogate parents may be qualitatively different from the relationships between adolescents and their biological or adoptive parents (Furstenberg 1987). This reduces the sample size from 3,055 to 2,532.

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which parents influence their adolescent child's educational expectations, and the sources of variation in parents' ability to do so. As such, for the purposes of this
study, parental influence is inferred from parent-child agreement on educational expectations, or "educational agreement." This is, of course, an imperfect measure of parental influence. As noted in Chapter 1, the educational expectations of parents and the educational expectations of children can be related through several distinct processes: (1) parents are acting as models for their children, (2) parents are acting as definers for their children, (3) parents are engaged in a wide range of subtle behaviors such that their children's educational expectations are influenced, (4) children are influencing their parents, directly, via interaction, or indirectly, via other forms of behavior, and (5) both parties are forming their expectations independent of the other such that agreement between them occurs because both parties, as a result of their similar position in the social structure, have been exposed to the same cultural and structural influences which shape expectations. Theoretical arguments have already been presented which suggest that the relationship between parental and adolescent expectations is more a function of the first three processes, rather than the latter two. At the same time, part of the purpose of this study is to disentangle some of those diverse effects.

However, two caveats are in order here. First, the nature of the High School and Beyond data set itself,
Despite its longitudinal character, makes a rigorous exploration of the relative effects of children on parents and parents on children impossible. These technical issues will be addressed later. Second, it is likely that the five processes exercise a joint effect on parent/child agreement.

In any analysis the ability to study the joint effects of several independent variables on a dependent variable is severely affected by constraints such as sample size. As an example, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression allows researchers to examine the simultaneous effects of several independent variables, \( X(i), i = 1,2,\ldots,k \), where \( k \) equals the number of independent variables, on a given dependent variable, \( Y \). However, generally, a constraint imposed by the researcher is that the independent variables do not interact with one another. Each regression coefficient, \( b(i) \), in a regression equation, is the effect of independent variable, \( X(i) \), on \( Y \), holding the values of all other independent variables constant. That is, \( b(i) \) does not vary, depending on the values of other independent variables. Researchers of course, can and do, add interaction terms to regression equations, but the addition of each interaction term reduces degrees of freedom by one. Thus, the ability to examine multiple interaction effects between variables is always limited by sample size. Thus, it will be impossible to precisely gauge the relative effects of each of the five
processes on the relationship between parent/child agreement.

The educational agreement variable is formed by cross-classifying parents' educational expectations for their children, by adolescents' own educational expectations. The *High School and Beyond* data set is particularly valuable in that educational expectations are obtained directly from parents and adolescents reports. The form of the questions are listed in Table 2-1.

Note that these questions focus primarily on the educational expectations of parents and children, rather than their aspirations. Expectations, rather than aspirations, are used primarily because an educational aspiration question, comparable to the expectation question above, is not asked of adolescents in *High School and Beyond*. Also, as discussed in Chapter 1, there are some theoretical advantages to using expectations, rather than aspirations.

Because parents' and adolescents' expectations are both ordinal measures, the cross-classification of parent's educational expectations by child's educational expectations actually yields a three-category dependent variable, with the following values:
Table 2-1. Question Wording of Adolescent's and Parent's Educational Expectations.

As reported by adolescents: As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will go?

- Less than high school graduation
- High school graduation only
- Vocational, trade or business school after high school:
  - Less than two years
  - Two years or more
- College program
  - Less than two years of college
  - Two or more years of college (including two-year degree)
  - Finish college (four or five-year degree)
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Ph.D., M.D. or other advanced professional degree.

As reported by parents: As things stand now, how far in school do you think your son/daughter will get?

- Less than high school graduation
- High school graduation only
- Vocational, trade or business school after high school
  - Less than one year
  - Between one and two years
  - Two years or more
- College program
  - Some college
  - Finish a two-year program
  - Finish a four or five year program
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Ph.D., M.D. or equivalent.

Source: High School and Beyond 1981, p. 20
[1] Adolescents whose future educational expectations are lower than those of their parent. (C < P: Child less than parent)
Adolescents expect to receive fewer years of education than their parent expects they will receive.

[2] Adolescents whose future educational expectations are equivalent to those of their parent. (C=P: Child equal to parent)

[3] Adolescents whose future educational expectations exceed those of their parent. (C > P: Child greater than parent)
Adolescents expect to receive more years of education than their parent expects they will receive.

A measure of agreement or consensus which incorporates direction provides more information than a dichotomous measure with categories agree/disagree, and hence, may improve the predictability of agreement. McBroom, et.al. (1985) suggest that directionality is especially important in a measure of agreement, if agreement has some relationship to behavior. For the purposes of the present study, directionality is crucial. For here, agreement is seen as indicative of future behavior: adolescents eventually attaining a given level of education, and possibly, future attempts by parents to influence their offspring's expectations. Agreement is also seen as an outcome of past behavior: parents' efforts to influence their children. As such, parent/child disagreement in the form of children having lower expectations than their parents, implies a qualitatively different state of events
than disagreement in the form of children having expectations which exceed those of their parents. One might expect that a parent who expects his or her child to eventually attain a bachelor's degree will have a wholly different attitude, if the child expects to terminate his or her education at high school graduation, than if the child intends to go on to graduate school.

Operationalizing agreement in this way also avoids some methodological problems which are common to many studies of inter-generational value transmission. These issues, discussed by Troll and Bengston (1979), affect the extent to which it is possible to make firm generalizations about the value transmission process from any empirical analysis.

First, Troll and Bengston criticize many studies of inter-generational value transmission on the basis of their statistical techniques. They note that often, studies of parent-child value transmission utilize some form of correlation coefficient as a statistical indicator of value correspondence. Troll and Bengston caution that "covariation does not necessarily reflect agreement or similarity. Parents and children may exhibit high covariation (correlation) but low absolute agreement" (p. 131). This problem is avoided in the present study because the dependent variable is parent-child agreement on educational
expectations. However, as noted above, just as correlation does not imply causality, neither does agreement.

Second, Troll and Bengston distinguish between several types of generational correspondence or agreement. The unit of analysis in this study is the parent-child dyad, such that agreement here is what Troll and Bengston refer to as "absolute pair correspondence," or agreement between members of a dyad. Alternatively, other forms of correspondence, such as group correspondence, which measures agreement between cohorts, are less rigorous forms of correspondence.

Third, Troll and Bengston argue that studies of inter-generational value transmission have been weakened by the use of small or opportunistic samples, reliance on children's reports of parental values, or reliance on a single parent's opinion. Since High School and Beyond is a nation-wide probability sample of both adolescents and their parents, the first two methodological problems are avoided. However, like most other studies, the High School and Beyond data contains the responses of only one, rather than both, parents. Troll and Bengston caution that parents who are willing to fill out a questionnaire, or be interviewed by a survey researcher, may be closer to children than parents who were unwilling to make a similar effort. As a result, estimates of the likelihood of parent-child agreement may be
inflated in this study, and might actually be lower if a sample where both parents were interviewed was used.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

The statistical techniques used to analyze the data in this study are log-linear techniques (Fienberg 1980; Knoke and Burke 1980; Hout 1983; Duncan and Duncan 1978). Log-linear statistical methods are particularly appropriate when the variables to be analyzed are ordinal or nominal level variables. Both the dependent variable in this study, as well as the independent variables not yet introduced, are nominal, or at best, ordinal level variables. Furthermore, few of the independent variables can be combined to produce an interval or ratio level scale which purportedly measures some latent factor.

However, nominal and ordinal variables can be cross-classified into multi-way contingency tables. For any contingency table, a class of hierarchical log-linear models, which fit various marginal distributions in the table, can be considered. Comparing the expected cell frequencies under a given model to the observed cell frequencies in a given table yields a test of a hypothesis specifying that a particular set of associations among variables in the table are present in the population from which the survey sample is drawn. The models are hierarchical in the sense that higher order models, which
specify a greater number of associations among variables, are implied from lower order models which specify fewer associations. The fit of each model to the data is assessed using the L-squared statistic. Furthermore, the L-squared statistic allows one to test whether a higher order model provides a significantly improved fit to the data, as compared to the fit of a lower order model. This allows the researcher to select a preferred model which is representative of the true associations among the variables in the population.

Using the expected frequencies under a preferred model, the odds and log-odds on a given category of the dependent variable, relative to some other category of the dependent variable, can be calculated. Comparing these log-odds across categories of the independent variables allows researchers to assess the magnitude and the direction of the associations between independent and dependent variables.

It has been noted that the results of log-linear data analysis do not lend themselves to easy interpretation (Kaufman and Schervish 1986). In this study, for the sake of clarity and ease of presentation, the log-odds, rather than the odds, for categories of the dependent variable will be presented. Presenting the log-odds, rather than the odds, of an event has several advantages. One can compare the
relative effects of categories of the independent variable by simply adding and subtracting log-odds. Furthermore, log-odds can be presented in a format that is analogous to a linear regression equation (Duncan and Duncan 1978). The "dependent variable" for the regression equation is the log-odds on some category of the dependent variable of interest, relative to some other category. The intercept of the equation is the log-odds associated with a selected base category of the independent variables. Each regression coefficient in the equation represents an increase or decrease in the log-odds, for a particular category of the independent variable, relative to the chosen base category or intercept. More specifically, each coefficient is the log of an odds-ratio.

Consider, for instance, the hypothetical three-way cross-classification of three dichotomous variables, Y, A, and B, where Y is some dependent variable, and A and B are each independent variables. The observed cell frequencies for the table are reproduced in Table 2-2. The log-odds on category 1 of variable Y, relative to category 2 of variable Y, represented as "log-odds Y(1:2)," as calculated from the observed cell frequencies in the table, are also presented in Table 2-2.

The eight hierarchical log-linear models to be considered for the three-way contingency table are:
where (YA), for example, indicates that the model fits the joint marginals for this variable, and denotes an association between variables Y and A in the table. None of the eight hierarchical log-linear models fit the data in the table. Thus, the "saturated model" is the preferred model for the table. The expected cell frequencies under the saturated model are the observed cell frequencies. The degrees of freedom for the saturated model are zero, which means that all the degrees of freedom in the table are used to describe the associations between the variables in the table. As one can see from the log-odds Y(1:2), calculated from the observed frequencies, the saturated model indicates that there is a three-way interaction in the table. That is, the magnitude and the direction of the relationship between Y and B, varies, depending on the category of A. Or, conversely, the relationship between Y and A varies, depending on the category of B.

Using the modified regression equation approach to describe the associations in the table, the log-odds on
Table 2-2. Observed Cell Frequencies for Hypothetical three-way table. Variable Y by Variable B by Variable A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Y</th>
<th>Variable B</th>
<th>Variable A</th>
<th>Log-odds Y(1:2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Y(1:2) can be described by two separate regression equations, one for each level of variable A.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var A} = 1 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = a + b_1 (X) \\
\text{Var A} = 2 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = a + b_1 (X)
\end{align*}
\]

Within each level of variable A, the intercept, a, is the log-odds on Y(1:2) when \(B = 1\), the base category.

Generally, the selection of the base, or intercept, category is arbitrary, or may be made on theoretical grounds. X is a dummy variable such that \(X = 1\) when \(B = 2\); \(X = 0\) when \(B \neq 2\). Thus, the regression coefficient, \(b_1\), is the increase or decrease in the log-odds on Y(1:2) when one moves from category 1 of variable B, to category 2 of variable B. Since there is a three-way interaction in the table, "a" and "b1" take on unique values for each level of variable A. In this case:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var A} = 1 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = -.69 + 2.30 (X) \\
\text{Var A} = 2 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = 1.10 - 1.61 (X)
\end{align*}
\]

Note that all the log-odds can be reproduced from the regression equation. Thus, considering the case where \(A = 1\), the log-odds on Y(1:2) for \(B=1\) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var A} = 1, \text{Var B} = 1 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = -.69 + 2.30(0) \\
& = -.69
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, when \(A = 1\), the log-odds on Y(1:2) when \(B = 2\) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Var A} = 1, \text{Var B} = 2 & \quad \text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = -.69 + 2.30(1) \\
& = -.69 + 2.30 \\
& = 1.61
\end{align*}
\]
One can make similar calculations for the case when $A = 2$. All the equations can be represented in a tabular format, as presented in Table 2-3. Note that the right hand panel of Table 2-3 presents the two equations for variable $A$, within categories of variable $B$. The choice of which interaction effects to highlight in the equations are generally based on theoretical grounds. However, as Table 2-3 shows, one can present the effects of different independent variables on the dependent variable such that the positive or negative consequences for the dependent variable are clearly indicated by the signs of the "regression coefficients." Furthermore, no information is lost when the data is presented in this way, since all the log-odds can be reproduced from the equations.

Now, consider the expected frequencies for the table under model 8, which fits the marginals $(AB) (YB) (YA)$. Model 8 does not provide an adequate fit to the data at the $p=.05$ level of significance, because the model specifies an associations between $Y$ and $B$, and $Y$ and $A$, which are independent of one another. That is, the association between $Y$ and $B$ is the same, regardless of the category of variable $A$ under consideration, and the association between $Y$ and $A$ is the same, regardless of the category of variable $B$ under consideration. The expected frequencies for the table, as
Table 2-3. Variable Y by Variable B by Variable A. Log-odds on Y(1:2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log-odds Y(1:2)</th>
<th>Log-odds Y(1:2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=1, B=1</td>
<td>B=1, A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B effect</th>
<th>A effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B = 2</td>
<td>A = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=2, B=1</td>
<td>B=2, A=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B effect</th>
<th>A effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B = 2</td>
<td>A = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-4. Expected Cell Frequencies for Hypothetical three-way table, under Model 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Y</th>
<th>Log-odds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>152.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>197.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>97.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>127.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-5. Variable Y by Variable B by Variable A. Log-odds on Y(1:2). Calculated from Expected Frequencies under Model 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log-odds Y(1:2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A=1, B=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03 [Intercept]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
well as the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$, as calculated from the expected frequencies, are presented in Table 2-4. In this case, the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$ can be described by a single equation:

$$\text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = a + b_1 (X_1) + b_2 (X_2)$$

where $a$ = the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$ for the base category. In this case, let "a" = the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$ when $A = 1$ and $B = 1$. $X_1$ is a dummy variable such that $X_1 = 1$ when $A = 2$; $X_1 = 0$ when $A \neq 2$. $X_2$ = a dummy variable such that $X_2 = 1$ when $B = 2$; $X_2 = 0$ when $B \neq 2$. Thus, coefficient $b_1$ represents the increase or decrease in the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$ when moving from category 1 of variable $A$ to category 2 of variable $A$. Similarly, coefficient $b_2$ represents the increase or decrease in the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$ when moving from category 1 of variable $B$ to category 2 of variable $B$. Replacing $a$, $b_1$ and $b_2$ with actual values, as calculated from the log-odds in Table 2-4 yields:

$$\text{Log-odds } Y(1:2) = .03 - .08 (X_1) + .62 (X_2)$$

Thus, the change in the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$, when moving from category 1 of variable $A$ to category 2 of variable $A = -.08$, and in the absence of an interaction effect, this value remains constant, regardless of the category of variable $B$ under consideration. Similarly, the change in the log-odds on $Y(1:2)$, when moving from category 1 of variable $B$ to category 2 of variable $B = +.62$, and in
the absence of an interaction effect, this value remains constant, regardless of the category of variable A under consideration. As before, all the log-odds in Table 2-4 can be reproduced from the equation. Lastly, Table 2-5 presents the data from the equation in a tabular format.

Thus, given the prevalence of linear regression in the sociological literature, presenting the data from log-linear analysis in this format is useful. The data are more easily interpreted than if the log-odds alone were presented, yet at the same time, no information is lost.
CHAPTER 3

THE COMPONENTS PRINCIPLE:
THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL STATUS VARIABLES ON PARENTAL INFLUENCE

This chapter has several objectives. The first is to briefly examine the overall distribution of parent-child agreement among the adolescents and parents in the High School and Beyond sample. The second objective is to examine the effects of social class, as measured by parent's education, on agreement. Congruent with the idea that parental influence is a function of parents' ability to act as educational models and definers, it is hypothesized that the ability of parents to act as such varies by class, which in turn, produces class differences in the likelihood of agreement. The extent to which these differences are specifically due to parents' modeling ability is also addressed in this chapter; defining effects will be examined in subsequent chapters. A third objective of this chapter is to examine the effects of two other social status variables, race and gender, on agreement. Wilson (1980) has suggested that the significance of race as a determinant of life chances is declining, and that social class instead, is a more powerful predictor of life chances. The relevance of this still controversial hypothesis, at least with regard to parent-child agreement, will be tested here.
THE DISTRIBUTION OF AGREEMENT

To provide an initial perspective on the question which is central to this study, the overall distribution of parent-child agreement is examined. Table 3-1 presents, for comparison purposes, the raw frequencies, percentages, odds and log-odds on agreement for the High School and Beyond sample of parents and adolescents. For informational purposes, Table 3-2 is also presented, which shows the crosstabulation of parent's expectations, by adolescent's expectations, from which parent-child agreement is derived. In Table 3-2, parents' expectations are the origin categories. Thus, each row is the percent distribution of adolescents' expectations, given parents' expectations.

It is readily apparent from Table 3-1 that families are almost uniformly distributed across the three categories, with a slightly greater proportions in the agreement category ("child=parent," or C=P), and the third category, ("child > parent," or C>P) where adolescents' educational expectations exceed those of their parents.

It is probably a safe assumption to say that parents care about the educational attainment of their offspring. As such, parents whose offspring persist in having educational expectations for themselves which are below their parents' hopes for them (C<P) have reason for concern. If the trend persists over time, that would mean that slightly more than
one quarter of the adolescents in the High School and Beyond sample will be underachievers in their parents' eyes. For instance, as Table 3-2 shows, about one-third of the parents who expect that their children will receive some minimal vocational training after high school have children who are apparently satisfied to end their education with high school graduation. Similarly, about one quarter of the parents who expect their child to receive a four year college degree have children who expect less. Although, most of these potential underachievers apparently see a need for some level of post high school training.

Conversely, considering those adolescents whose expectations exceed those of their parents (C>P), it is difficult to imagine parents complaining that their children are overachievers. In that sense then, the contrast between the C<P families and the families in which parent-child agreement exists is perhaps the more interesting contrast.

What about those families in the third category? Why would adolescents have expectations which exceed those of their parents? More importantly, are the raised expectations of these adolescents of sufficient concern to their parents that they would actually discourage their children from having these lofty ambitions? Agnew and Jones (1988), in a study of high school students who had inflated educational expectations - that is, educational expectations which the
Table 3-1. The Distribution of Parent-Child Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Odds *</th>
<th>Log-Odds *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child &lt; Parent</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child = Parent</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &gt; Parent</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Relative to Agreement (Child = Parent)
Table 3-2. Parents' Expectations by Adolescents' Expectations (Row Percentage).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Expectation</th>
<th>Adolescents' Expectations</th>
<th>% (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &lt; HS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HS GRAD. VOC. TR:</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &lt; 2 YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2+ YRS COLLEGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. &lt; 2 YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2 YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 4 YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PH.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Parents' Expectations are the origins; adolescents' Expectations are the destinations.
Note: Agreement is in **Boldface**
student had a low probability of actually attaining - suggest that their are four reasons for such expectations. First, individuals may have a mistaken image of themselves, such that they perceive themselves to be more capable than they actually are. Second, students may be ignorant of the requirements for goal achievement. Third, individuals may be responding to the general cultural messages about success, and "rags to riches." Fourth, individuals may be responding to pressure from others to succeed.

Thus, perhaps the parents of adolescents in C>P category are using a reality principle more than their children. Several studies, cited by Agnew and Jones (1988), suggest that little of the variation in parental expectations is explained by children's academic and/or intellectual capabilities; however, parents may be more aware of unpleasant realities, such as family financial difficulties, or other perceptions of blocked opportunity, resulting in lowered expectations for their children.

Of course, even harsh financial realities may not keep parents from dreaming of loftier ambitions and a better future for their children. It costs nothing to dream. In fact, comparing parents' educational aspirations for their

---

1 In Table 3-2, note the widely scattered pattern of expectations among adolescents whose expectations exceed those of their parents. The pattern does suggest that many of these adolescents may not understand the requirements necessary to achieve these educational goals.
children, with their educational expectations, approximately one third of parents have educational aspirations which exceed their expectations. \(^2\) More importantly, the tendency for parents to have aspirations which are greater than their expectations is more pronounced in families where children's expectations exceed those of their parents. Table 3-3 presents the log-odds comparing parents' expectations and aspirations, by categories of parent-child agreement. As indicated by the increase of .91 points, parents in C>P families are the most likely to have aspirations which exceed their expectations. These parents, in their influence attempts, may inadvertently be passing on their aspirations to their children, rather than their lowered expectations, which have been tempered by the reality principle.

What this suggests then, is that it is important to be cognizant of the direction of parent-child disagreement. Families in which adolescents' expectations are below those of their parents appear to be different from families in which the situation is reversed. And parents may be correspondingly more concerned with the former condition, adolescents having expectations which are too low, rather

\(^2\) Most of the remaining parents have aspirations which are equivalent to their expectations, and a minority (less than 4%) have aspirations which are lower than their expectations. In addition, parents whose aspirations exceed their expectations are significantly more likely to report that they have not done any specific financial planning for their child's education.
Table 3-3. Parent's Aspirations vs. Parent's Expectations, by Categories of Agreement. Log-odds on Aspirations Greater than Expectations, Relative to Equivalent Aspirations and Expectations.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Asp.}>\text{Exp.} : \text{Asp}=\text{Exp.} & \quad -0.77 \quad [\text{Intercept}] \\
\text{Child} = \text{Parent} & \quad -0.15 \\
\text{Child} < \text{Parent} & \quad 0.91 \\
\end{align*}
\]

L squared = 122.75, 2 df, p<.01
than the latter.

Having considered the overall distribution of parent-child agreement, and some possible interpretations of the varying direction of disagreement, it is now time to turn to a consideration of the effects of parents' social status on agreement.

**THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL CLASS ON AGREEMENT: THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS**

There may be a variety of reasons why parent-child agreement may vary by social class. Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978), for instance, have shown that the consequences, relative impact, and interpretation of life in a particular class position varies among children, adolescents and adults. As such, adults and adolescents within and between class positions may interpret life chances differently enough such that class differences in parent-child agreement are the end result. However, this study is primarily concerned with two processes inside the family which may result in class differences in parent-child agreement. The contention here is that the ability of parents to act as models and definers of educational expectations varies across social classes, resulting in class differences in the likelihood of parent-child agreement.

Consider first, the relative ability of parents to act as educational models for their children. An
individual's educational attainment is one of several indicators of that individual's class position. As such, parents whose educational expectations for their children are equivalent to the level of education that they have attained are able to act as educational models for their children. The literature suggests that this is the case, especially parents with high levels of education who inspire their children to attain similarly high levels of education. As Sewell and Hauser write:

The child who has for a model at least one parent with high educational achievement is likely to develop high educational aspirations. If there are two such parental models, the child is still more likely to develop high levels of educational aspiration (1980, p. 66).

Recent research, such as that of Cohen (1987), also confirms this result; in that study, parents' education was positively correlated with adolescents' aspirations.

However, parents who expect that their children will attain a higher level of education than they have attained are at a disadvantage with respect to modeling. Although they may certainly be able to act as models in other ways, these parents may be less successful at passing on these expectations to their children, precisely because they cannot act as educational models. This assumes, of course, that less educated parents in the &High School and Beyond sample do have a modeling disadvantage, and hence, are at a
modeling disadvantage. The data indicates that this is precisely the case. Table 3-4 presents the log-odds on parents having expectations which exceed their education, relative to parents having expectations which are equivalent to, or are below their own education.

The data in the table clearly show that the trend is quite dramatic. As parents' level of education increases, they are more likely to have expectations for their children which are at least equivalent to their own level of education. Parents with lower levels of education overwhelmingly expect their children to do better than they did, but these higher expectations may put these parents at a relative disadvantage in their ability to pass on these expectations to their children. That is, they are blocked from using an important mode of influence, namely, modeling.

The effects of social class on a parent's role as a definer of educational expectations are likely to be more complex because they involve two distinct issues. First, are their qualitative differences in parents' defining effort by social class? That is, does the content or style of parental messages differ by social class? Do parents at different class levels use different filter categories in the process of defining? Second, are there quantitative differences in parental defining effort across social classes? Do parents at different class levels engage in more or less frequent
Table 3-4. Parent's Education by Relative Expectations. Log-odds on Education Less than Expectations, Relative to Education Equal to or Greater than Expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years College</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L squared = 801.74, 2 df, p<.01
defining effort? Each of these issues will be considered in turn.

Qualitative Differences in Defining Effort

Melvin Kohn (1977) and Kohn and Schooler (1983) have long maintained that individuals' educational and occupational experiences influence their personalities and value orientations. Depending on the social conditions of one's work, Kohn has argued that parents will be more or less likely to value self-direction or conformity for themselves and their children. By conformity, Kohn is referring to "conformity to external authority" (1977, p. xxvii) and conformity to externally imposed standards; while self-direction, according to Kohn, implies "thinking for oneself, making one's own decisions - in short, flexibility" (1981, p. 270). "People who value self direction," says Kohn (1977 p. xxviii), "think it is desirable to try to act on the basis, not of authority, but of one's own judgement and standards." Individuals whose work is substantively complex, non-routinized, and relatively free from supervision will come to value self-direction, rather than conformity, for themselves and their children. Conversely, individuals whose work is routinized, heavily supervised, and less substantively complex will come to value conformity for themselves and their children. These values of
self-direction and conformity may influence the style of parents' influence attempts.

Parents, who, as a result of their education and the social conditions of their work, come to value conformity to external authority, may be more authoritarian in their orientation towards their children. Lower and working class parents are more likely to have a relationship with their children that is authoritarian or autocratic in nature, and are more likely to use commands and imperatives when interacting with their children (Gecas 1977, p. 373,376). Given these results, the efforts of lower class parents to influence their children may also be more authoritarian in nature. That is, in their attempts to influence their children, working class parents may try to impress upon their children the conception that they are the authority to be obeyed, or they may suggest that their children listen to the "expert advise" of external authorities, such as teachers and guidance counselors (Lareau 1987). Furthermore, Kohn documents that working class parents who value conformity are more likely to pay attention to the external consequences of behavior. This suggests that working class parents, in their efforts to influence the educational expectations of their children, may focus more on the external consequences of education, such as the ability to make more money, or get a better job.
Conversely, parents who value self-direction, as a result of their education and occupational position, may use a different style of parental influence techniques in their efforts to influence their children. Gecas (1979) found that parents' social class is positively related to the use of reasoning when interacting with children, disciplinary practices based on a child's motives and intentions, and an equalitarian relationship between parent and child. These inductive techniques have been shown to be related to a variety of traits in children: creativity, self-esteem, social competence and moral behavior (Rollins and Thomas 1979), although, notably, not academic achievement. Melvin Kohn (1977) also found that upper and middle class parents were more likely to focus on the intentions underlying children's behavior when meting out punishment. Furthermore, upper-class, self-directed parents in Kohn's study (p. 51) were more likely to value intellectual curiosity in their children, one type of self-direction, whereas lower-class parents placed more emphasis on their children being good students, or in other words, an emphasis on standards imposed by some external authority.

Recall that defining is conceptualized as a complex process. It involves conveying information about filter categories for ego [the child] and filter categories for the object category that parents wish their children to fill,
and showing that a match exists between them. Thus, successful influence involves focusing on the characteristics of the child, the role the parent wishes the child to fill, and showing that there is a match between the child's individual characteristics and the characteristics of individuals incumbent in the role in question. Lower and working class parents, if their efforts are primarily authoritarian in nature, may fail to do this, as they may be more attuned to the external consequences of receiving or not receiving a given amount of education. Conversely, upper and middle class parents, using inductive influence techniques based on a focus on internal and/or intrinsic motivations, may have a greater repertoire of filter categories about the child and the role, from which to draw upon during their attempts at influence. That is, self-directed parents may focus on both internal and external filter categories for ego and object. Compared to their lower class counterparts, they may be more aware of

---

3 There is some evidence of this among parents in High School and Beyond. For instance, while the majority of parents in the sample, at all educational levels, were likely to label "training for a good job" as a "very important" reason for attending college, college educated parents were somewhat less likely to do so than their less-educated counterparts. The log-odds on responding "very important," rather than "somewhat important" to this item were 1.14 for parents with four or more years of college education, and ranged from 1.95 to 2.65 for less educated parents. This difference was statistically significant at the p<.05 level.
the intrinsic benefits of education, and the necessary intrinsic skills needed to be a successful student at a given level of education. As a result, the style and content of parental influence efforts is likely to vary by social class. Subsequently, for a given level of parental defining effort, upper and middle class parents should be more successful at influencing their children's educational expectations than lower and working class parents. 4

4 According to Kohn, parents who are self-directed attempt to instill these same values of self-direction in their children. So, despite parents' interest in their child's education, if parents value a child's sense of self-direction, this might suggest that parental attempts to influence their child's educational expectations are self-defeating, in that they would actually undermine children's self-direction. However, it is probably a mistake to equate parents' valuation of self-direction with a "laizze faire" parenting style or a lack of influence attempts altogether. Socialization, by its very nature, implies that agents impart a sense of direction to the object of socialization, pointing them in socially appropriate directions. Even if individuals are to be ultimately self-directing, they still require information in order to develop standards and make decisions. Thus, while the self-directed adolescent may be permitted greater latitude in decision making than other adolescents, and while self-directed children would probably resent too much parental interference in their education, this is not to say that parents are not a vital source of information and guidance on which an adolescent's decisions about education may be based. Perhaps it is best to say that the bases of power for highly educated parents are more informational, a la French and Raven (1959), than they are for less educated parents. Furthermore, educated parents who value self-direction, may actually point out, in the course of their defining efforts, another intrinsic quality of education: the opportunities for self-direction and expression inherent in education.
Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) notion of "cultural capital" also suggests that there may be qualitative differences in defining behavior across classes. Bourdieu has used the notion of cultural capital to explain the reproduction of social classes from generation to generation. That is, schools and families of the "ruling class" legitimize and pass on a dominant class culture composed of ideas, values, modes of thought and styles of speech, that in turn, form the cultural resources or capital which allow successive generations of a particular class to maintain their dominant position in society. Giroux, in reviewing Bourdieu's ideas, summarizes the idea nicely:

A child inherits from his or her family those sets of meanings, qualities of style, modes of thinking, and types of dispositions that are assigned a certain social value and status in accordance with what the dominant class(es) label as the most valued cultural capital (1983, p. 268).

This class difference in "cultural capital" once again suggests that parents from the upper classes are likely to have defining styles qualitatively different from those of other classes. Parents in the upper classes are more educated and thus are, themselves, the product of educational institutions which aid in the legitimization and reproduction of this cultural resource. As such, these parents can draw upon these ideas and styles in their own influence attempts. That is, highly educated parents have
cultural resources which less educated parents lack, and which can be used in influence attempts.

**Quantitative Differences in Defining Behavior**

It may also be argued that the quantity of defining effort exerted by parents may differ by social classes. Most studies of status attainment report that higher SES parents, according to adolescents' perceptions, are more likely to encourage higher levels of education (Sewell and Hauser 1980; Hout and Morgan 1975). Other studies, such as Lareau (1987), have found that highly educated parents are more likely to get involved in their child's academic career, and feel more comfortable doing so, precisely because the educational system is an institution which espouses, legitimizes and reproduces middle class "cultural capital." This suggests that as parents' educational attainment increases, the frequency and variety of their defining efforts may increase as well. This is because parents with more education may feel more comfortable exerting an effort, may have more information and a greater variety of filter categories, and may have a greater store of "cultural capital" that they can draw upon in their influence attempts. Parents with greater levels of education are already familiar with the world which they expect their children to enter, whereas parents with lower levels of
education may have little direct experience or knowledge of the educational levels they aspire for their children. **Additive effects of modeling and defining**

In sum, these arguments suggest that modeling and defining will have separate, independent effects on the likelihood of parent-child agreement. Furthermore, the effects of the two processes may be additive. If this is the case, then less educated parents may be doubly disadvantaged, relative to their more educated counterparts. If highly educated parents are in fact more successful definers than less educated parents, then those differences, combined with modeling effects, may result in greater disparities in the likelihood of agreement across social classes.

**Other Sources of Class Differences**

Above and beyond the effects of social class on personality, social class may affect parents' ability to act as definers in other ways as well. The number of children in a family is negatively correlated with a family's SES (Blake 1985). Furthermore, children from large families are likely to obtain less education than children from small families, even after SES is taken into account (Blau and Duncan 1967), and the effect of parents' educational attainment on offsprings' educational attainment is greater in large families than in small families (Blake 1985). Larger
families must divide finite family resources among more family members - hence, each family member is allocated a smaller piece of the resource pie. This may apply to all resources, financial and otherwise. The more children in the home, the fewer opportunities parents may have to interact with a specific child, and subsequently, less parental effort may be directed towards a particular child. There is some evidence for this interpretation. Hout and Morgan (1975, p. 376) found that in white families, even after controlling for SES, the number of siblings was negatively related to parental encouragement, suggesting that children may be competing for parental attention in these homes. Furthermore, Nye, Carlson and Garrett (1970) found that parental socialization practices in large families tend to be more authoritarian in nature. This suggests that the effects of social class on the likelihood of successful parental influence may also be influenced by family size.

PARENT'S EDUCATION AS A MEASURE OF CLASS

There are clearly many ways to measure social class, from the well-known Hollingshead index (Hollingshead and Redlich 1958) which combine several components of class into one index, to measures which disassemble the notion of class into its component parts: occupational prestige, relation to the mode of production, educational attainment, etc. Furthermore, the level of measurement of social class ranges
from discrete to continuous. In this study, parents' educational attainment will be used as a single measure of social class. Admittedly, this has several disadvantages, the primary one being that by focusing on a single component of class, much of the information inherent in the notion of social class is thrown away. However, for the purposes of the present analysis, the advantages of using parent's education outweighs the disadvantages.

First, using parent's education simplifies the process of analysis. Given that log-linear techniques are used in the present study, parent's education provides a single measure with well-defined discrete categories for use in cross-tabulation tables.  

Second, by using parent's education, the degree to which parent may act as educational models for their children can be easily assessed.

Third, education is one source of "cultural capital," and is directly related to individuals' valuation of self-direction or conformity. The High School and Beyond data does not provide detailed information about parents' work experiences, above and beyond their occupational title.

---

5 Parent's education, as reported by parents in the High School and Beyond sample, is a ten category variable. Using all ten categories in a crosstab would result in a number of empty cells in a table. To avoid this problem, the parent's education was collapsed into four categories: "Some high school or less," "High school graduate," "Some college," and "Four or more (4+) years of college."
In the absence of information about the conditions of work which serve to instill the values of self-direction or conformity in parents, education is a reasonable proxy measure. Kohn (1977, p.188) argues that education provides or fails to provide the "capability for self-direction" whereas occupational experience provides or fails to provide the opportunity to exercise self-direction. In fact, in Kohn's analysis, the independent effects of education on parental values is actually stronger than the independent effects of occupation on parental values. Of course, Kohn uses both measures - education and occupation - because the effects of the two are additive. What this suggests then, is that the effects of parent's education on agreement may be smaller than the effects of a more comprehensive measure of social class on agreement. This is because a more comprehensive measure of social class might capture the degree to which parents' occupational experiences have subsequently allowed them or prohibited them from capitalizing on their education. However, despite this disadvantage, parent's education is a simpler measure.

THE EFFECTS OF PARENT'S EDUCATION ON AGREEMENT

To begin the analysis of the effects of parent's education on agreement, the bivariate relationship between the two variables will be assessed. Then, the effects of modeling, and the degree to which modeling can explain
differences in agreement by parent's education, will be examined. An analysis of the effects of defining effort on agreement is reserved for subsequent chapters.

In Table 3-5, the log-odds on agreement are presented, as calculated from the crosstabulation of parent's education by agreement. While the data indicate that there is strong relationship between the two variables, the log-odds in the table also show that the association is not a straightforward, linear relationship.

First, looking at the log-odds of agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations below that of their parents \((C=P:C<P)\), it is clear that parents with four or more years of college have an advantage over their less-educated counterparts. The log-odds on agreement are 0.17 points greater than the log-odds for the least educated parents. The difference is slightly greater, when compared to high school educated parents. However, parents with four or more years of college education have the greatest advantage over those parents who have had "some college"; a simple calculation reveals that the difference between the two groups is +0.58! Why might parents with "some college" be particularly disadvantaged? Perhaps modeling works against these parents. Perhaps in these families, it is generally agreed that a college education is a valued goal. However, the adolescents of "some college" parents may see their
Table 3-5. Parent's Education by Agreement. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent's Education</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years College</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L squared = 24.84, 6 df, p<.01
parents as educational models and come to the conclusion that "some college" is sufficient, whereas parents, in contrast, may be urging their children to go beyond them and obtain a four year degree. This modeling issue can be explored below.

The relative advantages of parent's education are less clear when looking at the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations which exceed those of their parents (C=P:C>P). Here the log-odds on agreement are roughly equivalent for the most educated and least educated parents, whereas parents with a high school diploma, and once again, the "some college" parents are at the greatest disadvantage, as indicated by the decline in log-odds of -.23 and -.45 points, respectively.

**Parents' Influence as Educational Models**

As hypothesized, parent's level of education produces substantial differences in the likelihood of agreement. It is the contention of this study that at least some of the effects of parent's education on agreement are due to the relative ability of parents to act as models. Thus, the logical next step in the analysis is to determine the degree to which modeling is important for the likelihood of agreement. Following that, the combined effects of modeling and parent's education on agreement are examined.
To measure the impact of modeling, a modeling variable was created with the following categories:

(1) Parents' education is LESS than their expectations for their children (Ed.<Exp.): These parents expect that their children will eventually attain higher levels of education than they received. As such, these parents cannot act as educational models. Their alternative is to rely on defining techniques in order to influence the educational expectations of their children. These parents make-up nearly two thirds of the High School and Beyond sample.

(2) Parents' education is EQUAL to their expectations for their children (Ed.=Exp.): These parents expect their children will eventually attain the same level of education that they attained. These parents, therefore, can act as models, as well as definers, for their children. These parents comprise another one fifth of the High School and Beyond sample.

(3) Parents' education is GREATER than their expectations for their children (Ed.>Exp.): These parents, a pronounced minority in the High School and Beyond sample, apparently have little faith in their children, as they expect that their children will have less successful educational careers than their own. For families in this category, modeling may actually work against parents' defining attempts. If adolescents of these parents, rather than agreeing with their parents, are more likely to have educational expectations which exceed those of their parents, then this would suggest that these adolescents are paying attention to their parents as models, rather than paying attention to any explicit messages from their parents.

The most interesting characteristic of the MODEL variable, already alluded to in Table 3-4, is the distribution of parent's education in these categories. Over
three fourths of parents with a high school education or less are in the first category (Ed.<Exp.). However, less than one sixth of parents with four or more years of college are in the same category. Rather, they are equally distributed in the remaining two categories.

Table 3-6 presents the log-odds on agreement calculated from the bivariate crosstab of the modeling variable and agreement. The L squared statistic for the table indicates that, as expected, modeling exerts a major influence on agreement. The increase in log-odds on agreement for parents who can act as educational models for their children indicates that parents who are educational models are at a clear advantage over those parents who cannot act as models (Ed.<Exp.), or who choose not to act as models (Ed.>Exp.).

Also interesting is the fact that the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations which exceed those of their parents (C=P:C>P), decline by -.43 points for families where parents' education levels exceed their expectations. Consider the situation of the youth in these families. They are adolescents whose parents apparently have little faith in their ability. These parents expect that their child will not attain the same level of education that they achieved. Yet, these adolescents reject their parents' low estimation of them in favor of higher
Table 3-6. Parental Modeling by Agreement. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental modeling</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;(p)</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &lt; Exp.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. = Exp.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &gt; Exp.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(L\) squared = 65.68, 4 df, \(p<.01\)
expectations. The question is: are these adolescents still using their parents as educational models? Subsequent analysis reveals that the majority of these adolescents, about two thirds, also reject their parents as educational models. They apparently march to the beat of their own drummer, rejecting both their parents' low expectations of them, and their parents' educational level as well!

**Parent's Education and Modeling Combined**

Since modeling has a significant impact on agreement, the next step is to determine if the association between parent's education and agreement is wholly, or in part, attributable to the effects of modeling. Using the data from the three-way cross-tabulation of agreement by modeling by parent's education, it is possible to use hierarchical log-linear models to sort through alternative causal models.  

---

6 Several problems presented themselves in this table. While these presented some difficulties, fortunately, none were sufficiently serious to negate the interpretive value of the table.

First, in order to avoid the problem of zero marginals in the table, because of categories which are, by definition, undefined, parents who are not high school graduates are excluded from the table.

Second, even with the exclusion of least educated parents, some cell sizes in the table were quite small. In one case, a cell contained a "sampling zero" - a zero cell which indicates that families of these types are sufficiently rare such that none fell in the sample. Sampling zeros lead to problems in the calculation of odds and log-odds, since division by zero is undefined. Therefore, as suggested by Knoke and Burke (1980 p.64), citing Goodman (1970 p.64), a value of 0.5 was inserted in
If, on the one hand, the effects of parent's education on agreement are solely a function of modeling, then a log-linear model specifying modeling effects, but no education effects, should be the preferred model. Such a model would imply that modeling is the intervening variable between parent's education and agreement, and that parent's education has no additional effect on agreement. This would also mean that within categories of the modeling variable, parent's education and agreement are independent of each other.

This cell. It should be emphasized that this in no way affected the process of model selection, or the interpretation of the results. Unfortunately however, small cell sizes still have the effect of artificially inflating some of the log-odds in the table, because of small cell sizes. Some examples from Table 3-7 should illustrate this point.

Consider parents who are in the "High school" category, and expect their children to attain an equivalent level of education (Ed. = Exp.). The log-odds on C=P:C<P for these families is quite large, 2.44. This is because very few adolescents expect that they will not graduate from high school.

Some other log-odds in the table are deceptively large as well. Consider parents with four or more years of college, whose expectations exceed their education (Ed.<Exp.) By definition, these are parents who expect nothing less than graduate school for their children. In this situation, there are very few adolescents whose expectations are even loftier than those of their parents, C>P, since by definition, these are adolescents who expect to attain a Ph.D, while their parents "only" expect that they will receive a master's degree! Hence, the log-odds of 2.00 here are artificially inflated, relative to other log-odds in the table.
Alternatively, if modeling helps to explain some, but not all, of the effects of parent's education on agreement, then a model specifying a three way interaction between agreement, parent's education, and modeling should be the preferred model. That is, parent's education affects agreement, partly due to modeling, and partly due to other causes, such as defining. In this case, the effects of parent's education on agreement might be different for each category of the modeling variable.

The data indicate that the latter, rather than the former, causal model is appropriate. None of the hierarchical log-linear models specifying independent associations between modeling, parent's education and agreement, fit the data in the table. Therefore, the saturated model, which exactly fits the observed frequencies in the table, is the preferred model. An attempt was made to fit the data to several additional models, in order to specify the form of the model-parent's education interaction. However, none of these models fit the data. This suggests that the joint model-education effect on agreement is sufficiently complex such that all the degrees of freedom in the table are needed to adequately describe the effects.

7 The additional models tested were a uniform association model, a column effect model, and a row effect model.
Table 3-7 presents the log-odds on agreement, calculated from the saturated model. Within each category of the modeling variable, parents who are high school graduates serve as the base, or intercept, from which the remaining log-odds are calculated.

The effects in the table are quite subtle, however the overall impression one gets from the table is that the ability of parents to act as models helps to specify the parent's education-agreement relationship. The best way to see this is to look at the relationship between parent's education and agreement, within each category of modeling. Within the first two categories of the modeling variable, the relationship remains statistically significant. Within the last category of the modeling variable, Ed.>Exp., the bivariate relationship between parent's education and agreement is no longer statistically significant. More detailed inspection of the table reveals some interesting interactions.

Consider first, the upper panel of Table 3-7, for families in which parent's education is less than their expectations. The L squared statistic for this portion of the table indicates that the differences in agreement across levels of parent's education are statistically significant. This alone suggests that some, but not all, of the effects of parent's education are due to modeling. That is, even
Table 3-7. Parental Modeling by Parent's Education by Agreement. Log-odds on agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &lt; Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years College</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L squared = 26.315, 4 df, p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. = Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years College</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L squared = 87.702, 4 df, p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &gt; Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Graduate</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Years College</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L squared = 4.262, 4 df, n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Model: Saturated Model (observed frequencies)
when parents cannot act as educational models, differences in agreement across levels of parent's education remain!

For the log-odds on $C=P:C<P$, much of the difference between parents who are high school graduates and parents with "some college" disappears. Parents with four or more years of college, on the other hand, preserve their small, yet significant, advantage, as indicated by the .21 point increase in the log-odds on agreement for these families. This suggests then, that for parents with four or more years of college, qualitative or quantitative differences in defining effort may allow these parents to be more successful at influencing their children than their less-educated counterparts. This hypothesis will be investigated further in subsequent chapters.

Much more interesting is the relationship between parent's education and agreement when parents have expectations which are equivalent to their own level of education, in the second panel of Table 3-7. These parents are educational models for their children, and this modeling ability turns the relationship between parent's education and agreement on its head.

In the case of the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations below that of their parents ($C=P:C<P$), parents who are high school graduates have the edge; their likelihood of agreement is higher than
that of any other level of education in this portion of the table. Parents with four or more years of college also appear to act as effective models, although not to the extent of high school educated parents.

Continuing with the second panel of Table 3-7, when considering the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations above those of their parents (C=P:C>P), the differences between the most and the least educated parents all but disappear. However, their log-odds are still positive, once again indicating that modeling is effective for these parents.

If high school educated parents can be as effective, if not more effective, educational models for their children than more highly educated parents, what accounts for the overall differences in agreement across levels of parent's education? The analysis thus far makes the answer clear: while high school educated parents can be effective educational models for their children, more often than not, they do not wish to be! That is, parents who attained a high school diploma or less overwhelmingly wish and expect that their children will be able to go farther than they did. They want better for their children, but to convince their children of this, they must resort to defining techniques. And the preliminary indications from the data here indicate that it may be defining where less-educated parents are at a
disadvantage. Conversely, parents with four or more years of college are, by and large, content to see their children attain the same level of education. Moreover, the data indicate that these parents are effective educational models. The high likelihood of agreement in these families suggests that college expectations are normative.

Of course, there is one anomaly yet to be explained, and that is the case of families where parents have only "some college" - by definition, vocational schooling, a community college degree, or only some college at a four year school. The bivariate relationship between parent's education and agreement suggested that these parents are at a severe disadvantage; compared to all other families, the likelihood of agreement in these families is much lower. The effects of the modeling variable help to explain some of that disadvantage.

When the expectations of these parents exceed their own level of education (Ed.<Exp.), these parents are similar to high school educated parents. Like their less educated counterparts, parents with "some college" must fall back on defining behavior to convince their children to go beyond "some college." At least when it comes to influencing the educational expectations of adolescents, the data in Table 3-7 indicates that "some college" for parents is apparently no better than no college, since the log-odds on agreement
are roughly equivalent to those for high school educated parents, and less than those of parents with four or more years of college.

But the greatest disadvantage, by far, for parents with "some college" education is when these parents expect their children to attain an equivalent level of education. The data indicate that, compared to all other parents, parents with "some college" are notoriously poor educational models for their children. The log-odds on agreement, relative to both C<P and C>P are dramatically lower for these parents, in comparison to both their more and less educated counterparts. Adolescents overwhelmingly reject these parents as models; alternatively, they appear slightly more likely to have higher, rather than lower expectations than their parents. 8 Perhaps this is because of the nebulous status of the vocational or community college degree. The payoff, in terms of additional annual income, from less than four years of college, is considerably less than the returns to education for four years or more of college (Kennedy 1989 p. 39). While adolescents are hardly likely to make such cold and rational calculations, perhaps

---

8 For "some college" parents who act as educational models, the log-odds on C=P:C<P and C=P:C>P, can be easily calculated. The log-odds on C=P:C<P are:

\[ 2.44 \text{ [intercept]} - 3.16 = -0.72 \]

and the log-odds on C=P:C>P are:

\[ 0.57 \text{ [intercept]} - 1.56 = -0.99 \]
they perceive that their parents have accrued benefits from "some college" which are negligible at best. Thus, they subsequently reject their parents as educational models. Given the data, it appears that some of these adolescents, as an alternative, decide that additional education is not worth the effort, and hence, have expectations lower than their parents. A slightly greater proportion of these adolescents appear to make the opposite calculation, perceiving that a greater level of education is necessary, and hence, have expectations which exceed their parents' expectations. Perhaps these adolescents view their parents' decision to forgo a four year degree as a mistake that they wish to avoid.

To a large extent then, the initial hypotheses about parent's education are confirmed. Not only are there parent's education effects on agreement, but these effects appear attributable, in part, to modeling. The remaining differences in agreement due to parent's education suggest that another influence process, defining, may also account for variation in agreement by parent's education. A more detailed examination of these processes is reserved for the next chapter.
RACE DIFFERENCES IN AGREEMENT

This section has two objectives. The first objective is to determine the extent of race differences in agreement. If race differences in agreement exist, a second objective will be to examine the extent to which these differences are a function of parents' education, and their ability to act as educational models for their children.

Theories of Race Differences in Socialization

The nature of race differences in parental socialization, and the subsequent effects of these differences historically has been, and continues to be, a hotly debated topic. The central issue of concern to sociologists is whether observed race differences are a function of social class, and its myriad effects on social behavior and life chances, or rather whether race effects are due to the existence of a distinct racial or ethnic culture. This controversy has been fueled by Wilson's (1980) influential book, The Declining Significance of Race in which he maintained that existing Black-white differences

---

9 The convention followed by McAdoo and McAdoo (1985) is adapted here, such that the term "Black" is capitalized, denoting that Blacks constitute an ethnic, as well as a racial group. The term "white" is left uncapitalized. The term "white" denotes race, but not ethnicity, since whites in the United States are an ethnically heterogeneous group. The term "Hispanic" will also be capitalized. While Hispanics are an ethnically diverse group, at least in the High School and Beyond data, they are predominantly Chicano. When Hispanic and Black youth are referred to as a group, the term "minority" will be used (Wirth, 1945).
in achievement and socio-economic status, while having their historical origins in processes of discrimination and oppression, continue to exist today not because of continued racial oppression, but because of the severely constraining effects of lower class status. Since the appearance of Wilson's book, other authors, such as Willie (1981), have maintained that race is still relevant to the status of Blacks. However, the issue is far from resolved.

With regard to the more immediately salient issue of parental influence, Scanzoni argues from Wilson's perspective that "Black and white families are basically more similar than divergent at the same social class levels" (1985, p. 113). This claim, based on his 1977 study, found that both Black and white parents encourage their children to "get ahead in life." The 1977 study (p. 292) also found, not surprisingly, that the higher the social class level of both Black and white parents, the more likely it was that parents valued autonomous thinking in their children; the lower the class level, the more likely it was that both Black and white parents saw conformity to authority as the most important behavior in their children. Despite these similarities among Blacks and whites at the same class level, Scanzoni (1985, p. 117) concludes that, overall, Black parents are more likely than their white counterparts to emphasize education as the primary route to mobility.
This may be because of Black parents' perceptions of racial discrimination which, historically, has blocked other routes of mobility.

The view that, net of social class effects, the socialization styles of Black parents are distinctly different from those of their white counterparts has been expressed by several scholars concerned with Black family issues. These writers argue that Black parents espouse and believe in the same middle-class American norms as white parents. However, despite this similarity, it has been suggested that Black parents face a "triple quandary" when socializing their children (Boykin and Toms 1985). Specifically, Black parents are confronted with three competing socialization contexts: "socialization in the mainstream of American society, socialization informed by oppressed minority status, and socialization linked to a proximal Black cultural context that is largely noncommensurate with the social dictates of mainstream American life" (Boykin and Toms 1985, p. 46). The authors argue that this makes the task of socialization for Black parents much more complex than it is for white parents.

In addition to Scanzoni, there does seem to be some evidence that Black parents place a greater emphasis on education than white parents. Peters (1985), in her discussions with Black mothers of very young children, found
an awareness and emphasis among these mothers that education was an important route to mobility for their children. Although, since Peters lacks a comparison group of white mothers, it is unclear whether white mothers, under similar circumstances, would report different attitudes about education. More significantly, Hout and Morgan (1975) report higher levels of parental encouragement among Black parents than among white parents. Additionally, Black parents' encouragement was less dependent on parents' socio-economic status than white parental encouragement.

Parents in the High School and Beyond data appear to be like those in the Hout and Morgan sample. The bivariate relationship between race and parents' expectations indicates that minority parents \(^{10}\) are significantly more likely to have lower expectations for their children than their white counterparts. However, this initial difference is deceptive. When controlling for the effects of parent's education, most race differences in parental expectations evaporate. In fact, the only remaining statistically significant race difference is among those parents with the least amount of education: parents who did not graduate from high school. In this group, minority parents were actually

\(^{10}\) Black and Hispanic parents were not significantly different from one another. Partitioning revealed that these groups of parents could be collapsed together into a single category.
likely to have higher expectations for their children than their white counterparts.

Clearly then, minority parents are in the mainstream when it comes to educational expectations for their children. That is, minority parents "buy into" the general cultural ethos of individual achievement and the importance of education as much, if not more, than white parents. And perhaps, less educated minority parents, as indicated by the high expectations they have for their children, are reacting to Boykin and Tom's second socialization context as well. For these parents, their high expectations may be a rational reaction to their oppressed minority status. Education may represent the best, and perhaps the only mechanism available to their children if they are to overcome their status as an oppressed minority.

Still unresolved however, is whether Black parents can successfully transmit this mainstream orientation to their adolescent children. The evidence, and the arguments in the literature, are mixed. Boykin (1983) suggests that there is a distinctive Black culture. Furthermore, Boykin and Tom maintain that Black parents are generally unaware that they are transmitting this particular cultural style, or even the African origin of such a style. They go on to say that,
Suffice it for now that it is difficult to put spirituality, communalism, a rhythmic-movement orientation, expressive individualism, an affective orientation and the likes in the service of mainstream institutional strivings... in spite of their [Black Americans] intentions [to participate in mainstream institutions] their own cultural habits may continue to get in the way. In any case, they are unlikely to be aware that such habits are cultural (1985, p. 42).

In a similar vein, Ogbu writes about the distinctiveness of Black family socialization styles, but frames these socialization styles within Boykin's second socialization context, that of the Black family's oppressed minority status:

On the one hand, parents espouse the need to work hard in school and to get more education than they themselves did. On the other hand, the same parents teach their children verbally and through their own life experiences of unemployment, underemployment, and other discriminations, as well as through gossip about similar experiences among relatives, neighbors and friends - through the actual texture of life in the home and community [his emphasis] - that even if the children succeed in school they may not make it as adults in the wider society (1981, p. 149).

If writers like Ogbu and Boykin and Toms are correct, then Black parents' efforts to influence their children may be less successful than the efforts of white parents. The arguments of these authors implies that when Black and white parents exert the same level of effort, the "payoff," in terms of the likelihood of agreement, will be
lower for Black parents. For these writers, the lower "payoff" would be seen as the result of a cultural style outside the mainstream, or as a latent consequence of the pessimism engendered by the Black family's caste-like status in society.

However, there are several counterpoints to this argument. First, Hout and Morgan (1975, p. 384) did not find the effects of parental encouragement on children's own educational aspirations to be lower among Black parents.  

Second, Boykin and Tom (1985), for instance, do not suggest a schema for operationalizing their typology of Black families. Little subsequent research has been done, and the distribution of Black families, or Hispanic families, across the three socialization contexts: cultural, minority or mainstream, is presently unknown. Furthermore, even Boykin and Tom caution that there is no single Black family experience. They suggest instead, that Black families can be characterized as mainstream, minority or Black cultural in their orientation toward socialization and child-rearing. But, even then, they argue that no family is likely to

---

It is also worthwhile to note that Gottfredson (1981) cautions against an interpretation of the differences in the size of regression coefficients in Black-white models of status attainment as being indicative of real race differences. She points out that model specification, operationalization of constructs and differences in statistical procedures often make such interpretations suspect.
operate purely within one of the three socialization contexts. Last, Boykin (1983) suggests that the distinct Black cultural socialization style emphasizes, among other things, affect, expressive individualism and orality. Boykin suggests that these socialization styles are at odds with mainstream cultural orientation; perhaps the opposite is the case. These expressive socialization styles may actually make Black parents more successful at influence than white parents.

The class vs. race controversy has been applied to the study of Hispanic, and particularly, Chicano families as well. Ybarra (1983, p. 92) writes that, much like early research done on the Black family, research on the Chicano family tended to have a pejorative view of Chicano family life. Such a view emphasizes the supposed patriarchal nature of the Chicano family, and parents' excessive demands for obedience and submission on the part of their children. More recent evidence, such as that of Cromwell and Ruiz (1979) refute the stereotypical notions of Chicano family life. An alternative to the pejorative view, that of Alvirez, et.al. (1981, p. 274), identifies several cultural traits which characterize an "ideal cultural type" for Chicano families. These include a greater emphasis on warmth and emotionality among Chicanos than among Anglos, and a decreased emphasis on materialism and competitiveness. Furthermore, a general
ethos of familialism is seen as a characteristic of the Chicano family.

This emphasis on familialism has been interpreted in different ways by different researchers. While Grebler, Moore and Guzman (1970, p. 351) have suggested that this orientation may hinder mobility because it stresses attachment to the family, Alvirez, et.al. (1981) views familialism as more of an adaptive strategy, arguing that it may serve as a supportive force in Chicano families, such that family members support and help one another to achieve individual goals. Furthermore, Alvirez, et.al. notes that, for Mexican Americans, "the family is often the primary source of refuge from what is often seen as a hostile [dominant Anglo] world" (p.275). Once again, it may be that an alternative cultural socialization style may help, rather than hurt, parents' attempts to influence their children.

Taken as a whole, the literature suggests that Chicano parents may be operating under the same triple quandary that confronts Black parents. That is, socialization practices in these families are hypothesized to be a function of three influences: a Chicano cultural tradition, a reaction to oppression and discrimination, and a desire to attain the middle-class socio-economic status which typifies mainstream American society. However, Alvirez,et.al. cautions that, as with the case of Black
families, it would be a mistake to view Chicano families as a homogenous whole.

Given the controversies surrounding issues of race, the consequences of minority status, and socialization, what should one expect the relationship between race and parent-child agreement to look like?

One thing is clear: there should be initial race differences in the level of agreement. This is because, first, minority parents, regardless of educational level, have educational expectations for their children which are similar to, if not greater than, the expectations held by white parents. Second, minority parents, on the average, have lower levels of education than white parents. In the High School and Beyond sample, minority parents are about one-quarter as likely as white parents to have graduated from high school, and about half as likely to have completed some level of education beyond high school. Consequently, there is a greater disjunction between the education and expectations of minority parents than there is for white parents. Since parents' ability to act as educational models for their children is associated with a greater likelihood of agreement, minority adolescents should be correspondingly less likely to agree with the educational expectation of their parents because their parents are less able to act as educational models.
Furthermore, if Wilson's view is correct - that social class outweighs, if not outright nullifies the effect of race - then any observed race differences in the likelihood of parent-child agreement are solely a function of race differences in parent's education and the relative ability of parents to act as educational models. Thus, following Wilson's argument, once those effects are controlled, any race differences in agreement should disappear.

Alternatively, the discussion of racial differences in socialization styles speaks to the idea that race differences in agreement may be a consequence of the relative effectiveness of parents' defining efforts, net of any social class effects. However, this hypothesis rests on two largely unproven assumptions. First, it assumes that Boykin and others are correct in their assertion that non-white parents are adapting a distinct cultural socialization style. Second, the hypothesis assumes that this socialization style is at odds with the mainstream culture, despite parents' mainstream ambitions for their children. If these assumptions are true, one would expect minority families, despite parents' valuation of education, to have lower levels of agreement than white families. That is, for this hypothesis to be true, one would expect that minority families would have a lower likelihood of agreement.
than white families, at the same level of defining effort. However, it should be noted that this would only be necessary, but not sufficient evidence, in favor of a cultural socialization explanation of race differences in agreement.

Race Differences in Agreement

To begin the analysis of race differences in agreement, the bivariate relationship between race and agreement will be examined. Then, the issue of whether race differences are a function of parent's education and modeling will be addressed. As with parent's education in the previous section, a discussion of race and defining behavior is reserved for the next chapter.

As expected, an initial examination of the data shows that there are pronounced differences in the likelihood of agreement by race. Table 3-8 shows that for minority families, the log-odds on agreement drop sharply. The positive log-odds for white families indicate agreement is more likely than disagreement, whereas the opposite is true for Black and Hispanic families; minority adolescents are more likely to disagree with their parents' expectations for them. Moreover, in minority

---

Partitioning revealed that there were no significant differences in agreement between Black and Hispanic families. Therefore, the two groups were collapsed into a single "minority" category.
Table 3-8. Educational Agreement by Race. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=\text{P:C}&lt;\text{P}</th>
<th>C=\text{P:C}&gt;\text{P}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model of Independence
L squared = 22.54, 4 df, p = 0.000 (Model rejected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=\text{P:C}&lt;\text{P}</th>
<th>C=\text{P:C}&gt;\text{P}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model of Independence
L squared = 19.28, 2 df, p = 0.000 (Model rejected)
families, disagreement in either direction appears to be about equally likely; minority adolescents' expectations are about as likely to be higher than that of their parents, as they are to be lower.

But the more interesting question is whether these differences can be attributed to the effects of modeling and/or parent's education. To test this, two separate three-way tables are examined: first, agreement by modeling by race, and second, agreement by parent's education by race.

Consider what the different log-linear models might imply about the causal relationship among these variables. If race differences in agreement are due entirely to the effects of modeling, then the preferred hierarchical log-linear model for the table which incorporates parental modeling should be a model which specifies an association between modeling and agreement, and no association between race and agreement. Any other model would imply that race, in and of itself, is an important causal variable. The same argument may be made for the table which incorporates parent's education.

\[\text{footnote}{13}\text{ While it would have been theoretically interesting to do so, it was impossible to examine the four-way table of agreement by modeling by parent's education by race, due to a lack of cases.}\]
In fact, the latter case holds for the relationship between agreement, modeling and race. The preferred log-linear model for the table is a model which specifies separate, independent effects of race and modeling on agreement. Table 3-9 presents the log-odds calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model. The relative effects of modeling and race on agreement replicate the bivariate relationships discussed above. That is, according to the model, minority families are less likely to agree than white families, and families where parents can act as educational models are more likely to agree than families where educational modeling is not possible.

Moreover, the effects of the two variables in the table are additive. That is, while both white and minority parents' ability to act as educational models increases the likelihood of agreement, the likelihood of agreement is still lower in minority families than in white families. Thus, minority adolescents appear more likely than their white counterparts to reject their parents as educational models.

Why is this so? The cultural socialization explanation would imply that parents' defining efforts may adversely affect parents' influence attempts; this is the issue to be investigated in the next chapter.
Table 3-9. Educational Agreement by Modeling variable by Race. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;Exp.</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites/Ed.&lt;Exp.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.=Exp.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.&gt;Exp.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \{(23) \{31\} \{21\} where 1=Agreement, 2=Modeling Variable and 3=Race

$L^2 = 1.57, 4 \text{ df}, p=.814 \text{ (Model Accepted)}$
However, at the same time, as Ogbu (1981) suggests, it is worthwhile to consider the social context in which any influence attempt - modeling or defining - occurs. Adolescents, regardless of race, are not empty vessels waiting to be filled. Rather, they are acting and reacting to the socialization agents around them. As such, perhaps they are reacting to the second socialization context of minority family life - that of oppressed minority status. Among other things, minority adolescents may be reacting to their parents' experiences with unemployment and underemployment. If adolescents come to the conclusion that education did not pay off for their parents, perhaps then, they reject their parents as educational models. In fact, lower returns to education among minority group families are well documented (Kennedy 1989), and the minority families in the High School and Beyond sample are no exception. In the High School and Beyond sample, for most levels of education, returns to education for minority parents, in the form of income, are significantly less than the returns to education for white parents. 14 Thus, perhaps enough outward signs of minority parents' lower returns to education exist to cause minority adolescents to be more likely to reject their parents as educational models.

14 In the calculation of returns to education, gender was used as a control variable.
Still unresolved, however, is the race vs. class issue. That is, while race differences may not be the result of modeling, they may be the result of race differences in parents' education, and the differences in defining styles and cultural capital that are implied by parents' education level. In fact, however, race differences in parents' education fail to explain race differences in agreement in the High School and Beyond sample. The preferred log-linear model for agreement by parent's education by race is, once again, a model which specifies separate, independent effects of race and parent's education on agreement. The model indicates that the effects of race persist, even within different levels of parent's education. As Table 3-10 clearly shows, at every level of parent's education, minority families are less likely to agree than white families.

Thus, the suggestion that the significance of race is declining appears to be premature, at least with respect to parents' ability to influence the educational expectations of their children. Race appears to be a highly salient variable. Moreover, since race differences in the likelihood of agreement do not appear to be a function of either modeling, or of parent's education, the causes of racial differences must be found elsewhere. The persistence of race differences suggests that Boykin's third
Table 3-10. Agreement by Parent's Education by Race. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites/Some High S.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years college</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: [23] (31) (21) where 1=Agreement, 2=Parent's Education and 3=Race

L squared = 2.43, 4 df, p=.876 (Model accepted)
socialization context is one possible explanation. According to this explanation, while minority parents have expectations for their children which may be characterized as "mainstream," their socialization practices may be influenced by a Black or Hispanic cultural context in such a way that, compared to white parents, they are less successful at transmitting these mainstream expectations to their children.

However, alternative explanations cannot be summarily ruled out. In particular, given the dynamic nature of parent-child interaction, it would be unwise to place the onus of responsibility for parent-child agreement, or lack thereof, solely on the shoulders of parents. Recall that Stryker and Serpe's theory of influence suggests that commitment to, and the salience of, the respective roles in parent-child interaction are necessary pre-requisites to successful influence. Thus, perhaps the degree to which minority adolescents are exposed to different sources of influence makes them more resistant to parental influence attempts; this is one avenue which will be explored in subsequent chapters. Furthermore, remembering House's third principle of research into the relationship between personality and social structure, the "psychological principle," the degree to which adolescents experience feelings of powerlessness, and the subsequent impact of
these attitudes on agreement, will be explored as well. This may also help to explain race differences in agreement.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN AGREEMENT

This section considers the effect of one last social status variable on agreement, that of gender. As with the previous section on race differences in agreement, this section has two objectives. The first objective is to determine the extent of gender differences in agreement, considering both the gender of adolescents and their parents. If gender differences in agreement exist, a second objective will be to examine the extent to which these gender effects interact with modeling effects to produce differences in agreement. As with the other social status variables examined in this chapter, a consideration of these variables, in conjunction with defining processes, is reserved for the next chapter.

The Theory and Literature of Gender Differences in Parental Influence

Any discussion of gender differences must begin with a cautionary note. Over the past twenty years, gender roles in the United States have changed, and continue to change,

Continually using the terms "gender of adolescent" and "gender of parent" throughout the text is cumbersome at best. To avoid this, the term "gender" and "gender effect" will specifically refer to the gender of adolescents, whereas the use of the term "parent" and "parent effect" will specifically refer to the gender of parents.
so rapidly, and in such fundamental ways, that any research which utilizes gender as an independent variable risks becoming out-dated due to the pace of change. For instance, Lenore Weitzman (1984), in an informal survey of her undergraduate students at Stanford University in 1983, noted the extent to which students' reports of their parents' educational and occupational expectations for their daughters had become much more non-traditional in nature, as compared to the expectations reported in the scholarly literature several years earlier. Similarly, Oppenheim-Mason and Lu (1988) found that in the relatively short period from 1977 to 1982, nationwide attitudes about gender roles had undergone a major shift towards more non-traditional views. The rapid pace of change, in and of itself, may be a sufficient rationale for including gender as an independent variable in the present study. But it also means that the results of studies which examine the effects of gender on the process of parental influence may be timebound, such that the reliability of their results may decline over time.

There are literally volumes of research on gender differences in the educational and occupational aspirations and expectations of young adults. The literature in this area, until quite recently, as suggested by Weitzman's informal research, cited above, has historically focused on the traditional sex-typing of occupational and educational
aspirations. Furthermore, it is suggested that the degree to which girls, in particular, are either home or career oriented, helps to shape aspirations along more traditional (sex-typed) or non-traditional lines. (Betz and Fitzgerald 1987).

Similarly, the status attainment literature, produced primarily in the 1960's and the 1970's, have reported differences in the formation of parents' aspirations for their children, which were due either to gender, or to an interaction between gender and social class. Studies of status attainment have found that the socio-economic status of parents has a positive effect on the educational aspirations of both sons and daughters. However, depending upon the gender of their children, parents appear to draw upon different sources of information as their expectations for their children take shape. Whereas a son's academic ability may be taken into account by parents in forming educational aspirations (although SES is still the major determining factor), for girls, the effects of SES on parental expectations outweigh the effects of ability (Sewell and Hauser 1980, pp. 66-67). That is, parents place less emphasis on their daughter's ability when forming expectations for their children. This may indicate that, at least with regard to the families studied by Sewell, Hauser and their colleagues, parents, in forming
expectations for their daughters, may be guided more by traditional gender-role norms, than by their daughter's ability. Conversely, if gender, and traditional ideas about gender roles were unimportant to parents, then one would expect that the effects of a child's ability on parents' expectations to be equivalent for both sons and daughters.

However, this body of research focuses more on outcomes — that is, the aspirations of parents and their children, rather than the process of influence itself. The question remains: "What theories lead one to expect differences in the likelihood of agreement by parent and gender of adolescent?" That is, does the process of parental influence differ sufficiently across the four parent-child dyads: mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, and father-son, such that there are systematic differences in the likelihood of agreement, across dyad types? Unfortunately, the literature is less clear on this issue. The few studies which focus on gender differences in the process of influence suffer from the perennial problem discussed by Stacey and Thorne (1985). Stacey and Thorne criticize most studies focusing on gender differences, because, they argue, gender is simply included as an extra variable in these studies, with little thought as to precisely why there should be systematic gender differences in most social processes.
However, within the last decade and a half, greater effort has been devoted to the development of a comprehensive theory of gender differences in socialization, personality, and modes of thought and behavior (Chodorow 1974, 1977; Gilligan 1982; Schaef 1985). Nancy Chodorow's theory of gender socialization is still probably one of the best efforts to develop a theory of gender role socialization which effectively accounts for the most prevalent differences in masculine and feminine personality.

Chodorow suggests that women's personalities are more relational, or characterized by a sense of "communion," while men's personalities are characterized more by a sense of separateness, or "agency." More succinctly, Chodorow writes:

Feminine personality comes to define itself in relation and connection to other people more than masculine personality. For boys and men, both individuation and dependency issues become tied up with the sense of masculinity or masculine identity, for girls and women, these issues are not problematic in the same way (1974, p. 44).

If this is an accurate characterization of male and female personality, then differences in male and female personality alone suggest that adolescent girls may be more amenable to influence from their parents than adolescent boys. This is not to suggest that females are simply more easily influenced than males. Rather, these differences in male and female personality suggest that adolescent girls may be more
likely to seek out, listen to, and seriously consider the opinions of others than adolescent boys. That is, compared to boys, girls might be more likely to view their parents as a valuable source of information. And, if this is the case, then one might expect the likelihood of parent-child agreement on educational expectations to be greater for adolescent girls than adolescent boys.

However, in addition to the outcomes of socialization described by Chodorow, the process of gender-role socialization which Chodorow describes also suggests that there may be gender differences in the likelihood of parent-child agreement. Chodorow's theory, while largely derived from psychoanalytic theory, is distinctly sociological in that she argues that gender role socialization is different for boys and girls because the traditional family structure assigns the primary responsibility for caregiving to mothers. As a result, young children's first identification in life, regardless of gender, is with their mothers. Girls' socialization, then, is largely an extension and continuation of the primary identification with mother. Boys' socialization, on the other hand, involves rejecting that primary identification with mother, and all that is feminine (i.e., not male), in favor of identification with an idealized male role image,
since fathers are largely absent from the caregiving process. 16

Given the gender differences in identification suggested by Chodorow, there may be gender differences in the selection of parents as appropriate educational models. Identification with a parent, in psychoanalytic terms, may be a profoundly more powerful process than the selection of a parent as an educational model in that identification suggests more than just modeling. According to Schellenberg (1978, p. 28), identification is, in a psychological sense, the individual becoming the external object (of identification). However, the definition of modeling provided by Woelfel and Haller (1971) in chapter one

16 Of course, this suggests then, that the crucial independent variable is not simply gender of parent, but rather family structure. Stephan and Corder (1985), for instance, predicted and found, to some extent, that in dual-career families (i.e., families where both parents have high prestige jobs, not just families where both parents have jobs), adolescent girls were more non-traditional in their gender role attitudes and work and family plans than adolescent girls in traditional families (i.e., families in which the father works in a high prestige occupation and the mother is not employed outside the home.) Unfortunately, when applied to the High School and Beyond Sample of families, this dichotomy excludes most of the families in the sample; the remaining number of families are too small for useful analysis. Furthermore, Stephan and Corder explain the greater non-traditional attitudes of daughters in dual-career families in terms of fathers' greater involvement in child rearing in these families, although they do not test this hypothesis. More recent studies (Hochschild 1989) suggests that one cannot automatically assume that dual-career families will have greater paternal involvement in child rearing activities than other families.
suggests that there may be some similarities. Recall, that according to their definition, "ego [the child] considers the others [the model] to be a member of the same category as himself [sic]; the other's actions help define that category and consequently his conception of himself" (p. 76). This would suggest then, that adolescents may be more likely to pay attention to the same gender parent as an educational model. Subsequently, daughters should be more likely to agree with the expectations of their mothers than their fathers; sons should be more likely to agree with the expectations of their fathers than their mothers.

However, Chodorow's theory suggests that male gender-role socialization, by necessity, involves an almost total rejection of all that is feminine, whereas female gender role socialization does not involve a similar rejection of all that is masculine. This would suggest that, while adolescents may be most likely to rely on the same sex parent as a source of influence, adolescent girls may be somewhat more likely to rely on both parents as a model and source of influence than adolescent boys.

However, the attractiveness of a parent as an educational model may play a role here as well. Some studies, such as Archer (1985), have shown that, in comparison to boys, adolescent girls are more aware of, and express greater concern about, possible future conflicts
between work and family life. Thus, it is not surprising that Betz and Fitzgerald (1987, pp. 44-45), in their review of the literature, cite research which suggests that daughters are more strongly career oriented when their working mothers have successfully integrated family and work roles, and are correspondingly less career oriented when their mothers have experienced difficulty in integrating the two domains. Other research cited by Betz and Fitzgerald (Helson 1971; Oliver 1975; Sostek 1963) suggests that strongly career oriented women are more likely to identify with their fathers than with their mothers. This does not seem surprising in light of the fact that, historically, the benefits which accrue to the highly educated - status, power, and income - clearly have been more evident in males than females. This suggests that the most highly educated parent in a family, regardless of gender, may be the most attractive educational model because of the benefits accruing to that parent as a result of his or her education.

Last, as the status attainment literature cited above suggests, gender variations in parent-child agreement may simply be a result of differences in gender role ideology between parent and adolescent. One would expect that families in which daughters have a gender role ideology which is different than that of their parents will have a
lower likelihood of agreement than families where daughters and their parents have similar gender role ideologies.  

In families where daughters have a more non-traditional gender role ideology than their parents, daughters should be more likely to have educational expectations which exceed those of their parents. This is because, with the exception of sex-typed professions such as nurse or teacher, most occupations traditionally dominated by women, such as clerical and secretarial work, generally do not require a level of education beyond a two year college degree. Alternatively, the vast majority of professions, occupations which were, until quite recently, effectively closed to most women, such as those in the sciences (MacCorquodale 1983), require a level of educational training beyond the two year college degree, such as a bachelor's degree or even a graduate degree. Thus, daughters who have a non-traditional ideology might be expecting to pursue a more non-traditional career path, requiring greater levels of education than a sex-typed career path. Conversely, in families where daughters have a more traditional gender role ideology than their parents, daughters should be more likely to have educational

17 Of course, this leaves unresolved the issue of why parents and children might disagree on issues of gender role ideology, and the possible sources of influence which lead adolescents to form a gender role ideology which is distinctly different from those of their parents.
expectations which are below those of their parents. These daughters may wish to pursue a more traditional career path which requires concomitantly lower levels of education. Presumably, gender role ideology, should have no effect on the likelihood of agreement between parents and their sons, since gender role ideology plays a less important role in the occupational and educational choices of boys than of girls.

Despite advances in the development of theories of gender differences in the process of influence, surprisingly few recent studies have examined gender differences in the process of modeling and defining. Furthermore, the operationalization of modeling and defining varies radically from study to study, which makes generalizations difficult. Saltiel (1985), for instance, relied on adolescents’ self-reports in his study of the relative influence of parents as models and definers. His results are somewhat consistent with the expectations derived from Chodorow’s research. Boys were somewhat more likely to rely on their fathers as definers of aspirations, while daughters were about equally likely to report both their fathers and mothers as sources of influence. Similarly, males were more likely to see their fathers as a model of educational attainment, whereas daughters were about equally likely to see either parent as models. Overall, defining played a greater role than
modeling in the formation of daughters' aspirations, while the reverse was true for sons. Youniss and Smollar's (1985) research, which does not look specifically at the degree of influence exercised by parents, suggests somewhat similar trends. They examined the topics discussed by parents and their adolescent children, and discovered that they vary by the gender of both parent and child. Adolescents in their study reported that they chose to discuss career plans more frequently with the same sex parent, rather than with the opposite sex parent. However, on those occasions when daughters did choose to discuss a topic with their father, it was likely to be a discussion of career plans.

A study done by Cohen (1987), which regressed adolescents' expectations on measures of modeling and defining processes, obtained results which were somewhat different from those of Saltiel. Like Saltiel, Cohen found that parents' role as definers exceeded that of parents as models. However, contrary to Saltiel's results, modeling, as a source of influence, appeared to play a greater role for girls than for boys, whereas defining appeared to play a greater role for boys than for girls. Also, contrary to Saltiel's results, mothers and fathers were about equal in their modeling influence, as long as both parents had attained relatively equivalent levels of education. When the educational attainment of parents was not equal, adolescents
tended to report that the parent with the higher education
was more often a model, rather than reporting that the
same-sex or the opposite-sex parent was more important. This
suggests that the attractiveness of a parent as an
educational model may play a role in making that parent a
source of influence.

Taking this body of theory and research as a whole,
what gender differences in parent-child agreement are
expected? Several hypotheses are suggested:

**Hypothesis 1:** If, as Chodorow suggests, the
personality structures of men and women are
distinctly different, then, all other things
being equal, the likelihood of parent-child
agreement should be greater for adolescent
girls than for adolescent boys.

**Hypothesis 2:** All other things being equal,
adolescents should be more likely to agree
with, and select as an educational model, the
same sex parent. However, if girls are
in fact, less likely to reject all that is
masculine than boys are to reject all that
is feminine, adolescent girls should be more
likely to agree with the opposite sex parent
than adolescent boys.

The *High School and Beyond* data set allows for a
direct comparison of adolescents' and parents' gender role
ideology. As such:

**Hypothesis 3:** When adolescent girls have a
more non-traditional gender role ideology
than their parents, they should be more
likely to have educational expectations
which exceed those of their parents.
Conversely, when adolescent girls have a
more traditional gender role ideology than
their parents, they should be more likely to
have educational expectations which are below those of their parents.

The High School and Beyond data set does not provide any information on the relative success with which mothers integrate home life and work. Lacking such information, and assuming that the higher educated parent is a more attractive model:

**Hypothesis 4:** When the education of parents is not equal, adolescents of either gender should be more likely to use the more highly educated parent in a family as an educational model.

**Gender Differences in Agreement**

To begin, the effects of the different parent-child dyads on agreement was assessed. For a three-way crosstab of educational agreement, by gender (of adolescent) by parent, the preferred model is a model which specifies a separate effect of adolescents' gender on agreement, but, surprisingly, no effect of parent on agreement. Thus, while the gender of adolescent appears to affect the likelihood of agreement, according to the preferred model for the contingency table, mothers and fathers appear equally likely to influence the educational expectations of their children. Table 3-11 presents the log-odds on agreement as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model.

As shown in the first column of the table, the likelihood of parents and children agreeing, relative
Table 3-11. Educational Agreement by Gender of Adolescent and Parent. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$C=P: C&lt;P$</th>
<th>$C=P: C&gt;P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Intercept]

Model: (23) (31) where 1=Agreement, 2=Parent, 3=Gender

$L$ squared = 6.92, 4 df, $p=.14$
to children having lower expectations than parents
\((C = P : C < P)\), is nearly equivalent for boys and girls, since
the log-oddson agreement for girls decline by a negligible
amount, only 0.04 points. However, in the second column of
the table, \((C = P : C > P)\), the utility of a directional measure
of agreement becomes apparent. The magnitude of the gender
difference in agreement is greater; girls are less likely to
agree with their parents than are boys, as indicated by the
-.24 decline in the log-odds on agreement for girls. That
is, contrary to hypothesis one, girls in fact, are less
likely to agree with their parents than are boys. Also
contrary to initial expectations, gender of parent, either
separately, or jointly with gender of adolescent, apparently
has no effect on the likelihood of parent-child agreement.
This suggests that parents may form a united front. That is,
both parents may have the same educational expectations for
their child. However, there is no way to test this with the
available data.

Of course, all other things may not be equal. In
fact, since both mothers and fathers appear more likely to
underestimate the educational expectations of their
daughters, than their sons, this suggests, as hypothesized,
that gender role ideology may play a role. That is,
adolescent girls who have educational expectations which
exceed those of their parents may have a more non-
traditional gender role ideology than their parents. As such, these girls may be envisioning a more non-traditional career path for themselves, requiring concomitantly higher levels of educational attainment, than their more traditional parents are envisioning for them.

Fortunately, the High School and Beyond data set includes three well-known likert scale items, asked independently, of both adolescents and their parents, to measure the gender role ideology of each. The wording of each item, as well as the response which indicates a non-traditional gender role ideology, is presented below:

"A working mother of pre-school children can be just as good a mother as the woman who doesn't work." (Agreement is the non-traditional response.)

"It is usually better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and the family." (Disagreement is the non-traditional response.)

"Most women are happiest when they are making a home and caring for children." (Disagreement is the non-traditional response.)

For each item, adolescents and their parents were classified, as to the traditionality of their gender role ideology, relative to the other. That is, for each item, adolescents were classified as having equivalent, more

---

16 Similar items have been used, among other places, on the General Social Survey. See, for instance, Oppenheim-Mason and Lu (1988).
traditional or more non-traditional gender role attitudes than their parent. Thus, three, three-way crosstabs were examined: gender of adolescent, by the relative traditionality of parent and child for each gender role item, by agreement. The log-odds on agreement, under the preferred model for each table, are presented in Table 3-12.

Regardless of the gender role attitude item in question, the preferred model for each table is a model specifying gender effects, but no gender role attitude effects on agreement. As clearly shown in Table 3-12, regardless of differences between parent's and child's gender role ideology, the gender effect persists. Parents are still likely to have expectations below those of their daughters, even when they agree with the gender role attitudes of their daughters. Perhaps there is an underlying cynicism on the part of parents, such that, even when parents have egalitarian gender role attitudes, they are more pessimistic about their daughters' ability to achieve a given level of education. While beyond the scope of the present project (and the available data), it would be interesting to investigate the source of parental cynicism. Perhaps it is rooted in doubts about women's ability to successfully combine the demands of work and family life. Perhaps it is rooted in some traditional notion, not adequately captured by the gender role items used here, that
Table 3-12. Educational Agreement by Gender Role Ideology by Sex. Log-odds on Agreement.

"Working Mother..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \( \{32\} \{31\} \) where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Gender Role Ideology; 3 = Gender. L squared = 4.38, 8 df, p=.82

"Woman takes care of home..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \( \{32\} \{31\} \) where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Gender Role Ideology; 3 = Gender. L squared = 5.10, 8 df, p=.75

"Women are happiest..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \( \{32\} \{31\} \) where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Gender Role Ideology; 3 = Gender. L squared = 5.75, 8 df, p=.67
a daughter's educational ambitions will eventually be displaced by concerns about marriage and family life. Whatever the cause, however, the apparent cynicism of parents even extends to the aspirations which parents have for their daughters. Earlier, it was noted that in families where adolescents had expectations which exceeded those of their parents, parents were still likely to have high aspirations for their children, even if they did not expect these aspirations to be fulfilled. However, this is less often the case for the parents of daughters than the parents of sons. A separate analysis indicated that in families where adolescents have expectations greater than those of their parents, the likelihood that parents' aspirations exceed their expectations is greater for sons than for daughters. The log-odds of parents having aspirations exceeding their expectations in these families is -.56 points lower for the parents of daughters than for the parents of sons. That is, the parents of daughters in these families, apparently, are not just more likely to expect that their daughters will achieve lower levels of education, they are more likely to aspire to less education for their daughters as well.

Alternatively, perhaps the persistent gender differences shown here reflect qualitative or quantitative differences in defining behavior on the part of parents, as
they attempt to influence their sons and daughters. If parents' defining behavior is qualitatively or quantitatively different when applied to sons than when it is applied to daughters, this might help to explain why the gender effect in agreement persists. This issue will be explored in the next chapter.

Parents as Educational Models: Gender or Education Effects?

The remaining question to be dealt with in this section is with regard to gender differences in the use of parents as educational models, and the resulting effects, if any, on parent-child educational agreement. Hypothesis four predicts that when parents in a family have the same level of education, adolescents should be more likely to select the same gender parent as an educational model. Conversely, when the parents in a family have different levels of education, there is reason to believe that adolescents will select the more highly educated parent as an educational model, because that parent, by virtue of his/her education, is thought to be the more attractive model.

Testing for these effects using log-linear models presented two major problems. First, in the High School and Beyond study, only one parent in each family was interviewed. While data on the educational attainment of the other parent is available, data on the educational expectations of these parents for their children is not.
Thus, it is impossible to determine precisely if, in a given family, the parent who is not interviewed is, in fact, more influential. The second problem in this analysis is the sheer number of variables involved in testing the hypothesis: gender of parent and child, educational agreement, modeling effects, and the relative education of both parents in a family. Generating a cross-tabulation which includes all these variables would be ineffective, since a large number of cells in such a table would have zero cases, making a useful analysis impossible. Furthermore, the large number of models to be considered for any table which includes more than four variables makes log-linear analysis unwieldy at best.

In order to surmount these problems, several variables were combined, and only families in which parents have unequal levels of education were examined. These families are, in fact, in the majority in the High School and Beyond sample; they outnumber families with equally educated parents by approximately two to one. If a parent's attractiveness as an educational model is more important than a parent's gender, then adolescents will be more likely to choose the more educated parent as an educational model. This assumes that a parent's greater education, and the corresponding occupational prestige and power that a parent
may enjoy as a result of his/her greater education, makes the parent with more education a more attractive model to the adolescent.

For families in which parents' education was unequal, a four way crosstab was generated: agreement by the modeling variable, by a new variable, "dyad," by a variable which indicated a parent's relative level of education within a family — whether or not the parent interviewed in each family was the more highly educated parent. The variable, "dyad," simply indicates whether an

19 In fact, not surprisingly, the parent with more education in High School and Beyond families is more likely to be the parent with the high prestige job (as defined by Stephan and Corder (1985)).

20 The modeling variable was discussed earlier in this chapter. Two points should be reiterated here. First, simply examining the relationship between adolescents' expectations and parents' education as an indication of adolescents' preferences for models, as Cohen (1987) did, is an ineffective strategy for this study. This is because such a strategy ignores the crucial question of what parents actually expect for their children, which, in turn, affects agreement. Thus, while all parents may be educational models for their children, not all parents wish to be, since clearly, many parents expect their children to achieve higher levels of education than they attained. Incorporating parents' expectations, as well as their education, into the modeling variable reflects this.

Second, while parent's expectations are incorporated into both the educational agreement variable and the modeling variable, this does not mean that the two variables are automatically confounded with one another, since neither variable is a simple additive function of parents' expectations. Thus, while there are good theoretical reasons to expect that the modeling variable, as defined in this study, and educational agreement, as defined, are associated with one another, there are no a priori statistical reasons for the association to occur.
adolescent and his/her parent make up a same sex parent-child dyad or an opposite sex dyad.

While the High School and Beyond data is not suitable for investigating the relative influence of parents within a family, it is possible to compare those families where the interviewed parent is the most educated parent in the family, with families where the interviewed parent is the less educated parent in the family.

If adolescents choose parents as educational models based on a parent's level of education, then the preferred log-linear model for this table should be a model indicating a joint "modeling" and "parent's relative education" effect on agreement, and no dyad effect on agreement. Furthermore, under this model, the greatest likelihood of agreement should be for those families in which the interviewed parent has more education than his/her spouse, and that parent's expectations are equivalent to his/her level of education (Ed.=Exp.). Conversely, if the gender of parent affects an adolescent's choice of educational models, then the preferred log-linear table should be a model which specifies a joint "dyad" and "modeling" effect on agreement.

As Table 3-13 clearly shows, it is the former situation, rather than the latter, which is the case for the families in the High School and Beyond sample. That is, the preferred model for the table specifies a joint "modeling-
Table 3-13. Families in which Parents have Unequal Education. Educational Agreement by Parental Modeling by Dyad by Relative Education of Parents. Log-odds on Agreement.

**Interviewed Parent has Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &lt; Exp.</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. = Exp.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &gt; Exp.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spouse has Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &lt; Exp.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. = Exp.</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &gt; Exp.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \{432\} \{421\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Modeling; 3 = Dyad; 4 = Parent's Relative Education
L squared = 14.06, 12 df, p=.29
parent's relative education" effect on agreement. That is, the effects of modeling on agreement are positive (i.e., the likelihood of agreement increases) when the interviewed parent is the more educated parent in a family. Conversely, the effects of modeling on agreement are negative (i.e., the likelihood of agreement declines) when the interviewed parent is the less educated parent in a family.

Thus, the likelihood of agreement is greatest, when the interviewed parent is the more educated parent, and when those parents have expectations for their children which are equivalent to their own level of education. The log-odds on C=P:C<P for these families are \(-.13 + .87 = .74\), and the log-odds on C=P:C>P are \(.11 + .37 = .48\). Conversely, consider families in which interviewed parents have less education than their spouses and these parents expect their children to attain the same level of education that they attained (Ed. = Exp.) Here, the log-odds on C=P:C<P are \(.35 + .16 = .51\), and the log-odds on C=P:C>P are \(.07 - .62 = -.55\). These latter log-odds are particularly interesting, since they suggest that, rather than aspiring to the level of education of their least educated parent, these adolescents expect to attain higher levels of education, perhaps as high as their more educated parent. 21

21 It is worthwhile to note, however, that the more educated parent is, not surprisingly, more likely to be a father than a mother.
Thus, parents' gender does not, apparently, play a role in their ability to influence their children. In families where parents have equivalent levels of education, adolescents are apparently equally likely to view either parent as an educational model. In families where parents have unequal levels of education, the parent with the greater level of education appears to be more influential, at least as an educational model. Furthermore, the gender of adolescents has an effect on the likelihood of parent-child agreement, in that parents, despite their professed gender-role ideology, appear to be consistently more likely to have lower expectations for their daughters than their daughters have for themselves.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter began with the premise, taken from House (1981), that "components of social structure are relevant for understanding ... differences in attitudes and behavior." Thus, parent's education, race, and the gender of both parent and child, were all predicted to have systematic effects on the likelihood of parent-child agreement. While, with the exception of parent's gender, all these variables had an impact on the likelihood of agreement, the effects of these social statuses on agreement were far more complex than initially predicted.
Thus, while parent's education did affect agreement, the trend was far from linear. That is, greater levels of education among parents did not always result in greater levels of agreement, in part, due to differences in parents' willingness to act as educational models for their children. Similarly, while a family's race affected the likelihood of agreement, the question of why those effects are present is still unanswered. Contrary to the claims of pundits who suggest that the significance of race is declining, the race effects uncovered in this chapter cannot be easily explained away by differences in racial differences in parents' educational attainment. Similarly, gender differences in agreement cannot be explained by differences in the gender role ideologies of parents and their children.

Thus, taking a cue from House's (1981) proximity principle, which suggests that sociologists need to trace the effects of "micro-social phenomena" on the individual, the next chapter examines the effects of parents' defining behavior, or effort, on the likelihood of agreement. Perhaps, as has already been suggested, it is systematic differences in defining behavior, among families in different positions in the social structure, which produce the differences in agreement which have been uncovered in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4
THE PROXIMITY PRINCIPLE:
DEFINING BEHAVIOR AND AGREEMENT

The major theoretical task outlined in House's (1981) proximity principle is to discover how macro-social structures "affect increasingly smaller social structures and ultimately those micro-social phenomena that directly impinge on the individual" (p. 540). The central argument of this study is that parents' defining behaviors are precisely the type of micro-social phenomena which are influenced by larger social structures. Ultimately, parent-child interactions are expected to impinge upon adolescents in such a way that they lead to the formation of educational expectations. Thus, the quantity and quality of parental defining behavior, or effort, is expected to be related to the likelihood that parents will successfully influence the educational expectations of their offspring. That is, the level of effort exerted by parents is expected to be positively related to the likelihood of educational agreement. It is the task of this chapter to investigate the relationship between indicators of parental effort or defining behaviors, and educational agreement.

More specifically, this chapter has two objectives. The first objective is to describe the bivariate relationship between parental effort and educational agreement. The second objective is to determine if the
relationship between parental effort and educational agreement helps to explain some of the structural relationships uncovered in the previous chapter. That is, parental effort may serve as an important intervening mechanism between some of the social structural variables described in chapter three, and educational agreement.

THE OPERATIONALIZATION OF INDICATORS OF PARENTAL EFFORT

The High School and Beyond data set contains several items, some asked of adolescents and some asked of their parents, which may be used as measures of parental effort. Stryker and Serpe suggest that "the measurement of effort involves estimating two separate dimensions: frequency of attempts to exert socialization influences and the intensity of the attempts made" (1983, p. 67). Smith (1983) also argues that the intensity or vigor with which a parent supports a particular position is likely to be related to successful influence. The variables available for this study vary in the extent to which they measure these dimensions. More often, they imprecisely measure the frequency of effort, or the simple presence or absence of effort, rather than the quality of effort attempts. Despite this, just as Stryker and Serpe hypothesize, it is expected that the presence of parental effort, or of high levels of effort,
will increase the likelihood of parent-child agreement on educational expectations.

Furthermore, effort is defined as "energy directed toward a socialization outcome" (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 57). Acock (1984) notes that most research has shown that the gross quantity of parent-child interaction is unrelated to parent-child agreement; parents and children may spend a great deal of time together without ever discussing a particular issue. Instead, he argues that when a particular issue is the focus of interaction, and when parental beliefs are concrete and unambiguously presented, the likelihood of parent/child agreement will increase. Unfortunately, the measurements of effort available in the High School and Beyond data set are rarely specific enough to allow one to infer that parental effort is directed exclusively toward the transmission of educational expectations. More often, the measures of effort in High School and Beyond deal with interactions between parents and children which may be indirectly related to the transmission of educational expectations: discussions about issues such as school grades or programs of study. However, these may still be important forms of parent-child interaction. During these discussions, parents consciously and unconsciously provide information about filter categories for self and object to their offspring. In doing so, parents may be influencing the
educational expectations of their children. However, it is unclear which form of effort or defining will have the greatest impact on parent-child agreement.

A further distinction must be made in that effort, when exerted, may be exerted by both parents and children. Stryker and Serpe suggest that when effort is exerted by parents, it is for the purpose of influencing their offspring. However, children's motives for exerting effort are less clear and are probably more varied. Children may make an effort to interact with their parents precisely because they are seeking guidance. In these situations, they are probably receptive to parental influence. Alternatively, children may seek to interact with parents for the purpose of influencing them - attempting to impose their own values or expectations upon their parents. Unfortunately, the variables available in the High School and Beyond data set yield little information as to which party most often initiates parent-child interaction. However, differences in question wording, and comparisons of adolescents' and parents' reports may yield some important clues.

With these potential problems in mind, the following questionnaire items from High School and Beyond are used as indicators of parental effort, or defining behavior, in this study.
Are the following statements about your parents true or false?

My mother (stepmother or female guardian) keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.

My father (stepfather or male guardian) keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.

These two questions deal with the simple presence or absence of effort on the part of parents. Although the specific goal of these efforts is not explicitly stated, it seems fairly likely that the desired outcome is good grades. By extension, parents who exert effort to insure their child's adequate progress in school may, in the process, provide information to their children about filter categories for themselves, and filter categories for various levels of educational attainment. Furthermore, these parents may have high expectations for their children, and may have an interest in transmitting those expectations to their children. Thus, keeping track of schoolwork may be correlated with more explicit parental efforts to influence their children.

Other questions regarding parent-child interaction, as reported by adolescents, include:

How often do you spend time... talking with your mother or father about personal experiences?
- Rarely or never
- Less than once a week
- Once or twice a week
- Every day or almost every day
How much have you talked to (your mother) (your father) about planning your school program?
Not at all
Somewhat
A Great Deal

These questions deal with the frequency of interaction between parents and children. The latter question deals more explicitly with issues which are directly related to future plans; the former, less so. As with the other measures of effort, the answer to the question, "Whose effort?" is still ambiguous. The wording of the second question implies that the interaction is initiated by adolescents, given the use of the phrases such as "How much have you talked to ..." rather than "How much have your parents talked to you about ...," although the question cannot really be resolved by this study.

One last measure of parental effort in the High School and Beyond data, are parents' responses to the following question:

Parents differ in how much and when they talk to their children about their plans for after high school. How much would you say that you [have] talked with your son/daughter about his/her plans for after high school?
Not at all
Somewhat
A great deal

This question reports on the frequency of parent-child discussions regarding post-high school plans,
and thus, has considerable face validity. During these types of discussions, parents may tell their children what expectations they hold for them, and may try to influence their children if they deem it appropriate or necessary.

Given that the gross frequency of parent-child interaction has been shown to be unrelated to agreement in previous research, it seems likely that questions dealing with "school plans" or "school programs" will be more strongly related to agreement, than questions which deal with unspecified parent-child interaction. Once again, during discussions of school plans, parents may be more likely to pass information regarding filter categories to their offspring, than in other kinds of discussions.

THE BIVARIATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EFFORT AND AGREEMENT

To begin the analysis, the bivariate relationships between the effort variables and educational agreement were examined. Table 4-1 presents the statistics associated with the bivariate cross-tabulations of each effort variable by educational agreement.

As shown in the table, only two of the effort variables are associated with educational agreement at the \( p = .05 \) level of statistical significance. They are, "Talking to parents about planning their school program," as reported by adolescents, and parents' report that they talked to
Table 4-1. Statistics for the Bivariate Crosstabulations of Effort Variables by Educational Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk to parents about planning school program</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents keep track of school work</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with parents about personal experiences</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss post high school plans in 6th or 7th grade</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss post high school plans in 8th or 9th grade</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss post high school plans in 10th grade</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Effort</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their children about their plans after high school, their "post-high school plans" when their child was in the 10th grade. Since families were surveyed during the spring of adolescents' sophomore year in high school, this implies that these discussions took place within a year of the survey. 1

The associations between agreement and the remaining effort variables in Table 4-1 are not statistically significant. Furthermore, all attempts to partition the bivariate tables, in order to uncover statistically significant contrasts in the table, were unsuccessful. The amount of time adolescents simply spend talking with their parents is unrelated to agreement. This suggests, as noted above, that while adolescents may spend a great deal of time talking to their parents, that does not necessarily guarantee that a particular subject, such as future educational plans, will ever become a topic of conversation.

The frequency of parents' discussions with their children about post high school plans, in the years prior to tenth grade are also unrelated to agreement. This may indicate that, prior to high school, adolescents' concepts

---

1 For the sake of brevity, the "Talking to parents about planning their school program," effort variable will, henceforth be referred to as the "school program" effort variable. The "discussion of post-high school plans in the 10th grade" effort variable will be referred to as the "post high school plans" effort variable.
of their self-identity and the world around them may be too variable and unrealistic for parental attempts at influence to have any real impact. Historical effort, a measure of parental effort over time, \(^2\) may have no effect on agreement for the same reason.

"School Program" Effort and Agreement

Table 4-2 presents the log-odds on agreement, for the bivariate crosstabulation of the "school program" effort variable, by agreement. As shown in Table 4-2, when parents talk to their children a "great deal" about planning their high school program, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having lower expectations \((C=P:C<P)\), increases slightly, by +.08. More significant perhaps, is the fact that as parents increase their level of effort, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having higher expectations \((C=P:C>P)\), decline dramatically. The decline in log-odds is .41 for parents who have talked to their

\(^2\) This variable was created by summing parents' responses to the three items regarding parent-child discussions of post high school plans in grades six or seven, eight or nine, or ten, respectively. Those parents who responded with at least "Somewhat" on any two of the three items, and "A great deal" on at least one of the three items were classified as having exerted a consistently "high" level of effort over period spanning sixth through tenth grade. Those parents who responded with a maximum of "somewhat" or "not at all" on all three of the items were classified as having exerted a consistently "low" level of effort over the same time period.
Table 4-2 "School Program" Effort and Agreement. Log-odds on Agreement.

"Talk to parents about planning school program"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;0</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All (None)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \{1\} \{2\} where 1 = agreement; 2 = "School program"
L square = 19.17, 4 df, p = .000 (Model rejected)
children "somewhat," and .60 for parents who have talked to their children a "great deal" about planning their school program. Compared to families in which parents exert little effort, the children of parents who exert greater effort are more likely to have expectations which exceed those of their parents. This suggests that in the process of helping their adolescent children plan their school program, parents may provide information about filter categories for self (the child), or for some objects, such that adolescents' conceptions of what they are capable of, and hence, their educational expectations, increase to the point where they actually exceed the expectations of their parents. One might say that parental effort in this case is "too successful."

Also, recall that in families where children's expectations exceed their parents' expectations, parents are actually quite likely to have aspirations for their children which are greater than their expectations for their children. This, once again, suggests that parents are probably less concerned when their child's expectations exceed their own expectations for the child, than when their child's expectations are below the level of education that parents expect the child will eventually attain.

Recall from chapter 3 that the modeling variable also reduced the likelihood of parent-child agreement, relative to children having higher expectations than parents.
That is, when parents had a level of education which exceeded their expectations for their children, rather than agreeing with their parents' low expectations for them, children were likely to have higher expectations than their parents. It was suggested that these adolescents are using their parents' level of education as models for their own educational expectations. Since the "school program" variable appears to have a similar impact on the likelihood of agreement, it is worthwhile to examine the combined effects of both "school program," and the modeling variable, on agreement.

First, it should be noted that there is a weak association between the modeling variable and the "school program" variable. Compared to parents whose expectations are equivalent to, or are below their own level of education, parents whose expectations exceed their own level of education are somewhat more likely to spend a "great deal" of time helping their children with the planning of their school program. 3 These parents hope and expect that their children will attain higher levels of education than they themselves have attained. Since these parents do not

---

3 In the bivariate cross-tabulation of modeling by the "school program" variable, when compared to other parents, the log-odds on "Great deal," relative to "Some" or "None," increased by +.17 for parents whose expectations exceeded their own level of education. The L squared for the table was 3.663 (p<.10).
wish to act as educational models for their children, the only way they can hope to influence their children is through defining behaviors. As such, these parents may recognize that in order to pass these high expectations on to their children, they may have to exert greater amounts of effort than other parents.

The three way cross-classification of educational agreement by "school program," by the modeling variable, suggests that when extra effort is exerted by these parents, it pays off. The preferred log-linear model for the table is a model which specifies independent effects of "school program" and "modeling" on agreement. The log-odds on agreement under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-3.

The log-odds in Table 4-3 indicate that the effects of the two independent variables on agreement approximately replicate the patterns of the bivariate associations.

Consider the case of parents whose expectations exceed their level of education (Ed.<Exp.), and who talk a "great deal" with their children about planning their school program. For these parents, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having expectations lower than those of their parents (C=P:C<P), increase by .13 points. Similarly, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having expectations which are higher than those of their parents
Table 4-3. "School Program" Effort by Modeling by Agreement. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Program</th>
<th>( C=P:C&lt;P )</th>
<th>( C=P:C&gt;P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/ Ed.&lt;Exp.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.=Exp.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.&gt;Exp.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \{32\} \{31\} \{21\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "School program" and 3 = Modeling

L squared = 7.39, 8 df, p = .495 (Model accepted)
(C=P:C>P), decline by .61 points. That is, the log-odds on (C=P:C>P) overall are .56 - .61 = -0.05, which indicates that these adolescents are about equally likely to agree with their parents, or have educational expectations which exceed those of their parents. Thus, even though these parents do not wish to act as educational models for their children, they can increase the likelihood of influence, or of raising their children's expectations, by exerting a "great deal" of effort. Thus, the disadvantage that these parents have because they do not wish to be educational models for their children is reduced when these parents involve themselves in, or help to direct, the school lives of their children.

However, Table 4-3 also indicates that, as suggested in Chapter 3, modeling, plus defining or effort, has additive effects. That is, parents who can act as models and who also exert a "great deal" of effort are at a double advantage. Consider the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having lower expectations than their parents (C=P:C<P). As noted above, parents who are unable to act as models (Ed.<Exp.), can increase the likelihood of agreement by exerting greater effort. Unfortunately however, their absolute likelihood of agreement, 0.08 + .13 = .21, is still lower than that of parents who can act as models (Ed.=Exp.) and who also exert a "great deal" of effort. Among these
parents, their absolute likelihood of agreement is \(0.08 + 0.64 + 0.13 = 0.85\). Thus, regardless of parents' ability to act as definers, at least as indicated by "school program," parents' ability to act as models appears to exert a powerful positive influence on the likelihood of agreement.

One might even argue that the effects of modeling on agreement, at least relative to adolescents having lower expectations than their parents, are stronger than the effects of "school program" effort. Comparing parents who exert no effort with those who exert a "great deal," the log-odds on agreement increase by .13 points. Alternatively, comparing parents who do not wish to act as models (Ed.<Exp.), with those who do (Ed.=Exp.), the log-odds on agreement increase by .64 points. This is unfortunate news for parents who expect their children to go farther in school than they did; the data indicate that even with increased effort, these parents may not be as successful at influencing their children as those parents who can (and do) act as educational models for their children.

"Discussions of Post High School Plans" and Agreement

The other effort variable related to agreement is the "post high school plans (in tenth grade)" variable. Table 4-4 presents the log-odds calculated from the
bivariate cross-classification of this effort variable, by agreement.  

As the log-odds in Table 4-4 indicate, when parents discuss post high school plans a "great deal" with their tenthgrade children, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having higher expectations \((C=P:C>P)\), increase slightly, by .08 points. However, the more interesting contrast is in the first column of the table, which presents the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having lower expectations than their parents \((C=P:C<P)\). Here, as parents increase their level of effort, the log-odds on agreement actually decline by -.22. That is, when compared to the families who exert little or no effort, adolescents whose parents have spent a "great deal" of time discussing post high school plans with them are actually more likely to have educational expectations below those of their parents.

Thus, it appears that the two effort variables actually have opposite effects. This is especially puzzling in light of the fact that the two effort variables are positively and strongly correlated. Families who are

---

\(^4\) A very small proportion of parents, approximately three percent, reported that they did not discuss post high school plans with their children at all, when their children were in the tenth grade. Partitioning of the bivariate table revealed that it was possible to collapse the "not at all" and "somewhat" categories into a single category, without a significant loss of information.
Table 4-4. "Post high school plans" Effort and Agreement. Log-odds on Agreement.

"Discuss post high school plans in 10th grade"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/Some</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: \{1\} \{2\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "Post high school plans" L squared = 8.42, 2 df, p = .015 (Model rejected)
classified in the "great deal" category of the "school program" variable are likely to be classified in the "great deal" category of the "post high school plans" variable as well. 5

To investigate the combined effects of both effort variables on agreement, a three way contingency table of educational agreement, by "school program," by "post-high school plans" was examined. The preferred log-linear model for the table is a model which specifies independent effects of each effort variable on agreement. The log-odds on agreement, as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-5.

The log-odds in Table 4-5 indicate that, in the three way table, the effects of each effort variable on agreement, approximately replicate the patterns of the bivariate associations. Thus, it does appear that the effects of the two effort variables cancel each other out. However, a closer examination of the parameters in the table reveals that this is only the case with regard to the

---

5 Although it appears as if the three relationships: "school program" and agreement, "post high school plans" and agreement, and "school program" and "post high school plans" contradict one another, it is worthwhile to keep in mind that not all of the relationships are linear. That is, the two effort variables are ordinal level variables, and the relationship between them is linear. However, agreement is a nominal variable, with the first and last category always being compared to the middle category. As such, the relationship between effort and agreement cannot be expressed as a simple linear relationship.
Table 4-5  Educational Agreement by "School Program" Effort Variable by "Post High School Plans" Effort Variable.  
Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
<th>[Intercept]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Some</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.40 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.20 *</td>
<td>-.62 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post High School Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.27 *</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, p<.05

Model: \{32\} \{31\} \{21\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "School Program" and 3 = "Post High School Plans." L squared = 1.86, 4 df, p=.76 (Model accepted)
log-odds on agreement, relative to children having expectations which are less than those of their parents (C=P:C<P). Among families who report a "great deal" of effort on both "school program" and "post high school plans," the change in the log-odds is \(+0.20 - 0.27 = -0.07\). That is, for these families, there is a small net loss in the likelihood of agreement, compared to those families who exerted no effort on both variables! However, with regard to the log-odds of agreement, relative to children having expectations which exceed those of their parents (C=P:C>P), the contradictory effect is not statistically significant. Among families who report a "great deal" on the "school program" variable, the log-odds on agreement decline by .62 points. However, the contradictory effect of the "post high school plans" variable, as indicated by the +.16 coefficient for families who report a "great deal," is statistically insignificant. Thus, with regards to the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having expectations exceeding those of their parents, the two effort variables

---

\(^6\) It is generally unnecessary to estimate individual parameters in a log-linear model in order to discuss the effects present in a given model. Preference for a given model implies acceptance of the view of the world under the model. However, the apparent contradictory effects of the two effort variables on agreement deserved closer scrutiny. Therefore, for the models discussed in this portion of the present study, estimates of the statistical significance of the parameters in each model were calculated.
do not work against one another. Rather, one variable has an effect on agreement, while the other does not.

**The Relationship between Effort and Agreement Reconsidered**

An alternative explanation for the contradictory effects of the two effort variables on agreement is possible. In chapter 1, it was suggested that parents' defining behavior may be both explicit and implicit. Explicit defining is interaction in which information about filter categories for self and object are communicated directly from parent to child. Implicit defining encompasses a wide range of subtle defining behaviors, which implicitly communicates information to the adolescent about filter categories for self, and for various educational levels.

In addition, while interaction is clearly a dynamic, ongoing process, the High School and Beyond survey, conducted in the spring of 1980, is a "snapshot" of a single point in time. Thus, while the theory outlined at the beginning of this study suggests that parental effort precedes parent-child agreement, it is impossible to directly infer this causal order from the 1980 High School and Beyond data. Thus, it may be that some forms of parental effort, precede agreement, while other forms of effort are actually parents' reactions to their children's stated
expectations, and signify parental efforts to change those expectations.

The wording of the two effort items discussed in this chapter is suggestive of a particular time order. Consider the case of the "school program" variable. Discussing the content of a school program would seem to be an ongoing process between parents and children which may take place several times a year, over the course of a child's school career. Perhaps at the beginning of each semester, parents and children who discuss school programs discuss issues of course selection, and the options available to children in the schools. As such, these discussions may be a form of implicit defining, in which parents and children discuss the child's interests, strengths and weaknesses, and how school programs may or may not coincide with a child's needs. Furthermore, these discussions deal with concrete issues: what an adolescent plans to do in school in the immediate, as opposed to some distant, future. Additionally, discussions of school programs may be correlated with other forms of parental defining behavior which are not tapped by the items in the High School and Beyond questionnaire. To the extent that these discussions may also provide information to a child about filter categories for self and object, this may be why
the "school program" variable is strongly related to agreement, largely in the predicted direction.

Alternatively, consider the second effort variable, which measures the frequency of parent-child discussions of post high school plans when the adolescent is in the tenth grade. This variable refers to a more immediate behavior on the part of parents and children, since the item refers to parent-child discussions which have presumably occurred in the few months preceding the High School and Beyond survey. And while these discussions may be more immediate, in the sense that they have taken place within a year of the survey, the content of the discussions is probably nebulous and not very concrete: discussions of plans for some distant future. Additionally, the "post high school plans" variable refers to more explicit defining behavior: parent-child interaction which is specifically directed toward a discussion of possible educational plans for the future.

The fact that the "post high school plans" variable has a largely negative effect on parent-child agreement suggests two possibilities. First, it may be that adolescents are rebelling against the explicit efforts of their parents to influence their post-high school plans. Some high school sophomores may simply be unable or unwilling to deal with issues, which to them, may seem of little immediate relevance to their lives. Additionally,
there is some evidence to suggest that when parents place too much emphasis on achievement, adolescents may react by underachieving (Metcalf and Gaier 1987). Although, it is unclear, even in Metcalf and Gaier's study, at what point parental efforts become a deterrent to, rather than an aid to successful influence.

Secondly, it may be that some of the parents who resort to explicit discussions of post-high school plans when their children are in tenth grade are doing so because earlier, and perhaps more implicit defining efforts, such as those indicated by the "school program" effort variable, were largely unsuccessful. If this is the case, and parents are in fact exerting greater effort when their children are in the tenth grade precisely because their children have expectations which are lower than their own expectations, then a rearrangement of the data in Table 4-5 is in order. That is, if the order of causality between "post high school plans" and agreement is reversed, then "post high school plans" becomes the dependent, rather than the independent variable in the table. If parents are in fact reacting to their children's lower expectations, then the data should show that the likelihood of parents exerting a "great deal" of effort, as reported on the "post high school plans" effort variable, is greater when children have educational expectations which are less than those of their parents.
Rearranging the contingency table of "post high school plans" by educational agreement, by "school program" shows that this is, in fact, the case. Under this reinterpretation, the preferred model for the table is a model which specifies independent effects of each independent variable: educational agreement, and "school program" on "post high school plans" effort. The log-odds on a "great deal" of effort, relative to "Some" or no effort, under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-6.

The strong correlation between "school program" and "post high school plans" is evident in table 4-6. The log-odds on a "great deal" of effort increase by 1.36 points when parents exert a "great deal" of effort, on the "school program" effort variable. This occurs, regardless of whether or not parents and children are in agreement, since the preferred log-linear model specifies that the effects of the two independent variables on "post high school plans" are independent of one another.

However, parents are even more likely to engage in a "great deal" of discussion with their children regarding post high school plans when their children have expectations below those of their parents (C<P). In these families, the log-odds on a "great deal" of effort increase by .27 points, as predicted. The data suggest that discussions between parents and children in the tenth grade may be motivated in
Table 4-6 "Post High School Plans" Effort by Educational Agreement by "School Program" Effort Variable. Log-odds on Increased Levels of Effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GD:S/N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C=P/Not at All</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.57 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>1.36 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C &lt; P</td>
<td>.26 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &gt; P</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, p<.05

L squared = 1.86, 4 df, p=.76 (Model accepted)
part, by children having lower educational expectations than their parents.

Last, it should be noted that the log-odds on a "great deal" of effort are statistically insignificant, when children have educational expectations which exceed those of their parents (C>P). This is further evidence that parents may be less concerned when their children have higher expectations than when their children have lower expectations.

Thus, the combined effects of the two effort variables, initially presented in Table 4-5, appear to be, in part, the result of parents' reaction to their children's lower expectations in the tenth grade. However, the data in Table 4-6 also indicate that parents are likely to discuss post high school plans with their tenth grade children even when parent-child agreement already exists. It may be, that when parents and their children already agree on educational expectations, then discussions of educational expectations move from the general to the more specific. For instance, while parents' implicit defining behavior may have resulted in children deciding that they are, in fact, "college material," more specific explicit discussions in the tenth grade may revolve around the choice of a college or a major program of study.
VARIATIONS IN PARENTAL EFFORT

The analysis presented in Chapter 3 showed that parent's education, race and gender of adolescent were all related to agreement. These relationships were, in part, due to the effects of parents' ability and desire to act as educational models for their children. However, it was also suggested that variations in the likelihood of agreement across these social status categories might also be due to differences in defining effort by parent's education, race, and gender. As such, the next step in the analysis is to examine the extent to which social structural variables are associated with parents' defining efforts. 7

A four-way crosstabulation of "school program" by race, gender of adolescent and parent's education indicates that each of these social status variables have independent effects on parents' defining behavior. The log-odds and on defining, as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-7.

Parent's Education

The data in table 4-7 indicates that parents with less than a high school graduation are the least likely to

7 It was not possible to look at all the possible interactions between agreement, effort variables and social status variables. As noted in chapter 2, even with seemingly large data sets, the number of cases is generally not sufficient to look at n-way interactions when n is greater than four.
Table 4-7. "School Program" Effort by Parent's Education, Gender, and Race. Log-odds on Increased Levels of Effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S:N</th>
<th>GD:S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Male/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Yrs. College</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: {432} {41} {31} {21} where 1 = Effort; 2 = Parent's Education; 3 = Gender; 4 = Race.

L squared = 16.89, 20 df, p=.659 (Model accepted)
exert effort, in the form of talking to their children about their school program. Their log-odds on "Some" rather than "Not at all" are .99; their log-odds on a "great deal" rather than "some" are -.82. This indicates that while these parents are quite likely to exert "some" effort in this direction, it is unlikely that they will devote a "great deal" of effort to discussions of school programs with their children.

As predicted in chapter 3, however, levels of effort and parent's education are strongly correlated. As the level of parent's education increases, the likelihood of greater effort increases as well. By far, parents with four or more years of education are most likely to exert effort. Compared to parents who are not high school graduates, the log-odds on "Some:None" for college educated parents increase by 1.48 points, and the log-odds on "Great Deal:Some" increase by .54 points. Recall from chapter 3 that parents with four or more years of college education were more likely to agree with their children than less educated parents. Some of this effect was due to the ability of these parents to act as educational models for their children. However, the fact that these well educated parents are also likely to exert greater levels of effort suggests that the greater likelihood of successful influence among these parents may
be also due to the greater frequency of their defining behavior.

**Race**

Table 4-7 also shows that minority parents are somewhat more likely to exert effort than white parents. While the log-odds on "Some:None" decline somewhat for minority parents, the log-odds on "Great Deal:Some" are .30 points greater for minority parents than they are for white parents. However, the results in chapter 3 indicated that minority parents were less likely to agree with their children than white parents. What this may indicate is that the efforts of minority parents are less likely to result in successful influence than similar efforts of white parents. This issue will be explored in greater detail below.

**Gender**

Last, the data in Table 4-7 indicates that, when compared with sons, parents are significantly more likely to spend a "great deal" of time talking with their daughters about planning her high school program. The log-odds on "Great Deal:Some" increase by .53 for girls. This suggests that the "school program" variable may help to explain the gender differences in agreement reported in chapter 3. Recall that girls were somewhat more likely than boys to have expectations which exceeded those of their parents. Adolescents are also more likely to have expectations which
exceed those of their parents when their parents exert a "great deal" of effort to help them plan their school program. These similar trends suggest that gender differences in agreement may be the result of the greater effort which parents apparently direct at their daughters. Furthermore, while the question of "whose effort" remains unresolved, the greater frequency of discussions among parents and their daughters may indicate, as suggested in the previous chapter, that compared to sons, daughters may be more receptive to parental influence, or more willing to turn to their parents for advise and guidance.

The relationship between social status variables and the "post high school plans" effort variable is considerably more complex, as indicated by the data presented in Table 4-8. For the four-way cross classification of this effort variable by the three social status variables: parent's education, race and gender, the preferred model for the table is a model which specifies a joint parent's education and race effect on effort, and an independent gender effect on effort.

The first thing to note in Table 4-8 is that the gender effect on "post high school plans" is in the same direction as the gender effect on the "school program" effort variable. The parents of daughters are somewhat more likely than the parents of sons to exert "a great deal" of
Table 4-8. "Post High School Plans" Effort by Parent's Education, Gender and Race. Log-odds on "Great Deal" of Effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GD:S/N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than H.S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Male</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.S. Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Male</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Male</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4+ Years College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Male</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: (432) (421) (31) where 1 = Effort; 2 = Parent's Education; 3 = Gender of Adolescent; 4 = Race.

L squared = 2.756, 7 df, p=.906 (Model accepted)
effort on the "post high school plans" variable. The log-odds on "Great Deal:Some/None" increase by +.16 for the parents of daughters.

The joint effect of race and parent's education on the likelihood of discussing post high school plans in the tenth grade are more complex. That is, the effects of race on the likelihood of a "great deal" of effort varies, depending upon parent's education. With the exception of parents who are not high school graduates, at every other level of parent's education, minority parents are more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort than their white counterparts. When compared to white parents, the log-odds on "Great Deal:Some/None" for minority parents increase by .71 points when parents are high school graduates, .57 points when parents have some college education, and .53 points when parents have four or more years of college education. However, recall from chapter 3 that, regardless of the level of parent's education, minority adolescents are less likely to agree with their parents' expectations than white adolescents. This suggests, perhaps, that minority parents are exerting greater levels of effort, at every level of parent's education, precisely because their adolescent children do not agree with the expectations which their parents hold for them. That is, minority parents may be reacting to, and attempting to correct this situation by
having more frequent discussions about post high school plans with their children.

It is possible to rearrange the data in Table 4-8, such that the effects of parent's education on the likelihood of "post high school plans" effort, within each racial group can be ascertained. For the sake of brevity, that data is not presented in tabular form. However, two points should be made. First, among white parents, parent's education has little impact on effort. When college educated parents are compared to less educated parents, the log-odds on greater levels of effort do not differ substantially. Second, for minority parents, parent's education has a positive impact on the likelihood of increased effort, but only to a point. Minority parents with a high school education are much more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort than their less educated counterparts; the log-odds on "Great Deal:Some/None" increase by .72 points for high school educated parents. However, among minority parents, education beyond high school does not yield additional increases in the likelihood of effort. In fact, when compared to parents who have a high school education, the log-odds on "Great Deal:Some/None" actually decline by .15 points when minority parents have four or more years of college.
As hypothesized in chapter 3, levels of defining effort vary substantially, depending upon the social status of parents and their children. Education and parental effort, at least as measured by the "school program" variable, appear to be positively correlated. Furthermore, at every level of education, minority parents appear to exert more effort than their white counterparts. Last, the data indicate that parents discuss the planning of school programs, and post high school plans more frequently with their daughters than with their sons. Given these differences, the next task is to examine the combined effects of the effort variables and social status variables on educational agreement. Once again, this is to determine if parental effort acts as an intervening mechanism between social status variables and parent-child agreement.

PARENTAL EFFORT AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE

Gender and Effort

For the four-way cross-classification of agreement by the two effort variables by gender, the preferred log-linear model for the table is a model which specifies, first, an independent effect of "post high school plans" on agreement, and second, a joint, interaction effect of gender and "school program" on agreement. The log-odds on
agreement, as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-9.

The figures in the table indicate that the effects of "post high school plans" on agreement are equivalent for sons and daughters, and they replicate the pattern of the bivariate association between "post high school plans" and agreement. If parents' discussions of post-high school plans in tenth grade are, in fact, a reaction to their children's low expectations, then the data in table 4-9 indicates that parents react equally to the low expectations of their sons and daughters. That is, if discussions in tenth grade are any indication, parents do not seem any less concerned about the low expectations of daughters than they are about the low expectations of their sons.

The interaction effect of gender and the "school program" effort variable on agreement is of greater interest. Depending upon gender, greater levels of effort actually have opposite effects on the likelihood of agreement, relative to adolescents having lower expectations than their parents (C<P). For sons, greater effort actually reduces the likelihood of agreement; the log-odds on agreement decline by .39 points when parents exert "somewhat" of an effort, and by .05 points when parents exert a "great deal" of effort. For girls, the reverse is true. As effort increases, the log-odds on agreement,
Table 4-9. Educational Agreement by "School Program" Effort by "Post High School Plans" Effort Variable by Gender. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post High School Plans</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.27 *</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Program:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>[Intercept]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>-.39 *</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Program:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>[Intercept]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.37 *</td>
<td>-.63 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.43 *</td>
<td>-.76 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, p<.05

Model: \{432\} \{421\} \{31\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "School Program"; 3 = "Post High School Plans"; 4 = Gender.

L squared = 10.95, 10 df, p=.362 (Model accepted)
relative to adolescents having lower expectations than their parents (C<P), increase as expected. For daughters, the log-odds on agreement increase by .37 points when parents exert "somewhat" of an effort, and by .43 points when parents exert a "great deal" of effort.

The gender-effort interaction takes a somewhat different form when looking at the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations which are greater than those of their parents (C=P:C>P). Here, despite the sizable coefficients, the effects of greater levels of effort on the likelihood of agreement between parents and sons are statistically insignificant. However, for girls, the effects of "school plans" effort on agreement are statistically significant. When parents exert a "great deal" of effort, and direct it at their daughters, the log-odds on agreement decline by .76 points. Put another way, parents' efforts may be seen as being more successful than they anticipated. That is, daughters' expectations are raised above those of their parents.

Thus, it would appear that the gender differences in the likelihood of agreement that were reported in chapter 3, are primarily a function of parental effort, as reported by adolescents. At least according to adolescents' reports, parents are more likely to spend a "great deal" of time discussing school programs with their daughters than with
their sons. And, it would appear that gender differences in the likelihood of agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations which exceed those of their parents, can be attributed primarily to the gender differences in the effects of these discussions on agreement. More frequent discussions with daughters increase the likelihood that girls will have higher expectations than their parents. For sons, the effects are not significant.

If, in fact, girls have more "relational" personalities, as was suggested in chapter 3, this may explain why parental effort has a greater impact on girls than on boys. Conversely, boys may be more resistant to parental messages because of their desire to appear independent and capable of making such decisions on one's own. To reiterate Chodorow's point, "individuation and dependency issues become tied up with the sense of masculinity or masculine identity, for girls and women, these issues are not problematic in the same way" (1974, p. 44). Lastly, while it is impossible to make such a distinction with the available data, it may be that some parents are reacting to their daughters' high expectations. In this light, parents' greater efforts might then be interpreted as an attempt to actually lower their daughters' expectations.
Finally, it should be noted that the data in table 4-9 indicates that, at least for girls, the effect of the "post high school plans" effort variable on the log-odds of agreement is outweighed by the impact of the "school program" effort variable on the likelihood of agreement. Thus, for instance, when parents direct a "great deal" of effort toward their daughters, as indicated by both effort variables, the net effect is to raise the likelihood of agreement by .16 points, relative to children having educational expectations below those of their parents. Thus, it would appear that the "school plans" effort variable is the more crucial effort variable, in that it has substantially greater effects on the likelihood of agreement. Perhaps this is because, as suggested above, discussions about school programs represent a sustained effort on the part of parents, with regard to a concrete issue: school programs in the immediate future.

Parent's Education and Effort

For the four-way cross-classification of agreement by both effort variables by parent's education, the preferred log-linear model for the table is, once again, a model which specifies an independent effect of "post high school plans" on agreement, and a joint interaction effect of parent's education and "high school program" on
agreement. The log-odds on agreement, as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-10.

Not surprisingly, as with all the other tables that have been examined in this chapter, the figures in Table 4-10 indicate that the effects of the "post high school plans" effort variable on agreement remain the same. Once again, if parents' discussions of post-high school plans in tenth grade are a reaction to their children's low expectations, then the data suggest that adolescents' low expectations are of equal concern to parents at all levels of education.

The joint effect of "school program" and parent's education on agreement is of great substantive interest. The data in Table 4-10 indicates that the effects of "school program" varies substantially, depending on the level of parent's education. That is, as parents' level of education increases, they appear to enjoy greater levels of success, defined as parent-child agreement. That is, a given level of defining effort results in a greater likelihood of agreement as parents become more educated.

Consider first, the log-odds on agreement, relative to adolescents having lower expectations than their parents (C<P:C<P). Here, the effect is quite dramatic. When parents have less than a high school education, but spend a "great deal" of time talking to their children about planning their
Table 4-10. Educational Agreement by "School Program" Effort by "Post High School Plans" Effort by Parent's Education. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post High School Plans</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.25 *</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent's Education X School Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than H.S.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>-.38 *</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.92 *</td>
<td>-.99 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.S. Graduate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.04 *</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.39 *</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some College</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.35 *</td>
<td>-.48 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.47 *</td>
<td>-.74 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4+ Years College</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>.40 *</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.99 *</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, p<.05

Model: {432} {421} {31} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "School program"; 3 = "Post High School Plans"; 4 = Parent's Education.

L squared = 17.82, 22 df, p=.716 (Model accepted)
school program, the log-odds on agreement actually decline by .92 points. Conversely, when parents with four or more years of college spend a "great deal" of time talking to their adolescent children about planning their school program, the log-odds on agreement increase substantially, by .99 points. The net result is that, according to the model, the likelihood of agreement, is actually greater for less educated parents when they exert lower levels of effort!

In chapter 3, it was argued that the content of a parent's defining messages varies by that parent's education. Parents with higher levels of education, it was argued, would be better equipped to influence their children than less educated parents. Parents with greater levels of education were hypothesized to have correspondingly greater levels of cultural capital and information from which to draw upon during their attempts to influence their children. The results in Table 4-10 lend credibility to that argument.

It was also noted in chapter 3 that in families where parents have a high school education or less, when parents and children do agree, it is often because children are using their parents as educational models for their own expectations. It has already been noted that less educated parents who exert a "great deal" of effort are often those
parents whose expectations for their children exceed their own level of education. This suggests that when parents do not wish to act as models for their children, they are more likely to resort to defining. Unfortunately, the data in Table 4-10 suggests that, despite these parents' best efforts, they are more likely to be unsuccessful at producing parent-child agreement.

One last thing to note about the data in the first column of Table 4-10 is that, as with the case of girls in Table 4-9, for parents who have at least a high school education, the negative effect of the "post high school plans" effort variable on agreement is outweighed by the positive impact of the "school program" effort variable. For instance, if parents with four or more years of college exert a "great deal" of effort on both effort variables, the net effect on the log-odds of agreement is: 

\[-.25 + .99 = +.74\]

which is a substantial net increase in the likelihood of parent-child agreement, relative to children having lower educational expectations than their parents.
former, as indicated by the negative coefficients, the relationship between effort and agreement approximately replicates the bivariate relationship. That is, as the level of effort increases, the log-odds on agreement decline. Alternatively, among parents who are high school or college graduates, the effects of greater levels of effort on the log-odds of agreement are not statistically significant.

Why might the effects of effort on the likelihood of agreement, relative to children having higher expectations, decline among more educated parents? It may be, that for the children of well educated parents, there are fewer levels of education, above their parents' own level of education, for them to aspire to. As such, the children of these parents cannot have educational expectations much beyond those of their parents. However, a similar explanation does not hold for the children of high school graduates. These adolescents may come to believe that, if their parents could "get by" with a high school diploma, then they can do the same, and end their educational career with a high school diploma.

It was hypothesized in chapter 3 that the greater the education of parents, the more successful parental attempts at influence were likely to be. Thus, it was expected that parents and children from these families would be more likely to agree about educational expectations than
families in which parents had less education. It was suggested that this result would be due to a combination of modeling and defining tactics. The results from Chapter 3 showed that there was a joint parent's education/modeling effect on agreement. In addition, the data presented in this chapter suggests that the effort exerted by higher educated parents is more likely to result in agreement than similar levels of effort exerted by less educated parents. The data also indicate that modeling, plus defining or effort, as measured by the "school plans" variable, have an additive impact on the likelihood of agreement. That is, parents who can act as both models and definers appear to be more successful at influencing the educational expectations of their children than parents who must (or choose to) rely solely on one technique or the other. Thus, the results of this study, suggest that the theory of class effects outlined in chapter 3 is quite plausible. The combination of modeling, plus more effective effort appear to make highly educated parents more successful in their influence attempts than their less educated counterparts.

**Race and Effort**

The last social status/effort combination to be considered, is that of race and effort. For the four-way contingency table of agreement, by both effort variables, by
race, the preferred model for the table is a model which specifies independent effects of each variable on agreement. The log-odds on agreement, as calculated from the expected frequencies under the preferred model, are presented in Table 4-11. The figures in Table 4-11 clearly show that the effects of each variable on agreement replicate the pattern found in each bivariate association.

The most significant trend in the table is the fact that a family's minority group status continues to have a negative effect on the likelihood of agreement, independent of the effects of other variables.

Consider the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having lower expectations than their parents \((C=P:C<P)\). The log-odds for minority parents decline by .51 points. Similarly, the log-odds on agreement, relative to children having expectations which exceed those of their parents \((C=P:C>P)\), decline by .31 points. Thus, while the effects of the effort variables on agreement are similar for both white and minority parents, minority parents, regardless of the level of effort exerted, are still more likely than white parents to have children who do not agree with their expectations.

Why is this the case? While many explanations are possible, two explanations within the symbolic interaction framework of this study, seem most plausible. In chapter 3,
Table 4-11. Educational Agreement by "School Program" Effort by "Post High School Plans" Effort by Race. Log-odds on Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/None/None-Somewhat</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>-.07 *</td>
<td>-.45 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>.13 *</td>
<td>-.65 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post High School Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>-.21 *</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>-.51 *</td>
<td>-.31 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, p<.05

Model: \( {432} \) \{41\} \{31\} \{21\} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = "School Program"; 3 = "Post High School Plans"; 4 = Race.

\( L \) squared = 12.13, 14 df, p=.595 (Model accepted)
it was suggested that non-white parents faced a "triple quandary" when socializing their children. Furthermore, it was suggested by Boykin (1983) that this cultural socialization style may be at odds with the dominant Anglo-American cultural socialization style. Boykin suggests that this socialization style may be a less effective strategy for passing on Anglo-American values to minority children, although no empirical evidence is presented to support that claim. The cultural socialization style, if it does exist, may be merely different, rather than less effective than other styles of socialization. However, if the cultural socialization style described by Boykin is, in fact, detrimental to minority parents' efforts to impress Anglo-American values upon their children, then this would suggest that minority parents may be less successful at influencing their children, regardless of the level of expectations that these parents hold for their children, or the level of effort exerted by these parents. The fact that the likelihood of agreement for minority parents is consistently lower than the likelihood of agreement for white parents, at every level of effort, may indicate that the content of minority parents' defining messages are sufficiently different such that they are ultimately less successful at influencing the educational expectations of their children.
However, a second explanation for the lack of successful defining among minority parents, as yet untested in this study, may be equally plausible. Interaction is a dynamic process, and for successful impact to occur, each party engaged in a given interaction must cast themselves and the other in appropriate roles. That is, as Stryker and Serpe suggest, successful impact or influence is, in part, contingent on the degree to which parents cast themselves (and are altercast by their children) as a "parent" who has the power to influence his/her children. Similarly, successful impact or influence is contingent on the degree to which children cast themselves (and are altercast by their parents) as "children" who are receptive to parental messages. If the parties engaged in interaction have disparate images as to the role identity of the other, messages between the parties may be confused, misinterpreted, ignored, or altogether resisted. Given this, it may be that minority adolescents are less receptive to parental messages than white children.

Why might minority adolescents be less receptive to parental messages than their white counterparts? First, if the role identities of minority children are embedded in extra-familial relationships, this may help to explain the differential level of success between white and minority families. However, it should be noted that, minority
children are apparently no more likely than their white counterparts to name persons outside the family as a source of influence. In fact, the reverse is the case: research evidence suggests that white children are more likely to name persons outside the family as significant others (Scritchfield and Picou 1982).

Alternatively, minority adolescents may be less receptive to parental messages about educational attainment because they perceive such messages as lacking in credibility. There is some evidence to suggest that blacks, while having high self-esteem, are more likely to report feelings and attitudes associated with an external locus of control (Porter and Washington 1979). This sense that individuals' attainment of societal rewards is controlled by external forces over which the individual has little or no control, may be conditioned by perceptions of racial discrimination and oppression. That is, if minority adolescents believe that society will deny them the opportunity to "get ahead," regardless of their personal effort or motivation, then parental messages about educational attainment as a route to upward mobility may go unheeded. Chapter 5 of this study, in keeping with House's psychological principle, will explore these issues in greater detail.
RACE AND EFFORT RECONSIDERED

One additional explanation is still possible. Earlier it was suggested that parents' effort, as measured by the "post high school plans" variable, may be, in part, a reaction to the low expectations of adolescents, rather than a cause of those low expectations. It is worthwhile to consider if this is the case for different types of families, particularly minority families. The greater efforts of minority parents may be due to the fact that, when compared with the children of white parents, minority adolescents are more likely to have expectations which are below those of their parents. Thus, minority parents may be reacting to those low expectations.

Consider a contingency table with "post high school plans" as the dependent variable, and agreement, "high school program" and race as independent variables. The preferred log-linear model for this table suggests that there is an independent effect of race on effort.

The log-odds on a "Great Deal" of effort on the "post high school plans" variable, relative to "Some/None" effort are presented in Table 4-12. The separate race effect indicates that, when compared to their white counterparts, minority parents are more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort than white parents; the log-odds on "Great deal" increase by .39 for minority parents. Furthermore, minority
Table 4-12. "Post High School Plans" Effort by Agreement by "School Program" Effort by Race. Log-odds on Increased Levels of Effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GD:S/N</th>
<th>(\text{Somewhat} )</th>
<th>(\text{A great deal} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Not at All/C=P</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Program</th>
<th>(\text{Somewhat} )</th>
<th>(\text{A great deal} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Agreement</td>
<td>.61 *</td>
<td>1.38 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>(\text{Minority} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C&lt;P} )</td>
<td>.21 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{C&gt;P} )</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Minority} )</td>
<td>.39 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parameters statistically significant, \(p<.05\)

Model: \{432\} \{41\} \{31\} \{21\} where 1 = "Post High School Plans" Effort; 2 = Agreement; 3 = "School Program" Effort; 4 = Race.

L squared = 8.51, 12 df, \(p=.743\) (Model accepted)
parents are more likely to exert greater effort, independent of agreement. That is, minority parents are more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort even if their children already agree with them regarding educational expectations, and regardless of their level of effort on "school plans."

Thus, it is not the case that minority parents are exerting greater effort solely because they are reacting to their children's lower expectations. Minority parents apparently have other reasons for exerting a "great deal" of effort. These parents may view education as so important, that even when their children already agree, these parents make an effort to reinforce their children's expectations.

CONCLUSION

This purpose of this chapter was to explore the degree to which parents' defining efforts affected agreement. As expected, some parental efforts were positively related to agreement. However, not all modes of defining are equally effective in producing agreement. While some measures of effort were not associated with agreement at all, a concrete and specific form of parent-child interaction, the planning of school programs, had strong effects on agreement. In addition, the data in this chapter suggested that parent-child discussions about post high school plans, while children were in the tenth grade, may be
as much a reaction to adolescents' expectations as they are a cause of those expectations.

Effort was also shown to be an important intervening variable. Differences in parental effort helped to explain the relationships between social status variables and agreement which were uncovered in Chapter 3. Parents of daughters, parents with higher levels of education, and minority parents were all more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort, at least as measured by the "school program" effort variable. This greater effort helped to explain gender differences in agreement. It also helped to explain why parents with high levels of education are more likely to agree with their children than other parents. Not only were the levels of effort exerted by educated parents likely to be greater, but, in addition, as hypothesized in chapter 3, the efforts of educated parents appear to be qualitatively different as well. That is, the efforts of educated parents appeared to produce greater returns, in terms of the likelihood of agreement, than similar efforts by less educated parents.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for minority parents. While these parents consistently exerted more effort than their white counterparts, their children were still more likely to disagree than were the children of white parents. However, it is unclear as to whether the lack
of agreement in minority families is due to qualitative differences in effort. Despite their parents' best efforts, minority adolescents may be more resistant to parental attempts at influence. This issue will be addressed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE:
THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL ROLES AND ALIENATION ON AGREEMENT

The goals of this chapter are twofold. The first goal of this chapter is derived from House's (1981) "psychological principle," which suggests that in order to adequately understand the relationship between social structure and personality, one must consider the psychological states of individuals, so as to understand how messages from the larger culture and social structure are received and interpreted. In keeping with this principle, this chapter examines the relationship between adolescent alienation and parent-child agreement. It is expected that alienated adolescents will be more likely to have educational expectations below those of their parents. If this hypothesis is correct, it may help to explain why Black and Hispanic youth, in particular, are more likely than their white counterparts to have expectations which are lower than those of their parents.

A second goal of this chapter is to examine the relationship between the salience of social roles among adolescents, and the likelihood of parent-child agreement. Stryker and Serpe argue that identity correspondence is necessary for successful parental influence to occur. Parents must act in the role of "parents" (and be viewed as such by their adolescent children), and children must
correspondingly act in the role of "children." This identity correspondence is a function of role salience - the degree to which the roles of "parent" and "child" are salient in the respective role hierarchies of both parties. Therefore, this chapter will investigate the effects of adolescent role identity on parent-child agreement. It is predicted that the likelihood of parent-child agreement will decline when adolescents' extra-familial roles are more salient than their "child" role.

ALIENATION AND ITS EFFECTS ON PARENT-CHILD AGREEMENT

The psychological and sociological concept of alienation which is relevant for the present study was developed by Melvin Seeman (1959) and Julian Rotter (1966). Seeman discussed six varieties of social psychological alienation: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, cultural estrangement, self-estrangement and social isolation. This study is primarily concerned with the first dimension, powerlessness, and its relation to parent-child agreement.

Powerlessness, as conceived by Seeman, is "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his (her) own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he (she) seeks" (1959, p. 784).
This definition is congruent with Julian Rotter's (1966) notion of internal/external control:

The degree to which the individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behavior or attributes [internal control] versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself and may occur independently of his own actions [external control].

Adolescents who have strong feelings of powerlessness or external control, may believe, to paraphrase Seeman, that their own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of some outcome. More specifically, they may believe that their own behavior or academic effort will not necessarily increase the likelihood that they will attain a given level of education, or the societal rewards associated with a given level of education. As a result, adolescents who express feelings of powerlessness may be resistant to any parental messages to the contrary. Regardless of parents' expectations, or the effort exerted by parents to convince their children to aspire to a given level of education, adolescents who have strong feelings of external control may be more likely than other adolescents to have expectations below those of their parents.

There is some indirect evidence for this in past research. Gurin and Epps (1975), for instance, found that feelings of internal control among college students were positively related to the prestige score of their
occupational aspirations and their aspirations for graduate school. Seeman cites several studies which suggest that "people who are high in powerlessness tend to be less oriented to learning and achievement in a variety of settings" (1975, p. 98). Among samples of adolescents, Burbach (1972), in one of the few studies of alienation conducted on representative samples of adolescents, found that powerlessness was negatively correlated with grade point average and educational aspirations.

Several items in the High School and Beyond data set attempt to measure feelings of perceived powerlessness among adolescents. All the items have a Likert response format. The items used in the present study are listed in Table 5-1, along with a mnemonic to be used for reference to a given item. All of the items in Table 5-1, with some variation in wording, have been used to measure feelings of control or lack thereof (Gurin and Epps 1975; Robinson and Shaver 1973). A response of "agree" to the first three statements in Table 5-1, GOOD LUCK, UNHAPPY and ACCEPT, indicates feelings of external control or powerlessness; conversely,

---

1. Adolescents in High School and Beyond could also choose a "No opinion" alternative; however, they are excluded from the present analysis. Furthermore, partitioning of the bivariate powerlessness by agreement tables indicated that the "strongly agree" and "agree" categories could be collapsed, as well as the "disagree" and "strongly disagree" categories.
Table 5-1. Items in the High School and Beyond Data set to Measure Feelings of Powerlessness or Internal/External Control.

"Good luck is more important than hard work for success." (GOOD LUCK)

"Planning only makes a person unhappy, since plans hardly ever work out anyway." (UNHAPPY)

"People who accept their condition in life are happier than those who try to change things." (ACCEPT)

"What happens to me is my own doing." (OWN DOING)

"My plans usually work." (PLANS WORK)
Table 5-2. Educational Agreement by Powerlessness Items.

Educational Agreement and:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD LUCK</th>
<th>UNHAPPY</th>
<th>ACCEPT</th>
<th>OWN DOING</th>
<th>PLANS WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 df</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td>2 df</td>
<td>2 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.073)</td>
<td>(.549)</td>
<td>(.257)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Agreement and GOOD LUCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree (Internal)</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
<th>[Intercept]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (External)</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Agreement and UNHAPPY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree (Internal)</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
<th>[Intercept]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (External)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>+.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rejection of the latter two statements, OWN DOING and PLANS WORK, indicates strong feelings of external control.

To begin the analysis, the bivariate relationship between each powerlessness item and parent-child agreement was examined. The top panel of Table 5-2 presents the $L^2$ statistic, degrees of freedom and statistical significance associated with each cross-tabulation of a powerlessness item by agreement. The bottom panel of Table 5-2 includes the log-odds and log-odds ratios on agreement, by powerlessness, for the bivariate relationships which are statistically significant.

Only two of the powerlessness items, GOOD LUCK and UNHAPPY, are related to agreement at the $p=.05$ level of statistical significance. The relationships are in the predicted direction. In Table 5-2, adolescents who disagree with the two statements, and thus express feelings of internal control, serve as the intercept. In comparison, adolescents who express feelings of external control, through their belief that good luck is more important than hard work for success (GOOD LUCK), are less likely to agree with their parents' expectations. This is indicated by the -.58 decline in the log-odds on agreement, relative to having expectations which are lower than their parents (C=P:C<P). Similarly, the decline in the log-odds on C=P:C<P is -.28 for adolescents who agree that "planning only makes
There may be several reasons why a relationship between powerlessness and agreement exists for only two of the five powerlessness items. First, Gurin (1969) and Gurin and Epps (1975) have suggested that it is possible to distinguish between personal control and control ideology. That is, questionnaire items which include a personal reference, such as the pronoun "I" refer to individuals' own personal sense of self-efficacy, whereas items lacking such a personal referent reflect a "control ideology." That is, according to Gurin and Epps, these latter items measure:

Beliefs about the role of internal and external forces in determining success and failure in the culture at large. Choosing the internal statements on these items meant rejecting the belief that success follows from luck, the right breaks, or knowing the right people in favor of the traditional Protestant ethic explanation of success. Such students [in the Gurin and Epps study] consistently held that hard work, effort, skill and ability determine success in life (1975, p. 71).

According to this distinction, the two items which are related to agreement are items which purport to measure feelings about the probability of success in the larger culture, rather than personal feelings of internal/external control. This suggests then, that when adolescents have expectations which are lower than those of their parents, it is not necessarily due to a sense of personal inadequacy,
but rather due to the perception that society does not recognize or reward hard work, and that success is less a function of personal effort than it is a function of random chance. That is, adolescents who have an external control ideology may believe that it is unnecessary to aspire to higher levels of education, because they do not perceive the acquisition of societal rewards as being contingent upon attaining those levels of education.

A second explanation for the statistical insignificance of three out of five crosstabulations in Table 5-2 may be that the items themselves reflect a generalized sense of internal/external control, rather than control, or lack thereof, in a particular sphere of life. Thus, there is no way to determine if adolescents' responses to the internal/external control items refer specifically to their perceptions of the likelihood of educational achievement in the future. As Seeman writes, "The I-E scale was developed as a measure of quite generalized expectancies for control with no particular attention within it to different domains in which control might be exercised (e.g. politics, family, or academic life)" (1975, p. 96).

Lastly, BOTH adolescents and their parents may be experiencing a sense of powerlessness (Renshon 1974), as a result of their common position in the social structure. If this is the case, then feelings of powerlessness may serve
to lower both parents' and children's expectations simultaneously, such that agreement still exists.

This leads to a new question, namely, what causes adolescents to develop an external control ideology? A comprehensive cataloging of the possible causes of external control ideology in adolescents is well beyond the scope of this study (c.f. Calabrese (1987) for a comprehensive review). However, it seems likely that feelings of powerlessness stem from an individual's assessment of his or her social environment. Indeed, this was certainly Marx's contention in his description of workers' lives under the conditions imposed upon them by modern capitalism. With regard to the independent variables under consideration in this study, Black and Hispanic youth are more likely than their white counterparts to live in a social environment which provide limited opportunities for achievement. These adolescents may assess their social environment and come to the conclusion that societal rewards stem more from luck than from hard work, or that people's plans are generally doomed to failure. In fact, there is evidence that lower class and minority group members are more likely to experience greater feelings of external control or powerlessness (Burbach 1972; Gecas 1979, p. 393; Porter and Washington 1979, p. 60).
Furthermore, recall from Chapters 3 and 4 that minority (Black and Hispanic) adolescents were more likely than their white counterparts to have expectations which were lower than those of their parents. This finding was not explained by differences in parent's education across racial groups, or by differences in parents' efforts to influence their children. Perhaps, it is feelings of powerlessness which are responsible for the lower expectations of these youths. Thus, it is worthwhile to consider possible linkages between race, internal/external control ideology and parent-child agreement.

The High School and Beyond data provides evidence that minority youth are more likely than white adolescents to report feelings of powerlessness. Table 5-3 presents the statistics associated with the bivariate crosstabulation of each powerlessness item by race. For four out of five powerlessness items, minority adolescents were significantly more likely to give an external control response than white adolescents. In particular, the log-odds on giving an external control response increase by .89 points for minority adolescents on the "GOOD LUCK" item, and by .60 points on the "UNHAPPY" item.

To summarize thus far: first, minority adolescents are more likely than white adolescents to have educational expectations which are lower than those of their parents.
Table 5-3. Powerlessness Items by Race. Log-odds on External vs. Internal Response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD LUCK</th>
<th>UNHAPPY</th>
<th>ACCEPT</th>
<th>OWN DOING</th>
<th>PLANS WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Sq.</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>16.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept = White adolescents
Second, adolescents who express an external control ideology are also more likely to have educational expectations which are lower than those of their parents. Third, minority adolescents are significantly more likely than white adolescents to give responses consistent with an external control ideology. Taken together, these results suggest that the persistent race differences in agreement found in this study may be the result of differences in feelings of internal/external control among adolescents.

To test this hypothesis, three-way cross classifications of agreement by the powerlessness items by race were examined. Only those powerlessness items which were significantly related to agreement, GOOD LUCK and UNHAPPY, were included in the cross-tabulations. If some proportion of the race differences in agreement is due to greater feelings of powerlessness among non-white youth, then the preferred model for these three way tables would be the saturated model, specifying a three way interaction between agreement, powerlessness and race. Alternatively, if the preferred model is a model which specifies first, a relationship between powerlessness and agreement, and second, no relationship between race and agreement, then it would be possible to conclude that the race effect on agreement is wholly attributable to greater feelings of powerlessness among minority adolescents.
Unfortunately, neither of these interpretations are supported by the data. The preferred models for the three way tables of agreement by powerlessness by race were models which specified separate independent effects of both race and powerlessness on agreement. Furthermore, the race-agreement relationship and the powerlessness-agreement relationship approximately replicate the bivariate relationships in Tables 5-2 and 5-3.

Therefore, greater feelings of powerlessness among minority youth, at least as measured by the available items, do not help to explain why these youth are less likely to agree with the educational expectations of their parents than white youth. The preferred models suggest that even when the responses of minority youth indicate acceptance of an internal control ideology (i.e., they do not feel powerless), these adolescents are still more likely than white youth to have expectations below those of their parents.

THE EFFECTS OF ROLE SALIENCE ON AGREEMENT

In this section, the impact of role salience on educational agreement is investigated. Role theory suggests that, for each individual, identities are arranged in a salience hierarchy. Identities with high salience will be invoked more frequently than identities with low salience.
Congruent with role theory, Stryker and Serpe predict that parents will be more likely to transmit their values to their children when the roles of "parent" and "son/daughter" are more salient for the respective actors in parent-child interaction. This is because, according to Stryker and Serpe:

> The more salient an identity, the more likely will be role performances consistent with the expectations attached to that identity (1982, p. 208).

Given this, one would expect that adults for whom the "parent" role is more salient than other roles will place a greater emphasis upon, and devote more energy to, the value transmission process than adults for whom the "parent" role is less salient. Correspondingly, children for whom the "son/daughter" role is more salient are predicted to be more receptive to parental influence attempts than children whose identities are anchored more firmly in non-familial roles.

By definition, the salience of a given role cannot be discussed in absolute terms, but rather, only in relation to the other roles in an individual's role hierarchy. Furthermore, the salience hierarchy for each individual is likely to be a function of two forces (c.f. Heiss 1981). First, role salience is a function of choice. That is, an individual may choose to play some roles more frequently than others (and place him or herself in situations
conducive to the performance of that role), because of his/her own motives, values and beliefs. Second, role salience is a function of the opportunity structure in which an individual regularly moves, such that an individual may be compelled to play some roles more frequently than others. However, despite the demands of a given structure, Stryker and Serpe suggest that: "the more salient an identity, the more likely a given situation will be perceived as an opportunity to perform the role underlying the identity" (1982, p. 208). That is, even within the available limits of an opportunity structure, individuals may seek to manipulate a situation so as to permit the expression of a salient role identity. Of course, as Stryker and Serpe caution, "choice presumes a social structure that provides options" (p. 208).

In their own research, Stryker and Serpe have focused primarily on social structures which provide those options and on social roles in which individuals are voluntary and willing participants. Correspondingly, their measures of role salience emphasize choice, and have tended to focus upon role salience as a function of beliefs, values and individual preferences. For instance, their questions to measure the salience of individuals' religious role clearly reflect this aspect of role salience:
Think about meeting people for the first time. You want to tell them about yourself so that they'll really know you, but you can only tell them one thing about yourself. Of the following (doing the work you do, being a husband or a wife, being a parent, doing the religious activities you do, something else) which would you tell them (first, next, next)?

Suppose it were a weekend and you had a choice to do the following things (go to a religious service or activity, go on an outing with/visit with your children, catch up on work, spend time with your husband or wife, none of these). Which would you most likely do? Next? Next?"

These questions also imply that individuals explicitly rank their roles in terms of salience. Furthermore, note the degree to which these questions conceptualize the playing of a given role as a function of choice, without reference to any additional constraints or structures which may force a given role to be higher in an individual's salience hierarchy than some other role.

A complete analysis of the degree to which familial roles are a function of choice or structure is beyond the scope of this study. Furthermore, data which explicitly ranks the salience of the familial role in a hierarchy of other roles, is not available in High School and Beyond. Rather, in keeping with Stryker and Serpe's hypothesis that:

The more salient an identity, the more likely opportunities to perform the role underlying the identity will be sought out (p. 208).
the salience of the "son/daughter," role, in particular, is inferred from the number, variety and frequency of various activities engaged in by adolescents. This, of course, assumes that, at least for adolescents, alternative roles, other than that of "son/daughter" are available to be chosen, and that time spent in social structures and networks outside the family is voluntary, rather than compulsory. If a greater proportion of youths' time and energy is devoted to these extra-familial structures and networks, rather than to their immediate family, such that the "son/daughter" role is less salient, then parents are expected to be less influential as a result. Furthermore, the lower salience of the "child" role also implies that adolescents may be exposed to non-familial significant others who may act as alternative sources of educational expectations.

Parental Role Salience

However, before the impact of "son/daughter" role salience is assessed, it is worthwhile to discuss and investigate the salience of the parental role. Data which may be used to measure the salience of adult roles for parents is less available in High School and Beyond than data which may be used to infer the salience of the "son/daughter" role. If role salience is, in part, conceived
as the number of times a given role is invoked across a
variety of situations, at the expense of other roles
(Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 66), then the number of children
in a family may be an appropriate proxy measure of the
relative salience of the parental role. As the number of
children increases, logically and, according to empirical
evidence as well (Berk 1985), parents may be forced to spend
a greater proportion of their time invoking their role as
parents, at the expense of other social roles. If this is
the case, the theory of parental influence would predict
that as the number of children in a family increases, the
likelihood of successful parental influence should increase
as well. The role of "parent" should become increasingly
salient to parents in large families, such that parents will
spend more time in activities appropriate to that role,
including influence attempts, to the point where parental
influence becomes more likely.

Of course, using "number of children" as a measure
of parental role salience does have several disadvantages.
First, the issue of family size as a function of choice,
random chance, or something else, is not entirely
inconsequential. Parents in large families may perform their
role obligations, including attempts at parental influence,
with more or less enthusiasm, depending upon the degree to
which family size was consciously planned by parents. A more
serious issue is the fact that parents have a wide variety of strategies for dealing with children, ranging from help from an extended network of neighbors and kin, to hired help, depending upon a family's social stratum and the age ranges of children in the family (Hochschild 1989). The end result of these strategies may be to reduce the salience of the parental role, by giving parents time to fulfill other role obligations, such as occupational roles. An alternative, but somewhat less likely scenario is that help from outside the family may relieve parents from the obligations of the more mundane parenting tasks, providing them with the necessary "quality time" to fulfill their more important parental role obligations, such as parental influence. Taken as a whole, however, these various factors suggest that the parental role in families of any size is more "made rather than simply played," (Styker 1980, p. 55) according to a rigid script. The end result may that these factors serve to confound the relationship between the number of children in a family and the likelihood of parent-child agreement.

To test the hypothesis that greater parental role salience, as measured by the number of children in a family, subsequently increases the likelihood of parental influence, the bivariate crosstab between the number of children in a family and educational agreement was examined. The
likelihood chi square of 9.64 for the table, is not statistically significant at the p=.05 level of significance, suggesting the absence of a relationship between the two variables. While there is some variation in the log-odds on agreement as family size increases (Table 5-4), extensive partitioning of the crosstab failed to reveal any significant contrasts in the table.

This does not necessarily mean that no relationship exists between parental role salience and agreement. Considering the disadvantages of using family size as a measure of parental role salience, it is perhaps, not surprising that no relationship exists. Indeed, some of the literature reviewed in chapter one suggested that family size was actually negatively related to parental encouragement, and furthermore, that the greater the family size, the greater the likelihood that parents would resort to authoritarian child rearing methods. These previous research results, coupled with the lack of a relationship between family size and educational agreement in this study serve to reinforce the notion that "role salience" is a complex function of choice vs. responsibility: a trade-off between what may be done, and what must be done, time permitting. To reiterate, "Choice assumes a social structure that provides options" (Styker and Serpe 1982, p. 208). While it may be true that as family size increases, parents
Table 5-4. Number of Children in Family by Educational Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: {1} {2} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Number of Children

L squared = 9.64, 10 df, p= .47 (Model accepted)
are forced to spend a greater amount of their time "being a parent," it may also be true that the this greater time is spent performing the more mundane and everyday tasks associated with family life, and that the "quality time" necessary to engage in specific and deliberate attempts to influence children is in short supply. Thus, ultimately, while the role of "parent" may indeed be salient for parents in large families, the absence of a relationship between family size and educational agreement suggests that the effects of this greater salience may be canceled out by the time and energy which parents in large families devote to more mundane tasks. As a result, parents in large families may not spend any more or less time engaging in defining behavior than parents in smaller families.

**Child Role Salience**

The investigation of the effects of "child" role salience on educational agreement may prove more fruitful, primarily because there are more measures available in *High School and Beyond* which may be used to infer the salience of the "child" role among adolescents.

It is predicted that the salience of the "child" role should be positively related to the likelihood of educational agreement for three reasons. First, the greater the salience of the "child" role, the more likely it may be
that the child will be available for attempts at parental influence. Second, the greater the salience of the "child" role, the more willing a receptor the child may be to attempts at parental influence. Third, the greater the salience of the "child" role, the less likely it is that adolescents will be exposed to alternative, non-familial sources of influence. To reiterate a point made in chapter one, "other things being equal, to the degree that a child's identity structure is restricted to that of son or daughter, parents will be effective socialization agents" (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 55).

The first measure of "child" role-salience to be examined may be more accurately referred to as a measure of the degree to which the "child" role is less salient than other roles. If, as Stryker and Serpe maintain, "the more salient an identity, the more likely opportunities to perform the role underlying the identity will be sought out" (1982, p. 208), then one might expect that adolescents who have roles which are higher in their salience hierarchy than the "child" role might seek out, and engage in activities which allow for the expression of those alternative, and more salient roles. This suggests that for adolescents who engage in several extracurricular activities, the "child" role is less salient than other roles. Conversely, the adolescent who engages in fewer extracurricular activities
has a more restricted set of roles, and fewer identities which may serve as a "barrier to parent influence processes or to filter those processes" (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 55). In sum, it is predicted that as the number of extracurricular activities in which adolescents engage increases, the likelihood of educational agreement will decline.

Adolescents in *High School and Beyond* were asked to report whether they had "actively participated" in several types of extra-curricular activities, ranging from athletic teams and band or orchestra to activities such as Junior Achievement or Scouts. A simple additive activity scale was constructed which counted the number of activities in which adolescents reported that they had "participated actively." The bivariate crosstabulation of the activity scale by educational agreement indicates that there is a strong relationship between the two variables. The likelihood chi-square for the table is 42.97 with 16 df, which is significant at the p<.001 level of significance. Table 5-5 presents the log-odds on agreement. Adolescents who checked none of the activities on the list serve as the intercept in the table.

The data in Table 5-5 reveals that the relationship between activities and educational agreement is not a straightforward, linear relationship. The log-odds on
Table 5-5. Number of Extracurricular Activities by Educational Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model: {1} {2} where 1 = Agreement; 2 = Number of Activities

L squared = 42.967, 16 df, p<.01 (Model rejected)
C=P:C<P actually show the greatest increase, +.28 and +.18 points, for adolescents who are engaged in a moderate number (three to four) of extracurricular activities. The log-odds on agreement decline sharply among adolescents who engage in five activities, and then increase again for higher numbers of activities, although not to the peak reached by adolescents engaged in three to four activities. The fact that adolescents who engage in a moderate number of extracurricular activities have the highest likelihood of agreement suggests that such a level of activity may be normative, rather than an attempt by adolescents to escape parental influence or pressure. Furthermore, the process of "overlap" (Stryker and Serpe 1983, p. 58) may apply here as well. If, because of their child's involvement in extracurricular activities, parents also become active in the same networks, then, the likelihood of agreement should increase. This is because the involvement of both parents and adolescents in the same extra-familial networks provides additional opportunities for parents to exercise influence over their children, outside of the traditional parental role.

For the log-odds on C=P:C>P, the shifts in the log-odds are less dramatic, and the trend is more nearly linear.

---

2. Unfortunately, the necessary data on the extent of parental involvement in adolescents' networks is not available.
By and large, as the number of activities increase, the log-odds on agreement decline. That is, as adolescents engage in more extracurricular activities, they are increasingly more likely to have expectations for themselves which exceed those of their parents. As Styker and Serpe suggest, these adolescents, as a result of their roles in these extra-curricular and extra-familial networks, may be exposed to alternative sources of influence which serve to raise their educational expectations. Moreover, the ability of adolescents to engage in, and successfully juggle, a wide variety of activities, and the corresponding role obligations they entail, may convince them that they have the capability to successfully pursue higher levels of education. 3

By and large, the prediction that the likelihood of agreement is negatively correlated with the number of extra-curricular activities in which adolescents engage, is confirmed by the data. While a moderate number of extra-curricular activities appears normative and actually

3 There is some evidence that this is, in fact, the case. Adolescents who have higher school grades are somewhat more likely, on the average, to have educational expectations which exceed those of their parents. Furthermore, there is a slight positive correlation (Gamma = .17) between school grades and the number of extra-curricular activities (c.f. Haensly, et.al. 1986). This suggests that adolescents who are successful in a number of different spheres are also likely to have expectations which exceed those of their parents, perhaps because of the very fact of their success.
conducive to parent-child agreement, higher levels of activities increase the likelihood that adolescents' educational expectations will be different from those of their parents.

The second set of measures of "child" role-salience used in this study, are, once again, not direct measures of the salience of the "child" role. Rather, they are a set of measures which indicate the extent to which significant others from outside the family have attempted to guide and/or influence the adolescent. They measure the extent to which adolescents report that they have talked to their peers, teachers or school guidance counselors about planning their school program, as reported by the adolescent. The wording of the question for each non-familial significant other is equivalent to that used in reference to discussions with parents about planning school programs.

As with the measure of parental effort discussed in chapter 4, the question of "whose effort or initiative" cannot be answered using the available data. That is, even when adolescents report that they have talked a "great deal" to extra-familial significant others about planning their school program, it is impossible to determine whether these conversations were initiated by the adolescent themselves or by the significant others in question. By and large, the literature on significant adults assumes that adolescents
choose to seek out extra-familial significant others, rather than the reverse, although this assumption has not been empirically tested (Galbo 1989). It has been suggested that the concerns of teachers and guidance counselors, are more "universalistic" than "particularistic" (Lightfoot 1978). That is, given that teachers and guidance counselors must be concerned with the needs of a large body of students, the time that they can spend with any one student is limited at best. Most research evidence supports this view; by and large, adolescents report that their parents or other family members are significant others much more often than any other adult (Galbo 1984). Similarly, in the High School and Beyond sample, only 8.3% of adolescents report having talked to their guidance counselors a "great deal" about their school program, and an even smaller percentage, 4.7%, report having talked a "great deal" with their teachers. Therefore, it may be safe to assume that, by and large, those adolescents who have talked a "great deal" with teachers or guidance counselors are either exceptional cases, such that the adult significant other has initiated contact, or that these adolescents have initiated contact on their own.

Perhaps the most effective way to deal with the issue of role salience among adolescents is to look at the relative impact of parents and extra-familial significant
others on the likelihood of parent-child agreement. If adolescents choose to discuss school plans with their parents more often than they do with non-familial significant others, then this suggests that the role of "child" may be of relatively greater salience for adolescents than alternative roles. That is, parents are sought out more frequently, or simply have sufficiently greater opportunities to interact with their children. The predicted end result in this case is that parents should have a greater influence on adolescent expectations than any extra-familial significant other. Conversely, if adolescents report that they discuss school programs more frequently with non-familial significant others than with their parents, then this suggests that the "child" role is less salient than alternative roles. Correspondingly, the non-familial significant others that the adolescent associates with may serve either as barriers to parental influence, filters for parental influence, or as a countervailing influence altogether. As a result, the likelihood of parent-child agreement is expected to decline.

To investigate these effects, agreement was cross-tabulated by parental effort, as measured by the "school program" item, and by each "school program" item corresponding to one extra-familial significant other: peers, teachers or guidance counselors. The preferred log-
linear hierarchical model for all three tables was a model specifying separate effects of each independent variable on agreement. The log-odds on agreement under the preferred model, for each of the three tables, are presented in table 5-6. For each table, adolescents who report that they have not discussed their school program with either their parents or non-familial significant others serve as the intercept category.

The most prominent trend in table 5-6 is that the independent effect of parental effort seen in chapter 4 are sufficiently robust such that they are replicated here, despite the inclusion of the other independent variables. That is, there is a small increase in the log-odds of $C=P:C<P$ when parents exert a "great deal" of effort, rather than "none." Conversely, the log-odds on $C=P:C>P$ decline as parental effort increases. As parental effort increases, adolescents are actually more likely to develop expectations above those of their parents. Furthermore, the effects of parental effort on agreement are essentially the same, regardless of whether parental effort is combined with the peer, teacher or guidance counselor variable.

The effects of extra-familial significant others on the likelihood of parent-child agreement are more difficult to discern. By themselves, they are of little interest. Only when the combined, or additive effects of both parental
Table 5-6. Educational Agreement by School Program Discussions with Parents and Non-Familial Significant Others

Parents vs. Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model \{32\}{31}\{21\} L squared = 8.91, 8 df, p=.350

Parents vs. Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model \{32\}{31}\{21\} L squared = 8.06, 8 df, p=.428

Parents vs. Guidance Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>C=P:C&lt;P</th>
<th>C=P:C&gt;P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Intercept]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model \{32\}{31}\{21\} where 1= Agreement; 2 = Extra-Familial Significant Other; 3 = Parental Effort.

L squared = 1.91, 8 df, p=.983
effort, and extra-familial discussions are examined, can some tentative statements be made.

Peer Effects The first panel of Table 5-6 presents the effects of adolescents' discussions with peers in combination with parental effort. Looking first at the log-odds of $C=P:C<P$, more frequent discussions with peers has a detrimental effect on the likelihood of agreement. In particular, when adolescents have a "great deal" of discussions with peers, and "none" with their parents, the log-odds on agreement decline by -.10 points, compared with the social isolate - adolescents who have no discussions with either parents or peers. What is even more interesting is the combined effect of parent and peer discussions. When adolescents have a "great deal" of discussions with both their parents and their peers, the detrimental peer effect, -.10, nearly cancels out the positive effect, +.12, of parental effort. Consequently, the socially isolated youth, who depends on neither his/her parents nor his/her peers for advise, is as likely to have low expectations (relative to parental agreement) as the youth who has had a "great deal" of discussions with both significant others! Thus, it appears that peers act as a barrier or a countervailing influence to parental effort.

However, the situation is not the same for the log-odds on $C=P:C>P$, the log-odds on educational agreement,
relative to adolescents having expectations which exceed those of their parents. Here, it appears that parent and peer discussions work in concert to actually reinforce high expectations. That is, the log-odds on $C=P:C>P$ decline dramatically as discussions with both parents and peers become more frequent. For instance, the log-odds on $C=P:C>P$ are:

$$-.38 \text{ (peer effect)} -.51 \text{ (parent effect)} = -.89$$

points lower for adolescents who have talked a "great deal" with both parents and peers, than they are for adolescents who have spent no time talking with either group of significant others.

Teacher Effects Galbo reports that:

Little is known as to the difference teachers actually make in the lives of adolescents, or what causes certain teachers to be viewed as more significant by some adolescents (1989, p. 553).

However, in the event that teachers are significant, Galbo reports that what is known is that adolescents generally have quite specific reasons for seeking out teachers: to discuss personal problems, to share similar school related interests, and to ask for advise regarding educational and occupational concerns. This suggests that while teachers' overall impact on adolescents may be limited
in comparison to that of parents, teachers may have a substantial impact on parent-child agreement.

The data presented in the second panel of Table 5-6 suggests that this is the case. In fact, teacher effects on the likelihood of agreement are similar in direction to the peer effects discussed above. However, the magnitude of teacher effects are greater than the peer effects. If adolescents report a "great deal" of discussion with their teachers and none with their parents, the log-odds on $C=P:C<P$ decline by -.29 points. Furthermore, the data shows that the youth who depends on both parents and teachers for advise about school programs is actually less likely to agree with his/her parents than the socially isolated individual who has had discussions with either significant other!! Here the decline in the log-odds of $C=P:C<P$ is:

$$-.29 \text{ (teacher effect)} + .11 \text{ (parent effect)} = -.18$$

Like peers then, it appears that teachers may also act as a barrier or a countervailing influence to parental effort.

However, once again, discussions with both teachers and parents significantly increase the likelihood that adolescents will have expectations above those of their parents. The log-odds on $C=P:C>P$ decline by:

$$-.97 \text{ (teacher effect)} -.53 \text{ (parent effect)} = -1.50$$

points when adolescents report that they have talked a "great deal" with both parents and teachers. This effect is
much larger than the corresponding peer effect, which suggests that teachers may be somewhat better at reinforcing high expectations than peers.

Guidance Counselor Effects The last panel of Table 5-6 presents the effects of teacher discussions in combination with parental effort. Unlike discussions with teachers, discussions with guidance counselors apparently have little effect on the likelihood of agreement, relative to adolescents having expectations below those of their parents. As discussions with guidance counselors become more frequent, the corresponding change in the log-odds of $C\leq P : C<P$ are negligible at best, $-0.01$ and $-0.02$. Thus, even if an adolescent prefers to discuss school plans with a guidance counselor, rather than with his parents, the likelihood of agreement, at least with respect to $C<P$, remains unchanged.

Once again, the log-odds on $C\geq P : C>P$ tell a quite different story, although the combined parent and guidance counselor effects are similar in direction and magnitude to the combined parent and peer effects. Discussions with both parents and a guidance counselor serve to increase the likelihood that adolescents will have expectations which exceed those of their parents. Adolescents who report that they have discussed their school program a "great deal" with both their parents and their guidance counselor have log-
odds on agreement which are 1.50 points lower than they are for adolescents who have not spent any time with either significant other.

The data on the relative effects of parents and non-familial significant others is unambiguous, and, by and large, supports the hypotheses stated above. That is, when adolescents have discussions with non-familial significant others more frequently than with parents, the likelihood of parent-child agreement declines.

However, the order of causality is a primary question here. Consider the fact that parental effort, at least as measured by the "school program" variable, has a consistently positive effect on adolescent expectations. The data in Chapter 4 showed that as parental effort increased, the likelihood that adolescents would have expectations that were at least equal to or above those of their parents increased as well. Recall that this latter trend is apparently not against parents wishes, since nearly one-half of the parents in these families have aspirations for their children which are greater than their expectations for their children!

Compare this with the effects of non-familial significant others. The data showed that as discussions with these individuals became more frequent, adolescents became increasingly likely to have expectations which were simply
different from those of their parents. That is, non-familial significant others do not have a unidirectional influence on adolescents' expectations. The order of causality may be reversed in the case of non-familial significant others. These others may play a reinforcing or reaffirming role, rather than an active role in changing or forming adolescents' expectations. Furthermore, it may be that adolescents are more likely to seek out non-familial significant others to confirm or validate their expectations when their expectations run counter to those of their parents. This interpretation is consistent with the results of past research, including that of Williams, whose data lead him to conclude, at least in the case of teachers, that:

The predominant direction of socialization influence in this teacher-student relationship appears to be opposite to that of traditional arguments. Students' own ambitions affect teachers much more than they are affected by the expectations teachers hold (1975, p. 452).

Thus, parents may play an active role, whereas non-familial significant others may play a more passive role, in the formation of adolescents' educational expectations.

CONCLUSION

The goals of this chapter were twofold. The first goal was to determine the degree to which adolescent attitudes, particularly feelings of powerlessness, affect
the likelihood of parent-child agreement. It was predicted that adolescents who experienced feelings of powerlessness would be more likely than other adolescents to have expectations below those of their parents. The second goal was to determine if the role salience of the "child" role, and adolescents' exposure to alternative sources of influence, affected the likelihood of agreement. It was predicted that as the relative salience of the "child" role declined for adolescents, the likelihood of parent-child agreement would also decline.

The first prediction was confirmed by the data. Adolescent alienation was related to agreement in the predicted direction. However, despite greater feelings of alienation among minority youth, their alienation did not help to explain why these youth, when compared to their white counterparts, are more likely to have expectations below those of their parents. In Chapter 4, it was suggested that white and minority parents may have qualitatively different styles of defining effort, since the defining efforts of Black and Hispanic parents were less likely to "pay off" in terms of parent-child agreement. The elimination of one competing hypothesis -- that of racial differences in feelings of powerlessness -- makes this explanation somewhat more plausible. However, other explanations may still exist. Perhaps some attitude other
than powerlessness is responsible for lowering the expectations of minority youth, relative to the expectations of their parents. 4

The second prediction was also confirmed by the data. When adolescents chose to discuss school programs more frequently with peers, teachers or guidance counselors than with their parents, the likelihood of agreement declined. However, the relative magnitude of these effects varied, depending upon the non-familial significant other in question. Last, discussions with these significant others may actually cancel out the positive effects on agreement produced by discussions with parents.

4 A second explanation is that other agents of socialization may exist, and their cumulative effect may be to make minority adolescents more resistant to defining messages from their parents. However, the data indicate that discussions with peers, teachers and guidance counselors do not explain the race effect.
This study's origins lie in previous research on the status attainment process, which has consistently shown that there is a strong, positive association between the expectations of parents and an offspring's own educational or occupational expectations. However, despite the existence of this link, the dynamics of family life which are responsible for this association are not well understood. Therefore, this study sought to integrate research and theory from status attainment, value transmission and socialization research, using a symbolic interactionist tradition, in an attempt to investigate the conditions under which parents and their adolescent children agree about educational expectations. Agreement is assumed to reflect, in part, parental influence, although it may also reflect adolescents' attempts to influence their parents. This study investigated some of the structural conditions which either aid or obstruct parents' attempts to influence their child's educational expectations. Additionally, this study attempted to identify patterns of family interaction which are most effective for the transmission of values from parents to offspring.
SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The analysis in this study was based on survey data from a 1980 nationwide sample of high school sophomores and their parents, the High School and Beyond data. The dependent variable in this study was parent-child agreement on educational expectations. While agreement may be the outcome of several different processes, it was argued that parent-child agreement is, in large part, the result of parents' attempts to influence their children. Thus, this study sought to identify those variables which affect the likelihood of agreement. The analysis was divided into three parts, as suggested by the guidelines provided by James House (1981) for research on the linkages between social structure and personality.

Chapter 3 was based on House's components principle, which suggests that "components of social structure are relevant for understanding ... differences in attitudes and behavior." Thus, Chapter 3 had two objectives: first, to briefly examine the overall distribution of parent-child agreement among adolescents and parents in the High School and Beyond sample, and second, to examine the effects of parent's education, race and gender on agreement. Congruent with the idea that parental influence is a function of parents' ability to act as educational models and definers, it was proposed that parents' ability to act as such varied.
by these social status characteristics. Thus, parent's education, race, and the gender of both parent and child, were predicted to have systematic effects on the likelihood of parent-child agreement. With the exception of parent's gender, all these variables had a substantial impact on the likelihood of agreement.

It was hypothesized that parent's education would be positively correlated with the likelihood of parent-child agreement. However, greater levels of education among parents did not always result in a greater likelihood of agreement. While parents with four or more years of college were more likely to agree with their offspring than less educated parents, families in which parents had only "some college" exhibited the lowest levels of agreement. It was suggested that this result may be due, at least in part, to the uncertain returns to education associated with "some college" education. The analysis revealed that adolescents were least likely to agree with their parents when parents had "some college" education and were in a position to act as educational models for their children -- that is, when parents expected that their children would also receive "some college" education. Alternatively, when parents with "some college" had expectations for their children which were greater than, or less than, their own level of education -- that is, when parents were unwilling to act as
educational models for their children -- much of the difference in agreement disappeared.

A family's race also affected the likelihood of agreement. Minority adolescents were much less likely to agree with the educational expectations of their parents than white adolescents. Contrary to the claims of pundits who have suggested that the significance of race is declining, the effects of race could not be explained by racial differences in parents' educational attainment, or the willingness of minority parents to act as educational models.

The gender of adolescents had effects on the likelihood of agreement as well. Compared to boys, adolescent girls were somewhat more likely to have educational expectations which exceeded those of their parents. This gender effect was not explained by differences in the gender role ideologies of parents and their children. Last, the data analysis in chapter 3 revealed that adolescents choose their parents as educational models based on the relative educational attainment of their parents, rather than their parents' gender.

The analysis in Chapter 4 was based on House's proximity principle, in which he advises sociologists to investigate how macro-social structures "affect increasingly smaller social structures and ultimately those micro-social
phenomena that directly impinge on the individual" (1981, p. 540). Thus, the focus of this chapter was on parents' defining behavior. Specifically, the quantity and quality of parental defining behavior, or effort were expected to be positively related to the likelihood that parents and their offspring would agree on educational expectations. It was also argued that parents' defining efforts, are micro-social phenomena, which are likely to be influenced by larger social structures. Thus, a second objective of Chapter 4 was to determine if the relationships between structural variables and educational agreement were due to differences in parents' defining behavior.

The analysis in Chapter 4 revealed that some forms of parental effort were positively related to the likelihood of agreement. However, not all modes of defining were equally effective in increasing the likelihood of agreement. Many measures of effort were not associated with agreement at all. However, a concrete and specific form of parent-child interaction, the planning of school programs, had strong positive effects on adolescents' expectations, such that when parents helped a "great deal," adolescents were likely to have expectations equivalent to, or even above those of their parents. However, the analysis in Chapter 4 also suggested that parent-child discussions about post high school plans, while children were in the tenth grade, might
be as much a reaction to adolescents' expectations as they are a cause of those expectations.

Additionally, parental effort was shown to be an important intervening variable. Differences in parental effort helped to explain some of the relationships between social status variables and agreement which were uncovered in chapter 3. Parents of daughters, parents with higher levels of education, and minority parents were all more likely to exert a "great deal" of effort, at least as measured by the "school program" effort variable. This greater effort helped to explain gender differences in agreement. It also helped to explain why parents with high levels of education were more likely to agree with their children than other parents. The analysis in Chapter 4 revealed that first, the level of effort exerted by educated parents was likely to be greater than the level of effort exerted by less educated parents, and second, that the efforts of educated parents produced greater returns, in terms of the likelihood of agreement, than similar efforts by less educated parents.

The same cannot be said for minority parents, however. The analysis revealed that these parents consistently exerted more effort than their white counterparts. Yet, despite this, their children were still
more likely to disagree than were the children of white parents.

The analysis in Chapter 5 was guided by House's (1981) "psychological principle," which suggests that in order to adequately understand the relationship between social structure and personality, researchers must consider the psychological states of individuals, i.e., how messages from the larger culture and social structure are received and interpreted. Thus, the analysis in Chapter 5 examined the relationship between adolescent alienation and parent-child agreement. Alienated adolescents were predicted to be more likely to have educational expectations below those of their parents. It was expected that alienation among Black and Hispanic youth would help explain why these youth were more likely than their white counterparts to have expectations which were below those of their parents.

A second goal of Chapter 5 was to examine the relationship between the salience of social roles among adolescents, and the likelihood of parent-child agreement. This analysis was based on Stryker and Serpe's theory of parental influence, which argues that the more salient the roles of "parent" and "child" in the respective role hierarchies of both parties, the greater the likelihood of agreement. Thus, it was hypothesized that the likelihood of parent-child agreement would decline when adolescents'
extra-familial roles were more salient than their "child" role.

The analysis in Chapter 5 did show that adolescent alienation was related to parent-child agreement; adolescents who expressed feelings of alienation were more likely to have expectations below those of their parents. However, despite greater feelings of alienation among minority youth, race differences in agreement remained, independent of the effects of alienation. This suggests that in addition to greater feelings of alienation among minority youth, other structural forces may be at work to create the impression among these youth that parents' messages about educational expectations are not credible.

The analysis in Chapter 5 also supported the hypothesis that role-salience would affect agreement. When adolescents chose to discuss school programs more frequently with peers, teachers or guidance counselors than with their parents, the likelihood of parent-child agreement declined. However, the relative magnitude of these effects varied, depending upon the significant other in question. Finally, the analysis in Chapter 5 indicated that discussions with some of these significant others may actually cancel out the positive effects of parental effort on agreement.
DOES IT MATTER? STRUCTURAL VS. FAMILY EFFECTS ON ATTAINMENT

Despite the substantive results produced in this study, an important question needs to be addressed: Do these results matter? If one takes a more macro perspective, it is legitimate to ask whether family processes have any meaningful effect on educational attainment and occupational achievement. When one considers the tremendous structural barriers to achievement that may exist "out there" in society, one wonders whether family processes, no matter how positive or supportive they might be, can really help adolescents, especially those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, to surmount those barriers.

Of course, as noted in Chapter 1, proponents of status attainment research argue that the effects of family processes are indeed significant. Sewell and Hauser have made this point on several occasions. In 1975, they wrote that "the effects of social background on later educational attainment are largely explained by social psychological experiences during the high school years" (p. 103). Later, in 1980, they echoed that sentiment: "We believe that the failure of many lower status children to have high aspiration levels is at least as likely to result from the student's perception of lack of encouragement by parents and teachers as it is to the lack of financial resources" (p. 65).
Yet, the status attainment model has been the target of a great deal of criticism. Most of this criticism is centered around the degree to which the status attainment model fails to account for structural impediments to individual achievement. For instance, Horan argues that status attainment research is based on a shaky foundation of neoclassical economic assumptions. He suggests that the model assumes "an open, fully competitive market process in which individual characteristics are identified and rewarded according to their societal value" (1978, p. 537).

Knottnerus makes much the same point. He argues that, from its very inception, status attainment research has been based on an overly optimistic "mass society" or meritocratic image of social processes, in which egalitarianism, rationalization and bureaucratization were all on the rise, and, as a result, a "more homogenous middle class or middle mass was emerging and economic and political inequalities were declining" (1987, p. 117). In a similar vein, Alan C. Kerckhoff, in an important 1976 article, compares and contrasts the individualistic "socialization" interpretation of status attainment research with a more structural "allocation" interpretation. Kerckhoff writes that the "socialization model anticipates that encouragement by significant others will affect the level to which [an individual] aspires," and that the socialization model tends
to "view the individual as relatively free to move within the social system, his attainment being determined by what he chooses to do and how well he does it." In contrast, the "allocation model," according to Kerckhoff, "emphasizes the importance of societal forces which identify, select, process, classify, and assign individuals according to externally imposed criteria ... an allocation model views the individual as relatively constrained by the social structure, his attainments being determined by what he is permitted to do" (p. 369).

It is important to emphasize, as Kerckhoff does, that the degree to which the status attainment model reflects a society operating under the "socialization model" or the "allocation model" cannot be easily determined. Clearly, American society is not all one or the other; rather, it falls somewhere in between (Krauze and Slomczynski 1985). Still, Kerckhoff suggests that:

Viewed from an allocation perspective, one could argue that the measures of ambition used in most analyses of status attainment do not index motivation so much as they index knowledge of the 'real world.'... An allocation interpretation would argue that expectations are strongly associated with attainments because adolescents become sufficiently knowledgeable to be able to estimate the probabilities of various outcomes (p. 371).

In this light then, parent-child agreement, or lack thereof, in the present study might be reinterpreted as
parents' and adolescents' realistic or unrealistic assessments of what is possible, given societal constraints. When adolescents have lower expectations than their parents, the allocation interpretation suggests that these adolescents may be reading the social structure more accurately than their parents. When adolescents have expectations which are higher than those of their parents, an allocation interpretation suggests that these adolescents still have their heads in the clouds. They may not realize, as suggested by Agnew and Jones (1988), the extent of the barriers to achievement which may exist in larger society, or they may be ignorant of the true requirements for higher levels of educational attainment. Conversely, the parents of these adolescents, with their correspondingly lower expectations for their children, are fully aware of what is "out there," and the possibilities (or lack thereof) that exist for educational attainment. Also, under an allocation interpretation, parents who expect that their children will attain greater levels of education than they attained are engaging more in wishful thinking than realistic expectations.

However, an allocation interpretation of the results of the present study leaves an important question unanswered: Who is in a better position, parents or adolescents, to accurately read and assess the structural
barriers (or lack thereof) to educational attainment? Under what conditions will adolescents be, in Kerckhoff's words, more knowledgeable of the "real world," and under what conditions will parents be the better judges of the hurdles which are "out there?"

The answer to that question would ultimately depend upon the precise nature of the structural barriers which exist. The concept of "societal constraints" is nebulous at best. However, if the structural impediments to educational attainment are contained within the educational system itself, then adolescents may, in fact, be in the best position to accurately assess the effects of those constraints. The very persistence of systematic race, gender and parent's education effects suggests that certain adolescents may be confronting barriers which give them a very different perception of the social world from that of their parents. That is, the parents of these adolescents may not be in a position to observe these barriers, or they may be unwilling to acknowledge the existence of these barriers, as they form their expectations for their children.

But, exactly what effects does the educational system have on an individual's prospects for attainment? As Kerckhoff notes, it is the job of the educational system to discriminate among "kinds" of students. However, he goes on to say that, "Our problem [as sociologists] is to learn more
about the bases of this kind of discrimination" (1976, p. 375).

The degree and nature of "education effects" on attainment, independent of individual and family characteristics, is a hotly debated topic. One perspective is that taken by Coleman (1966), Jencks (1979) (cited in Gordon 1988), and others, who maintain that "school effects" on student performance and attainment are outweighed by individual and family characteristics. At the opposite extreme is the more radical position taken by Bowles and Gintis (1976) and others, who maintain that schools actually perpetuate and reinforce social inequality. Bowles and Gintis argue that, via tracking mechanisms, curriculum choices and the imposition of school rules, the social relations within and between schools mirror social class relations in capitalist society as a whole. Thus, through their school experience, the children of factory workers are socialized to follow in their parents' footsteps; conversely, the children of professionals are prepared to take their parents' place in the ranks of professionals.

Between these two polar extremes, there is a large body of research (see Hallinan (1988) for a comprehensive review), which has identified other school effects. However, much of the research is controversial and has been hotly contested in some cases. The effects of labeling have been
addressed by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), who have suggested that when teachers have low expectations for minority students, those expectations have a detrimental effect on minority students' academic performance. The racial composition of schools may also affect student performance (St. John (1975), cited in Hallinan (p. 255)). This research generally indicates that Black students have higher levels of achievement in schools where white students are in the majority. Other research has suggested that the length of the school year and school day may be positively correlated with achievement (Wiley 1976; Heyns 1986; Karweit 1980, cited in Hallinan, p. 257). The effects of curriculum differentiation - tracking or ability grouping - have also been examined. Hallinan concludes from her review of this research that "tracking and ability grouping have a negative effect on the achievement of lower track or ability group students, a negligible effect on students in the middle groups, and a weak to modest positive effect on high track and ability group students" (p. 260). Most of this research also shows that these tracking effects are independent of family background and measures of ability. Lastly, classroom processes and characteristics -- the status characteristics of teachers in comparison to those of students, the student composition of the classroom and the resulting peer relationships -- may all have effects on student outcomes.
Lest one forget, beyond possible school effects on educational attainment, the ultimate outcome of concern is not educational attainment, but occupational attainment. Here, there may be an entirely new set of structural mechanisms which may affect occupational attainment, independent of individual characteristics. Many researchers have identified structural characteristics of the labor force and firms, which together, comprise an "opportunity structure" (Kerckhoff 1989), which all individuals must confront upon their entry into the labor force.

However, this literature has been criticized for ignoring the social psychology of social mobility (Kerckhoff 1989, p. 20). This has lead to new research on the fit between an individual's personality characteristics and the job which an individual holds. As Kerckhoff writes, with regard to this literature:

Significant others project onto students a set of aspirations (or expectations) for the future, and those future orientations affect the performances of the students. The work and personality literature suggests that these same influences may lead students to move into particular kinds of jobs when they enter the labor force (1989, p. 20).

Thus, one comes full circle. From one perspective, social mobility is viewed as a socialization process, driven, in part, by social psychological processes within the family, which ultimately influence achievement. From an alternative perspective, social mobility is viewed as an
allocation process, whereby a variety of educational, organizational and labor force mechanisms serve to sort individuals into various categories with little regard for individual characteristics. Finally, in an attempt to bring the individual back into the process, there is the work and personality literature, proposing reciprocal effects between individual personality and the characteristics of the work experience. Yet, the question remains: Which set of social forces has the greatest effect on an individual's educational and occupational achievement?

HELPING TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE: SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Ultimately, the question is an empirical one which sociologists are just beginning to address in a systematic way. And it is clearly not an either/or question. Kerckhoff writes:

There is no reason to deny that social structure is "real" and imposes limitations on the options open to individual actors. There is also no reason to deny that actors seek outcomes, have preferences, make choices. The choices may be delimited by the alternatives available, but not everyone makes the same choices when faced by the same delimited alternatives (1989, p. 23).

Thus, while nearly all research projects in sociology conclude with a perennial call for future research, the results of this research suggest some very specific areas of future inquiry, which may help to clarify
issues in the socialization/allocation debate on social mobility.

One of the primary strengths of the High School and Beyond data is that it is a longitudinal data set. The most recent edition of the Guide to Resources and Services (Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research 1989) lists three follow-up waves of the 1980 sophomore cohort, undertaken in 1982, 1984 and 1986, respectively. Thus, in subsequent research, it will be possible to determine whether parents' modeling and defining efforts actually had an effect on adolescents' educational attainment. This will allow several questions to be addressed.

Consider those adolescents whose expectations were below those of their parents. Using subsequent waves of High School and Beyond, it will be possible to determine if these adolescents were more likely to attain the low level of education which they expected to attain, or if their parents' greater expectations ultimately inspired these adolescents to go further with their education.

In particular, recall that in families where parents expected their child to attain higher levels of education than they attained, parents were at a particular
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1 While more recent waves may have been undertaken, since they are not included in the ICPSR catalog, they are not yet in the public domain.
disadvantage. Since these parents do not wish to act as educational models for their children -- in the sense that these parents expected that their children could attain greater levels of education -- they were forced to rely on defining techniques in an attempt to influence their children. However, the data indicated that in these families, parents and their children were less likely to agree than in those families where parents could combine both modeling and defining techniques. Thus, while combining these techniques apparently results in a greater likelihood of agreement, it is worthwhile to ask if this combination ultimately matters for educational attainment. The subsequent waves of High School and Beyond can help to resolve this issue.

Last, consider the case of adolescents whose expectations exceed those of their parents. Are these adolescents ultimately successful in attaining those high levels of education? Or, are their expectations so unrealistic that, once they become aware of the "real world," and the requirements for achieving those high levels of education, they retreat to the fallback position of the expectations which are held by their parents? From a slightly different perspective, does the apparent lack of parental support for these high expectations ultimately affect adolescents' ability to achieve those high levels of
education? Subsequent waves of the *High School and Beyond* may help to resolve this issue as well.

Thus, the existence of subsequent waves of *High School and Beyond* suggests some promising directions for future research. However, the limitations of this approach should be made clear as well. Analysis of the later waves of *High School and Beyond* should yield some important information about the outcomes of the educational attainment process. However, several questions about the process of educational attainment, and how families fit into that process, are likely to remain.

Thus, a second area of future research suggested by this study focuses on parental defining processes. Because this study sheds little light on these processes, a better understanding of them is needed. Three issues need to be addressed. First, what types of defining techniques are most effective? What is it about the content and the process of parent-adolescent discussions that make them effective mechanisms for the transmission of educational expectations? Are specific discussions about school plans less effective than other forms of parental involvement? The results of the present research suggest that when parents help plan their child's school program, they are more likely to agree with their children about educational expectations. Conversely, specific parent-child discussions about post high school
plans apparently have no effect, or, in the case of discussions in the tenth grade, a detrimental effect on the likelihood of agreement. Thus, it is worthwhile to ask if other forms of parental involvement in the school lives of adolescents have similar positive effects on the likelihood of agreement.

Second, the issue of the timing of parental effort needs to be resolved. At what times are parents motivated to exert effort to influence their children, and at what times are parents' efforts a reaction to their child's low expectations? Furthermore, precisely when is the best time for parents to exert effort to influence their children? Are early parental efforts more important than later parental efforts? There is some indication in the present study, as suggested by the analysis in Chapter 4, that if parents react to their offspring's low expectations when the child is in high school, rather than acting to influence their child early on, it may be too late for parents to make a significant impact. Additionally, specific parent-child discussions about post high school plans, prior to high school, have no effect on agreement. Thus, future research would profit by pursuing this line of inquiry.

Third, the frequency or quantity of parental effort appears to be important for parental influence as well. While this study found that more frequent parental effort is
better than less frequent effort, the relationship between effort and the likelihood of agreement may be curvilinear. That is, there is some indication that when parents place too great an emphasis on achievement, adolescents may react by underachieving (Metcalf and Gaier 1987). Perhaps this is why minority youth are consistently more likely to disagree with their parents' expectations for them, despite their parents' greater efforts. However, as noted in Chapter 4, the point at which parental efforts become an obstacle to successful influence has not been clearly delineated.

Last, once we understand the effects of the quality, frequency and timing of parental effort on successful influence, it is also worthwhile to ask which of these dimensions are more important for successful influence. Is quality more important than frequency? Is the timing of parental effort the most critical factor of all? And, are all these factors further influenced by the effects of race, class and gender? For instance, since minority parents' frequent efforts appear to have little effect on their children, perhaps the timing of minority parents' efforts is more important for agreement than the frequency of their efforts.

Survey research which employs standardized questionnaires or interview schedules may be an ineffective methodology for answering some of these questions. Clearly,
standardized survey research is advantageous in that it allows researchers to use sophisticated statistical techniques to analyze data. However, if researchers do not know which dimensions of parental effort are important to the influence process, they cannot know what questions they should ask on a standardized questionnaire. Therefore, in depth interviewing and observation of families, such as that employed by Clark (1983) or MacLeod (1987), may be more useful methodologies for addressing these issues.

Finally, it is hoped that future research may help to explain the race question. That is, why are minority youths consistently less likely to agree with the expectations of their parents than white youths? Not only is the race difference in agreement the most persistent finding of this study, it is the finding which has defied explanation. Race differences in agreement are independent of parents' education, or the ability of parents to act as models. The race difference persists, despite the fact that minority parents exert more effort than white parents, at all educational levels. The race difference in agreement is also independent of youths' feelings of powerlessness and their sources of extra-familial influence.

These results suggest two possible lines of inquiry. Race differences may be due to racial differences in parental socialization styles which are independent of any
effects of social class. Alternatively, race differences may be the result of differences in the attitudes or social milieus of minority and white youth.

Recall from Chapter 3, Boykin and Tom's (1983, p. 41) suggestion that there may be a distinctive Black socialization style which has its origins in African culture. Boykin and Tom suggest that this cultural socialization style has several dimensions: spirituality, harmony, movement, verve, affect, communalism, expressive individualism, orality and a distinct social time perspective. If race differences in agreement are due to distinctly different socialization styles, then several issues must be considered.

First, is it possible for such a cultural style to have survived across successive generations of Black families, despite forced enslavement and a historic caste-like status in American society? Several authors (Herskovitz 1958; Henry 1985; Raboteau 1978), all cited in Walter 1990) have suggested that elements of African culture – primarily linguistic and religious practices – have withstood the test of time. Thus, some distinctive socialization practices may have survived as well, particularly if those practices did not significantly threaten the social, cultural and economic hegemony of the elite (i.e., white, anglo slaveholders).

However, the degree to which cultural practices are retained
may vary tremendously across time and space. Walter (1990), for instance, has suggested that cultural hybridization (the blending of African and Anglo cultural elements) was the historically dominant trend, at least in the lowcountry areas of South Carolina. Conversely, in other regions of the United States, and in other countries where Africans were imported and enslaved, substantially different processes may have been prevalent. For instance, Raboteau (1978) maintains that compared to Blacks in the United States, Haitians have retained many more elements of African culture over time.

Second, assuming that it is possible for such a cultural tradition to have survived over time, precisely how are these cultural traditions expressed as specific socialization techniques? Above and beyond Boykin and Tom's nominal definitions of these techniques, what do these socialization styles look like? For instance, Boykin and Tom define orality as a "special emphasis on oral and aural modes of communication, especially through the use of the spoken word to convey deep textural meanings not possible through the written word" (p. 41). However, it is quite a theoretical and methodological leap from that broad definition to a precise understanding of what orality means,
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2 I am indebted to Dr. Emilie P. Walter, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Francis Marion College, for her comments and suggestions here.
in terms of the daily lives of Black families and the socialization practices of Black parents. Perhaps this tradition of orality is suggestive of a distinctive linguistic code (Bernstein 1971) which has not been considered by researchers in the past.

Third, assuming that it is possible for such a tradition to survive over time, and that this style can be identified, the key question remains. Is this African socialization style sufficiently distinctive to result in significant racial differences in the likelihood of agreement? There are a number of other factors which affect socialization practices -- social class, family structure and composition, among other things. Thus, it may not be possible to disentangle the effects of this cultural socialization style from all these other confounding influences. Even if it is possible, it is not clear if an understanding of these socialization styles can add significantly to sociologists' understanding of Black family processes and outcomes.

Thus, any attempt to assess the effects of minority parents' socialization styles on the likelihood of successful influence involves enormous methodological and theoretical problems. The situation is even more complex for Hispanic-American families. Hispanic-Americans are not a uniform group, but actually comprise several different
ethnic groups -- Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans -- each with its own distinct culture, and historic pattern of intergroup contact. Thus, in order to understand parental socialization practices, and the effects of those practices, disentangling the effects of class from the effects of race and ethnicity is necessary, but not sufficient. It is also important to understand the mosaic of cultural socialization patterns that may exist between racial and ethnic groups, and how those patterns contribute to the life experiences of each group's members. It is clearly a daunting research agenda.

A more fruitful line of inquiry might be to assess the degree to which minority adolescents are more resistant to parental messages than white adolescents, and the conditions which encourage this resistance. Minority adolescents in the present study are more alienated and express greater feelings of powerlessness than white adolescents, but that does not seem to be the only reason for race differences in agreement. Nor do there appear to be race differences in the degree to which adolescents are influenced by significant others outside the family.

Perhaps there is an underlying cynicism on the part of minority youth that is not tapped by the small number of attitudinal measures available in the High School and Beyond data. If this is the case, several questions present
themselves. First, what is it about the lives and social milieu of minority adolescents that engenders this cynicism? What factors keep minority parents from sharing in this cynicism? If minority adolescents are experiencing forms of discrimination which engender this cynicism, what are these forms? Are minority adolescents in a better position to perceive this discrimination than their parents? Is this discrimination primarily school based, or does its source lie elsewhere?

Perhaps it is not minority adolescents who are overly cynical, but rather, minority parents who are overly optimistic about their offsprings' life chances. The minority parents surveyed in *High School and Beyond* have been witness to important social changes over the course of their lifetime, moreso than any cohort since the Civil War. Most of these parents were probably born prior to, or during World War II, and grew up in a society that was still rigidly segregated, particularly in the Southern United States. However, by 1980, the time of the *High School and Beyond* study, these parents had been witness to, and their lives had been affected by, a series of important historical events: the *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* Supreme Court decision of 1954 which declared the notion of "separate but equal" school facilities unconstitutional, the abolition of Jim Crow segregation and the expansion of
voting rights in the South, and the passage of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. Thus, despite the fact that the socioeconomic status of Black Americans remains substantially below that of whites, these historical events may have been cause for considerable optimism among Black parents, and their expectations for their children may reflect this optimism. However, minority adolescents have not been witness to these same events. Certainly, they may be very aware of them, yet all they see around them are the immediate social and economic conditions of their lives. Thus, minority adolescents may not share in the optimism of their parents, and may have lower educational expectations as a result.

Clearly, a great deal of research needs to be done to accurately assess the "world view" and perceptions of minority youth and their parents. Again, systematic survey research may be the least appropriate method for addressing these issues. Rather, some form of ethnographic research may be better suited for answering some of these difficult questions.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to investigate the social factors and processes responsible for parent-child agreement on educational expectations. Race, parent's education, and gender all appear to affect the likelihood of parent-child agreement, as well as the family
interaction dynamics which mediate that agreement, or lack thereof. However, future research needs to address two issues. First, the forms of family interaction which inhibit or enhance the likelihood of successful parental influence need to be specified with much greater precision than was possible in the present study. Second, the degree to which an individual's chances for educational and occupational attainment depend upon family processes, or social structural variables beyond the control of the family, such as school and labor market effects, needs to be accurately assessed. Clearly, these are not just questions of concern to the academic community. As noted by Knottnerus (1987), American sociologists' concern or preoccupation with social mobility processes reflect similar concerns in American society. Notions of equality, equal opportunity and a "level playing field" are central to the American cultural ethos. If the eventual goal of American society is to become a true meritocracy, then effective social policies to achieve that goal will depend upon research which focuses upon these issues.
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