DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 244 RC 006 361

AUTHOR Lyson, Thomas
TITLE Parental Interest and Educational Mobility: A Comparative Study of Rural Youth in Norway and the United States.
PUB DATE Aug 72
NOTE 27p.; Paper prepared for the annual meetings of Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Career Choice; Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Educational Mobility; Family Resources; Flexible Progression; High School Students; Parent Participation; Positive Reinforcement; *Rural Youth; *Seniors; *Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Norway

ABSTRACT

A report of 1 phase of a larger cross-cultural project, this paper is primarily concerned with the interrelated influences of perceived parental support and social class origins on the educational plans of comparable populations of American high school seniors and Norwegian "ungdomskole" students. The data was obtained via a questionnaire survey from 2,313 graduating seniors in the high schools serving 4 selected rural areas of Kentucky and West Virginia and from 1,396 students in the terminal classes of the comprehensive schools serving 3 selected rural areas of Norway. Parental interest, social class origin, and academic performance, it was concluded, have important independent and interrelated effects on educational mobility in both Norway and the United States. Cross-culturally, social class origin and academic performance are the more consistent determinants of educational mobility, and their effects tend to be more stable. The findings further demonstrated that among American high school boys and lower class boys in the Norwegian comprehensive schools, a superior performance record in high school functions as a family involvement catalyst among the lower classes. Lower class girls, however, are at a continual disadvantage compared with upper class girls, regardless of past academic performance. The implication, viewed from a comparative perspective, is that the specific societal context may provide useful insights into the relative importance of the social-structural determinants of educational mobility. (HBC)

PARENTAL INTEREST AND EDUCATIONAL MOBILITY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RURAL YOUTH IN NORWAY AND THE UNITED STATES[1]

Thomas Lyson

West Virginia University

Annual Meetings, Rural Sociological Society

Baton Rouge, Louisiana

August, 1972

INTRODUCTION

In advanced industrial societies, such as the United States and Norway, the efficient allocation of available manpower resources--i.e., the process of getting adequately trained persons to fill the many and varied job positions--is an extremely complex and critical problem. It is not surprising therefore that the principle sorting-out functions are being delegated more directly and with increasing formality to that large-scale bureaucratic organization, namely, the modern educational system. Through very complicated and often rather subtile selection procedures, certain students are encouraged to become educationally mobile and, subsequently, to attain elite statuses in society, while others are either by-passed and tracked along the lower levels of the educational ladder or structurally discouraged from availing themselves of existing opportunities for advancement.

Given the particular selection strategy, however,--i.e., the institutionalized procedures for sorting-out those who are qualified--the upward educational mobility of an individual, of course, is dependent upon and can be attributed to a wide variety of social and psychological factors. Various authors have pointed to the effects of such variables as social class background, innate intelligence, race, ethnicity, sex role typing, parental values, and peer group characteristics.[2] Despite this proliferation of explanatory variables, it is clear that, in general, a lack of positive reinforcements and conditions for educational mobility, whether at home or in school, serves to modify a youngster's ambition and, consequently, may set him on a career course which fails both to reveal or to challenge his potential abilities.

PROBLEM AND APPROACH

This paper reports an empirical investigation--one phase of a larger, cross-cultural project--that explores some of the factors affecting the upward educational mobility of rural youth in Norway and the United States. It is concerned primarily with the interrelated influences of perceived parental support and social class origins on the educational plans of comparable populations of American high school seniors and Norwegian ungdomskole students. Since social mobility in an industrial society tends to be channeled through the system of formal education, the experiences of a student in school are especially critical to the fashioning of his ambitions and to his chances of fully developing his talents and of building a satisfying and challenging career. Hence, it is useful to view the school system as a mediating agency that dampens or exaggerates the effect of family background variables: from that perspective, a youngster's performance in school (grades) may be indicative of the educational mobility process and, employed as an intervening variable, can help to interpret the influence of family background on educational plans.

The effect of social class origins on the educational goals of young people has been a heavily researched area of inquiry in the United States. These studies consistently show that upper class children have a far greater chance of going on to college than do their schoolmates from lower class families. This relationship generally holds even when other important variables such as grades, I.Q. and community contexts are taken into account.[3]

For the present purposes, it is useful to conceptualize the social class configuration as being composed of two major dimensions. First there is a material dimension which involves family income, wealth, and material style of

life; it represents the resource base that is available to facilitate a youngster's career development strategy. Then, there is a nonmaterial dimension which is derived from the breadth of cultural experiences within the family; it represents the motivational bases fostering the development of career interests and ambitions.

In the U.S., perhaps because of the way in which American higher education is organized, the material aspects of social class have a considerable bearing upon a youngster's plan to go to college. Other factors, of course, are also involved. Norway, on the other hand,--consistent with the welfare state philosophy--has deliberately instituted a system that deemphasizes the material criterion for upward educational mobility. The spread between the wealthy and the poor is far narrower in Norway than in the U.S. and, more important, the state heavily subsidizes all levels of education. Any youngster who demonstrates superior academic ability and wants to pursue higher education is, in effect, sponsored. (A student's performance on a standardized test is the main criterion employed to determine who gets "sponsored" and, normally, those who have done well in the lower schools make good grades on these tests.)

In both the U.S. and Norway, the nonmaterial aspects of social class affect the educational mobility process in a more subtile fashion and, without doubt, the characteristics of the educational structures have much to do with the manner by which these influences are manifested. Since the method of "sponsorship" in the Norwegian system tends to lessen the importance of a family's material resources in determining a youngster's opportunity to pursue higher education, the nonmaterial aspects of class may be somewhat more critical at the point of decision-making. Traditionalized class orientations toward higher education tend to be stronger in Europe than in America and, despite the structured emphasis upon universalistic-achievement standards in

determining who gets sponsored, without parental support and encouragement those traditions may be exceedingly difficult to overcome. Thus, among the upper classes in rural Norway, where educational mobility is an expected pattern of behavior, youngsters who are academically qualified to go on will go on, almost as a matter of course. Among the lower classes, however, where the norm of upward educational mobility is not as deeply institutionalized, the parental encouragement factor is likely to be a relatively important determinant of educational goals even for youngsters who have demonstrated exceptional ability. In the United States, on the other hand, the system of selection for higher education--consistent perhaps with the American emphasis upon mass education -- permits many students to go on to college, if they wish, even though they may be less than exceptionally qualified. Consequently, this system (referred to as "contest mobility" by Turner)[4] allows the social class variable, and, likewise, the parental encouragement factor to manifest considerable influence at the point of decision-making.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS COMPARED

Although the educational systems of Norway and the United States have similar functional goals, namely the creation of a literature citizenry and a skilled labor force, they are structurally quite different.[5] Before entering college or specialized vocational training, American children are expected to complete at least twelve years of schooling; normally, this is organized as six or eight years of primary plus six or four years of secondary school. With the recent reform in Norway, on the other hand, the basic educational track is only nine years: six years of elementary plus three years of comprehensive school (ungdemskole). Upon completion of ungdomskole, the Norwegian students take a general examination and those who do well may gain admission to the

secondary school level (gymnas). The gymnas curriculum, normally a three year program, leads toward the university or to higher technical schools; to be admitted to a university, however, the student again must pass the hurdle of a comprehensive examination (examin artium).

Hence, although achieved status is the organizing principle of both the Norwegian and American systems of social mobility, there are marked differences in how this principle is instituted via the educational selection process. Norwegian students are tested at key points in their school careers in order to determine how they should be tracked and whether or not they will be sponsored for elite status. Those who do not "measure up" are funneled toward vocational and technical schools and subsequently to lower status jobs. This is in sharp contrast with the United States where everyone is kept in the running for scarce goals until the last possible moment. In effect, elite status is "up for grabs" in America. The Norwegian system of selection is perhaps more characteristic of, or at least consistent with, a "welfare state" ideology whereas the American system is more in keeping with the "equalitarian" philosophy of a capitalistic society.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The data for this research were derived from a larger, cross-cultural project which was designed to achieve a reasonably high degree of comparability at all stages of the research process (incl. selection of population, instrument construction, data collection, measurement and coding procedure, and analysis strategies).[6]

Information was obtained through a questionnaire survey from 2313 graduating seniors in the high schools serving four selected areas of Kentucky and West Virginia and from 1396 students in the terminal classes of the com-

prehensive schools serving three selected areas of Norway. The questionnaires were administered in classroom situations either by a member of the research staff (in the U.S. case) or by regular school personnel (in the Norwegian case).

The areas were selected to represent, in so far as possible, a wide range of rural socioeconomic circumstances within each society.[7] In the U.S., the study population was drawn from: (1) a heavily industrialized, part-time farming area in western Kentucky; (2) a commercial farming, diversified industrial area in central Kentucky; (3) a rural low-income, subsistence farming area in the Appalachian area of eastern Kentucky; and (4) a rural low income, coal mining area in southwestern West Virginia. The Norwegian study population was drawn from: (1) a heavily industrialized, marginal farming area in the Nordland-Narvik region; (2) a commercial farming, mixed industry area in the West Hedmark-Hamar region; and (3) a rural low income area in the East Hedmark-Sor Trondelag region near the Swedish border. These study populations are essentially "rural" since schools in large metropolitan areas are not included. Within reasonable limits and for exploratory purposes they can be regarded as fairly comparable and as encompassing a wide range of rural socioeconomic situations within the respective societies. For this paper, these regional data are pooled and the main variables dichotomized.

Plan for further education--beyond the immediate level and leading to a higher academic track---is the dependent variable and, in a general sense, the principle indicant of upward educational mobility. In the U.S. case, the focus is on plan to go to gymnas. For the purpose at hand, father's manual-nonmanual occupational status is used as an indicant of social class origin since it assures a high degree of cross-regional and cross-societal equivalency.[8]

Academic achievement level, the major control variable, is measured by grade average attained in school. In the U.S., grade point averages were taken directly from school records by the field worker whereas in Norway teachers were asked to rank each student on the basis of scholastic standing. For present purposes, the variable is dichotomized so as to focus on the upper-third and lower two-thirds of each school class.

The level of parental support experienced by a youngster is measured indirectly by an attitudinal scale designed specifically for that purpose.[9] Focused interviews with selected students yielded an initial battery of items which was further reduced on the basis of pre-test results and, subsequently by an item-analysis of the final set. These procedures were duplicated in both countries. The resulting summated five-item perceived parental interest (PPI) scale is internally-consistent and, to a reasonable degree, cross-culturally stable. It taps a general feeling of parental responsiveness via such indicants as the parent's readiness to "praise", to "listen", to discuss "problems" and "career plans", and to provide help with things related to "school".

FINDINGS

Basic Interrelationships

Social class origin, as we know from many earlier researches, is one of the more important determinants of educational mobility. Data from the present study also lend considerable support to this basic generalization in both Norway and the United States (Table 1). Although the proportion of American students planning on college is greater than the proportion of Norwegian students planning on gymnas, the pattern of class effect is essentially similar, cross-culturally, and its magnitude is substantial among all four segments of

the study population. (Parallel analysis, using a composite two-dimensional social class scale, clearly supports these observations.)

The class effect, it should be noted, is somewhat stronger in the case of Norwegian girls and especially so in comparison with Norwegian boys. A gymnas education for girls tends to be viewed as a traditional upper-class option; lower-class girls are more vocationally-oriented and less inclined to opt for an academically-oriented gymnas program. In the United States, on the other hand, the patterns of educational mobility of the sexes are remarkably similar even when social class is taken into account. This is not to say, however, that the underlying orientational premises here are any different from those in Norway; for Americans, "going to college" often implies a vocational goal which, in Norway, would be pursued outside of the gymnas-university track.

Parental interest is another career-influencing factor that, as we have suggested, may be linked with the social class configuration either as a component of that configuration or as a correlate within the general developmental sequence. Although this theoretical issue cannot be resolved by the present study, it is necessary to consider the degree of association between the parental interest and social class variables (Table 2). We find that the relationships are positive in direction, low in magnitude, somewhat stronger for girls than for boys, and fairly stable cross-culturally. (Parallel analysis, using a composite social class scale, tends to confirm these observations.) Thus, it appears that the parental interest factor may help to interpret the linkage between social class and educational mobility.

At this point, consideration of the basic association between parental interest and educational plan -- a main concern of the present paper -- is in order (Table 3). We find that the relationship is positive, of moderate magni-

tude for boys but low for girls, and again remarkably stable cross-culturally. Why the effect is greater for boys than for girls can only be inferred; we suspect that the orientational content or focus of parental interest is more career-specific for boys and more diffuse for girls. In any event, given these three sets of basic intercorrelations, it appears that the parental interest factor is less integrally bound into the social class configuration for boys than it is for girls and, more important, that it emerges as a significant factor in determining the educational mobility of boys in both societies.

Before elaborating on these findings, we must also take note of the possible intervening effect of academic achievement level (i.e., grade rank attained in school). The association between grades attained and father's status is moderate in the U.S. (Q=+.38) and somewhat weaker in Norway (Q=+.28). Norwegian schools have been more successful than American schools at defusing the class effect. However, a significant interaction between social class and academic achievement exists in both societies and this should be taken into account in determining the relative influence of either variable on a student's subsequent educational plans.

Academic achievement, of course, may also be influenced by the level of parental interest (and vice versa). This reciprocal relationship, however, appears to be negligible; only in the case of U.S. boys does it approach any degree of magnitude (Q=+.25).

Finally, we must consider the effect of academic achievement level on educational mobility plans. For reasons suggested earlier, we would expect a higher correlation in Norway than in the U.S., and that is indeed what these data reveal. In Norway, Q = +.87 for both boys and girls; only 17 percent of the boys and 10 percent of the girls who are ranked in the lower two-thirds of their school class plan on entering the gymnas. (This fact

helps to confirm our opinion that "educational plan" is a fairly valid indicator of subsequent educational mobility; only those students who have attained high grades in school can realistically expect to pass the rigorous entrance examinations for gymnas.) In the United States, the effect of grade-point average is somewhat less strong, with Q = +.78 for boys and +.61 for girls; nevertheless, the magnitude of correlation is substantial and, consequently, scholastic achievement level should be taken into account as an important determinant of educational mobility. The problem that confronts this research, then, is to partial-out the effect of the parental interest factor from that of the "achieved-status" (grades) and "ascribed-status" (social class) affects.

Elaboration by Controls

Table 4 reports the percentages of American and Norwegian students planning on further academic education, by sex, and taking into account the three determinants being investigated, namely, level of perceived parental interest (PPI), academic achievement level (grade rank attained), and father's occupational status. The correlations (Yule's Q) that obtain from various combinations of these variables are reported in Tables 5, 6, and 7. Findings are discussed in terms of each of the four segments of the study population.

American Boys: Quite clearly (from Table 5), the original, moderately-strong association between educational plan and parental interest is not spurious; introduction of the social class variable does not significantly alter the basic observation about the direction and magnitude of this relationship. For American boys, then, parental interest emerges as an important determinant of educational mobility, essentially independent of social class origin and, in that sense, it can not be regarded as an institutionalized component of the class configuration.

The parental interest effect, however, tends to be specified for high achievers. Weak scholastic records, as we might expect, have a greater determining influence on the college plans of lower-class than of upper-class boys and, conversely, social class background exerts a stronger influence on the college plans of low achievers than of high achievers. Nevertheless, these data demonstrate that the parental interest factor -- over and above the effects of prior scholastic achievements and social class origin -- can and does manifest considerable influence on the American boy's decision to go to college, and that this influence is especially critical for high achievers.

Norwegian Boys: In this case, unlike that of American boys, the original moderate association between educational plan and parental interest does not emerge as a phenomenon relatively independent of social class origin but, rather, is clearly specified for the lower class (Table 5). Whether or not a manual worker's son will plan on gymnas is dependent, to a large extent, upon the level of parental encouragement and support he feels. For the upper class boy, however, the parental interest effect is basically negligible once his level of scholastic achievement has been established; grade rank attained is the main criterion for educational advancement.

Similarly, the parental interest effect is also specified for low achievers. Although demonstrated scholastic ability poses a formidable barrier to upward educational mobility, low achievers are far more likely to consider going on to gymnas if they sense strong parental support than if they do not; without parental encouragement (and, we presume, parental endorsement) the odds of even contemplating going on -- particulary for youngsters who stem from working-class backgrounds -- are virtually insurmountable. In essence, then, the parental interest factor functions as an additional impetus that helps to move lower-class boys toward existing educational opportunities;

but, neither they nor their upper-class schoolmates will have much luck in gaining admission to a gymnas if their scholastic performance records are less than adequate.

American Girls: When elaborated by the introduction of a social class indicator, the original very weak relationship between educational plan and parental interest is reduced even more (Table 5). In the case of American girls, therefore, the parental interest variable appears to be not only an ineffective determinant of educational mobility but also a factor linked with and essentially a part of the social class configuration.

To the extent that it helps to interpret the influence of social class, the parental interest effect seems to be manifested mainly in conjunction with high achievers from upper-status families. Basically, however, the sorting out process is dominated by the social class variable. Indeed, although these American girls had achieved far better high school records on the average than their male counterparts, this sex-bias tends to be cancelled-out by the social class factor at the point of formulating college plans; for girls, the push toward college is more a traditionalized phenomenon than it is for boys.

Norwegian Girls: Level of parental interest, at least in terms of the present operational definition, appears to have very little effect upon the educational plans of Norwegian girls. Similar to the case of American girls, the original relationship between educational plan and parental interest, which is basically rather weak, becomes almost negligible when class is controlled (Table 5). What little effect is manifested, then, must be viewed as essentially bound-up with the social class configuration.

It should be noted that the class effect tends to be much stronger for high achievers than for low; grades are a very important condition for upward educational mobility in Norway but, once the level of scholastic ability has

been established, the class factor emerges as a more important determinant for girls than for boys. The chance that a girl will plan on a gymnas education is far less than that of a boy and especially so if she has not performed exceptionally well at the ungdomskole level.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study, one phase of a larger cross-cultural survey, explored some of the structural barriers to the upward educational mobility of rural youth in Norway and the United States. It focused on three factors: perceived parental interest, social class origin, and academic performance. Although a variety of interesting facts about the structuring of educational opportunities in these two countries were uncovered, all of the intriguing ramifications suggested cannot be pursued in this paper. We shall, however, consider further some of the more important findings relevant to the formulation of a comprehensive and systematic conceptualization of the interrelated effects of the main study variables on the educational mobility process.

One set of findings central to the raison d'etre of this research merits careful attention. It concerns the selective influence of parental interest on the educational plans of Norwegian and American students. We observed that the educational plans of girls in both countries appear to be only slightly affected by the parental interest variable; most of the variance is explained by social class origin and academic performance level. Only under specified conditions (e.g., high class, high grades) does an effect become manifested, if at all. For boys in both countries, however, the parental interest variable plays an important role in influencing the educational planning process; in Norway it is espcially critical in the fashioning of plans by lower class boys.

We should realize, of course, that the career opportunities open to girls who have attained a "high" educational level are rather restricted in both Norway and the United States. Thus, it may make little sense for a girl, at least from her point of view, to orient herself toward an occupation that requires the attainment of a "high" academic level; societal norms effectively

block women from pursuing the upper ranks of the professional hierarchy. It appears then, that in Norway and the United States the goal of parental interest tends not to be focused on the attainment of advanced education for girls. The limited opportunities for girls would serve to dampen any potential benefits derived from parental support directing them toward higher education.

For many boys in both Norway and the United States, however, and especially for those from the lower classes in Norway, parental support serves as a "push" toward educational advancement. In effect, the goal of parental interest tends to be "loaded" to some degree with a recognition of the practical value of higher education.

Another set of findings that merits special attention concerns the combined effect of social class origin and academic performance. Although academic performance manifests a strong independent effect on educational plan in both societies, this effect is reinforced by the social class factor. That is, a lower class youngster with either a "high" or "low" achievement record is at the same relative disadvantage vis-a-vis educational mobility plans to an upper class youngster with similar achievement records. Only in the case of American boys does academic performance have any appreciable influence in reducing class bias, and even here an exceptionally high achievement record does not completely diminish the social class effect.

These observations shed some light on the relative effects of academic performance and social class origin on the educational selection process and, even more broadly, on the structuring of educational opportunities in both countries. Grades are somewhat more important as determinants of educational plan in Norway than they are in the United States (particularly for girls). Any Norwegian youngster displaying a "strong" academic potential is virtually

assured of sponsorship for additional academic education beyond the comprehensive school level. Thus, one would expect a Norwegian youngster's educational plan to be somewhat insulated from the influences associated with the social class configuration. The findings reveal, however, that social class origin and parental interest exert considerable influence on the educational plans of boys. One may conclude, therefore, that a formalized tracking system of education, such as that instituted in Norway, although ostensibly emphasizing merit rather than family origins is, in fact, subject to strong social class pressures.

This is somewhat in contrast with the American case where, especially among boys, an excellent academic performance record serves as an important class-neutralizing factor in the setting of educational goals. Since the state does not provide any general monetary subsidy (as yet) nor sets any standardized academic requirements for college admission, much of the encouragement and burden of selection falls on a youngster's family. A superior performance record in high school, then, functions as a family involvement catalyst among the lower classes. If a lower class boy has performed exceptionally well and thus has demonstrated a potential to profit from college work, he is more likely to be encouraged by his family, through positive reinforcements, to go on.

The American system of selection, which permits the family to have a great deal of power in the decison making process, exists within a broader educational structure that favors educational opportunities for all, even at the college level, regardless of class origin or, to some extent, past academic performance. Within this kind of system upper class youngsters have a relative advantage because the attitudes and values normally associated with the upper class way of life tend to reinforce a youngster's educational

ambitions. It is interesting to note, therefore, that such upper class advantages are compensated for in the lower classes if a boy performs well, academically.

Lower class American girls, however, are at a continual disadvantage compared with upper class girls, regardless of past performance. Apparently they are locked into a system that reinforces non-academic type orientations; consequently, they tend to be tracked off the academic ladder after high school.

In summary, then, this study has shown that parental interest, social class origin, and academic performance have important independent and interrelated effects on educational mobility in both Norway and the United States. For a proper interpretation of these effects, however, the characteristic form of the educational system must be taken into account. Our findings further demonstrate that social class origin and academic performance are the more consistent determinants of educational mobility in both countries; their effects tend to be stable, cross-culturally. Nevertheless, we have also observed that parental interest, a variable that would appear to be more susceptible to manipulation than the other two determinants, exerts a significant influence especially among American high school boys and among lower class boys in the Norwegian comprehensive schools.

The important theoretical implication that emerges from this study concerns the susceptibility of the educational planning process in different educational systems to different kinds of social-structural influences. The structuring of educational opportunities in one system may be vulnerable to pressures that may have little or no bearing in relationship to the opportunities available in a second system. For example, it seems that the effects of social class and parental interest are permitted to "float free" of the

influencesof academic ability in the American case. In Norway, on the other hand, past academic performance is a primary criterion which may dampen the relative "advantage" of upper class origin or strong parental interest. Thus, it is very important that we consider the conditions under which educational mobility takes place. The specific societal context, viewed from a comparative perspective, may provide useful insights into the relative importance of the social-structural determinants of educational mobility.

FOOTNOES

1. This paper is based upon data collected through a series of field surveys organized and directed by Professor Harry K. Schwarzweller. We gratefully acknowledge the help and guidance of Professor James S. Brown and Dr. Donald Bogie at the University of Kentucky; John Marra at West Virginia University; and Professor Helge Solli and Dr. Lynne Lackey at the Norges Landbrukshogskole in Vollebek, Norway.

   For a more detailed discussion of the research reported here, see Thomas Lyson, "Educational Mobility and Parental Interest: A Comparative Study of Rural Youth in Norway and the United States", unpublished M.A. thesis, 1972, West Virginia University. See, also, Donald W. Bogie, "Sociocultural Differences Among Three Areas in Kentucky As Determinants of Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Rural Youth", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1970, University of Kentucky; Lynne Lackey, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, in process University of Kentucky (completion scheduled for 1972); John Marra, "Career Orientations of High School Seniors in an Appalachian Coal Mining County," 1971, unpublished M.A. thesis, West Virginia University.

2. For summaries of various studies dealing with the structural determinants of educational mobility, see James T. Horner, James G. Buterbaugh, and Judith Carefoot, Factors Relating to Occupational and Educational Decision Making of Rural Youth, Department of Agricultural Education Report 1, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, April, 1967. See, also the bibliography prepared by William Kuvlesky and David H. Reynolds, Educational Aspirations and Expectations of Youth, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Departmental Information Report No. 70-5, December, 1970.

3. William H. Sewell and Vimal P. Shah, "Social Class, Parental Encouragement and Educational Aspirations," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73, March, 1968, pp. 559-572.

4. Ralph Turner, "Modes of Ascent through Education: Sponsored and Contest Mobility," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 5, 1960, pp. 855-867.

5. For a more detailed description of the Norwegian educational system, see Gunnar Mortensen and Sven Persson, Vocational Training in Norway, published by the Norwegian Joint Committee on International Social Policy, Oslo, Norway, 1964, pp. 14-19; also, Olav Nyhamer, Education in Norway, published by the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Cultural Relations, Oslo, Norway, 1969.

6. See, Bogie, op. cit.; Lackey, op. cit.; Marra, op. cit.; and Lyson, op. cit.

7. Analysis of the regional effect is reported by Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Regional Variations in the Educational Mobility of Rural Youth: Norway, Germany and the United States," paper read at the 1970 Rural Sociology meetings, Baton Rouge, Louisana.

8. In addition, a parallel analysis was run using a social class index compared of father's education level and family level of living. For a detailed discussion as to how this index was formulated, see Lackey, op. cit.

   For purposes of the present paper, the results of this parallel analysis are reported only where they seem to deviate from observations made via the father's occupational status variable.

9. Bogie, op. cit. and Lackey, op. cit.

TABLE 1. Percent planning further academic education, by father's occupational status: study populations compared.

	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL: % planning on college				NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE: % planning on gymnas			
		Father's occupation				Father's occupation		
		nonmanual	manual	Q*	Total %	nonmanual	manual	Q*
BOYS	41.9	69.0	35.8	.60	34.7	53.8	27.5	.51
(N=)	(1161)	(261)	(805)		(695)	(196)	(451)	
GIRLS	39.3	65.2	33.4	.58	28.8	51.1	18.8	.54
(N=)	(1152)	(264)	(803)		(701)	(221)	(431)	

*Yule's Q statistic; a measure of association for a 2 x 2 table. The associations reported here are between father's manual-nonmanual status and youngster's plan to seek further, formal academic education beyond the level of high school (in U.S.) or comprehensive school (in Norway). Note that the difference between the sum of the manual-nonmanual categories and the total N is equal to the number of cases for which no information is available.

TABLE 2. Percent ranking "high" on perceived parental interest scale, by father's occupational status: study populations compared.

	U. S. HIGH SCHOOL: % "high" parental interest				NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE: % "high" parental interest			
	Total	Father's occupation			Total	Father's occupation		
	%	nonmanual	manual	Q*	%	nonmanual	manual	Q*
BOYS	49	58	48	.20	36	41	33	.16**
(N=)	(1161)	(261)	(805)		(695)	(191)	(452)	
GIRLS	57	67	55	.26	45	54	41	.25
(N=)	(1152)	(264)	(803)		(701)	(213)	(437)	

*Yule's Q statistic; ** indicates that P is less than .05 (based upon Chi square value). Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number in this and subsequent tables.

TABLE 3. Percent planning further academic education, by level of perceived parental interest: study populations compared.

	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL: % planning on college			NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE: % planning on gymnas		
	Parental interest			Parental interest		
	"high"	"low"	Q	"high"	"low"	Q
BOYS	51	33	.37	44	29	.32
(N=)	(573)	(587)		(236)	(420)	
GIRLS	43	34	.20	32	25	.20
(N=)	(654)	(498)		(301)	(369)	

TABLE 4. Percent planning further academic education, by father's occupational status, academic achievement level (grades), and level of perceived parental interest: study populations compared.

	Achievement Level (Grades)	Parental Interest (PPI)	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL: % planning college		NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE: % planning gymnas	
			Father's occupation		Father's occupation	
			nonmanual	manual	nonmanual	manual
BOYS	HIGH	HIGH	91	82	84	76
		(N=)	(65)	(91)	(25)	(46)
		LOW	83	67	89	58
		(N=)	(30)	(72)	(45)	(77)
	LOW	HIGH	66	32	35	25
		(N=)	(84)	(282)	(52)	(100)
		LOW	50	21	31	5
		(N=)	(76)	(331)	(62)	(203)
GIRLS	HIGH	HIGH	81	53	87	47
		(N=)	(106)	(178)	(61)	(57)
		LOW	69	46	86	42
		(N=)	(51)	(141)	(44)	(79)
	LOW	HIGH	47	24	21	8
		(N=)	(70)	(258)	(52)	(118)
		LOW	47	21	15	7
		(N=)	(34)	(214)	(53)	(168)

TABLE 5. Summary of associations (Q) between educational plan and parental interest level (PPI); controlling on father's occupational status and achievement level (grades): study populations compared.

CONTROL VARIABLE	EDUCATIONAL PLAN AND PARENTAL INTEREST (Q)			
	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL		NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Father's occupational status				
Nonmanual	.39	.14	-.08*	.16*
Manual	.32	.13	.46	.08*
Academic Achievement level (grades)				
High	.45	.26	.26*	.22*
Low	.30	.12*	.53	.13*
Both father's status & grades controlled				
High status, High grades	.33*	.33*	-.22*	.01*
High status, Low grades	.31	.00*	.09*	.11*
Low status, High grades	.40	.13*	.39	.20*
Low status, Low grades	.26	.09*	.71	.04*

*Indicates that the Chi square value of the observed relationship is not significant; P is less than .05.

TABLE 6. Summary of associations (Q) between educational plan and academic achievement level (grades); controlling on father's occupational status and parental interest (PPI): study populations compared.

CONTROL VARIABLE	EDUCATIONAL PLAN AND ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL (Q)			
	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL		NORWAY UNGDOMSKOL?	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Father's occupational status				
Nonmanual (high)	.69	.58	.86	.93
Manual (low)	.80	.54	.87	.82
Parental interest level (PPI)				
High	.81	.64	.82	.98
Low	.74	.56	.90	.96
Both father's status and PPI controlled				
High status, High PPI	.68	.66	.82	.92
High status, Low PPI	.67	.42	.90	.94
Low status, High PPI	.82	.56	.81	.93
Low status, Low PPI	.76	.52	.92	.91

TABLE 7. Summary of associations (Q) between educational plan and father's occupational status: controlling on levels of achievement (grades) and parental interest (PPI): study populations compared.

CONTROL VARIABLE	EDUCATIONAL PLAN AND FATHER'S STATUS (Q)			
	U.S. HIGH SCHOOL		NORWAY UNGDOMSKOLE	
	BOYS	GIRLS	BOYS	GIRLS
Academic achievement level (grades)				
High	.43	.54	.57	.79
Low	.58	.50	.59	.49
Parental interest level (PPI)				
High	.61	.57	.20	.66
Low	.56	.56	.66	.61
Both grades and PPI controlled				
High grades, High PPI	.35*	.59	.24*	.76
High grades, Low PPI	.43*	.44	.71	.80
Low grades, High PPI	.61	.48	.23*	.53
Low grades, Low PPI	.58	.54	.77	.40

* Indicates that the Chi square value of the observed relationship is not significant; P is less than .05.