DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 329   TM 000 367

AUTHOR   Schoenfeldt, Lyle F.
TITLE   Nontest Variables in the Prediction of Educational
                Progress.
INSTITUTION   Georgia Univ., Athens.
PUB DATE   Sep 70
NOTE   23p.; From symposium "Use of Nontest Variables in
                Admission, Selection, and Classification Operations"
                presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, September
                1970

EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Academic Performance, *Biographical Inventories,
                *College Freshmen, Evaluation Criteria, *Factor
                Structure, Longitudinal Studies, Predictive Ability
                (Testing), Predictive Measurement, *Predictor
                Variables, Questionnaires, Success Factors

ABSTRACT
                Historically, nontest variables have been used more
frequently than achievement test scores in the prediction of
educational progress, but research in this area has been largely
empirical. Recently, however, a theoretical model based on the
premise that past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior
was formulated. This model was used in a longitudinal study with a
sample of 1037 males and 897 females at a southeastern university.
Nontest variables were 389 biographical items drawn from a pool of
over 2000 items and assembled into a questionnaire. Subgroups were
formed on the basis of scores on biographical factors, thus
clustering similar profiles, rather than on the item responses. A
cross validation study was carried out with a 118-item biographical
questionnaire. Two types of educational criteria were used: (1) grade
point average and (2) number in a subgroup who were in an
arts-science curriculum, number with one or more dean's list, number
with one or more probation or dismissal, or number of dropouts.
Relationships between these criteria and subgroup membership were
univariately and multivariately analyzed. Subgroup structure was
stable over a two-year period. The relationship between group
membership and selected educational criteria was confirmed, showing
that knowledge of a person's past behavior can permit meaningful
prediction of educational progress. The female and male biographical
factors, subgroup differences on biographical factors and selected
criteria and group means are included. (CK)

NONTEST VARIABLES IN THE PREDICTION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS[1]

Lyle F. Schoenfeldt

University of Georgia

From a historical perspective, nontest variables have been employed
more frequently than test variables in the prediction of educational
progress. In fact, the wholesale application of achievement tests to
predict academic progress has been post WWII phenomenon.

Even as test scores have become almost universal components of the
academic prediction equation, research with nontest variables has continued.
Much of this research has been empirical in nature, as exemplified by one
commercial venture, the Alpha Biographical Inventory (Institute for Be-
havioral Research in Creativity, 1968), an instrument with 300 items
which provide about 1350 scorable alternatives. Although research details
are not available, the scales for predicting academic achievement were
de elcped by correlating each alternative with the criterion. The results
were correlations between the biographical scale and GPA one semester after
matriculation of .58 and .60 for males and females respectively (approxi-
mately 35% of the variance explained), about equal to the results obtained
using measures of academic achievement (high school GPA plus SATs), or
biographical data and achievement measures combined (Klein, Rock, & Evans,
1968).

The point is a simple one, and has been known for a number of years;

the empirical approach works. This is not to say that there have not

been criticism of this procedure, there have been, (Lovinger, 1967), the

most serious of which is that it is not science.

For the past 15 years efforts to successfully find an alternative

approach to prediction have concentrated on use of moderator variables.

Variously termed prediction of predictability (Frederiksen & Melville,

1954; Ghiselli, 1956, 1960a, 1960b), intra-individual variability (Fisk,

1957; Fisk & Rice, 1955), interactions (Lee, 1961), individual differences

regression (Cleary, 1966), and moderated stepwise regression (Rock, 1969),

the dominant theme has been the identification of Ss who are predictable

with a given set of predictors or group of Ss requiring different prediction

procedure. These research efforts have demonstrated that moderators do

contribute to differential validity, but are about as elusive as supressors

as far as holding up after cross-validation.

More recently Owens (1968) described a theoretical model based on the

premise that past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior. This

model provided that prediction would be accomplished by forming subgroups

with respect to the major dimensions of antecedent behavior, and relating

the subgroups to criteria of interest. Furthur, biographical data was

suggested as the vehicle for meaningfully measuring the important antecedent

characteristics that contribute to individual differences (Owens, 1968:

Owens & Henry, 1966).

The purpose of the present research is to describe results obtained

to date using the model suggested by Owens. The application of model was a

longitudinal study involving several educational criteria.

Procedure

Subjects. Two samples of Ss were involved. The longitudinal sample
consisted of 1037 males and 897 females, an 80% sample of the 1968 freshman
class at a southeastern university. All Ss completed a Biographical In-
formation Blank and a battery of tests.

The cross-validation sample consisted of 2,155 persons, an 83%
sample of students who matriculated fall 1970 at the same university. Ss
in the cross-validation sample completed a short form of the biographical
questionnaire while on campus for freshman orientation during the summer of
1970.

Biographical data. The nontest variables were 389 biographical items
assembled into a questionnaire from a pool of over 2,000 items. The item
screening, a several year procedure, has been described by Bryson (1969).
All items were multiple choice, with the responses arranged to form a
continuum.

The subgroups were formed on the basis of Ss scores on biographical
factors rather than on the item responses. Separate principal components
analyses for the females and males, followed by Varimax rotations, resulted
in 15 and 13 interpreted factors, respectively   (Schoenfeldt, 1970).
These factors are described in Tables 1 (females) and 2 (males). Thus the
data matrix consisted of 15 uncorrelated factor scores for each female and
13 for each male.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - --

Insert Tables 1 & 2 about here
- - -- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Clustering similar profiles. The problem of forming subgroups was
divided into three segments, each of which has been described in detail
previously (Schoenfeldt, 1970). The main clustering procedure was based
on the hierarchical grouping technique developed by Ward (1963; Ward &
Hook, 1963), an iterative procedure which makes no assumptions as to the
number of groups in the sample.

Because of computer limitations it was necessary to divide each sex
group into smaller samples, identify clusters in the separate samples, and
match across samples. This was accomplished by combining the groups iden-
tified from the separate samples that were essentially colinear in the
discriminant space of the biographical data.

One deficiency in the grouping procedure has been that once assigned
to a group, the individual remains in that group. Thus the assignment of
individuals to subsets is usually less than optimal at the conclusion of
the grouping (Ward, 1963). A two part procedure was developed to evaluate
the fit of each individual to the assigned group and remove him from the
structure if he failed to fit any group well (isolate), or fit more than
one group about equally (overlap).

Cross-validation. The Ss in the cross-validation sample completed
a 118 item biographical questionnaire. This short form consisted of the
items with the highest loadings on the factors previously described. The
multiple correlations and cross-validies, calculated by the procedure
suggested by Claudy (1969), obtained using the 118 items to predict the
factor scores for the 1968 Ss are presented in the right columns of
Tables 1 and 2.

Using the estimated factor scores computed from the 118 item form,

the Ss tested in 1970 were classified to the groups. The classification was
done by locating each S tested in 1970 in the space determined by discrimina-
ting the 1968 groups on the biographical factor scores. The S was then
placed in the group he most resembled, assuming that the 1968 groups were
of equal size (Cooley & Lohnes, 1962). As was done when the groups were
formed, overlaps and isolates were not assigned to a group.

Educational criteria. Two types of criteria data were used. The first,
available for the Ss in the 1968 study, consisted of the following measures
obtained for each group in Fall, 1969, 12 months after matriculation:
(a) number in an arts-science curriculum (versus professional, such as
education, business, journalism, etc.), (b) number with one or more dean's
list, (c) number with one or more probation or dismissal, and (d) number
of dropouts, i.e., number that failed to register in Fall 1969. These
measures were used to evaluate the grouping procedure interms of its ability
to produce groups that differ on educational criteria.

Since the above mentioned measures were not available for the Ss
entering in Fall 1970, a second criterion, predicted grade point average
(GPA) was obtained for both the validation and cross-validation samples.
This measure, as well as the high school GPA, SAT math , and SAT verbal
from which it was computed, were available from the admissions office.

Analyses. Relationships between subgroups membership and educational
criteria were analyzed both univariately and multivariately. The univariate
analysis consisted of computing chi-squares comparing the nominal group
categories with the several dichotomous criteria. Replication was examined
by comparing the rank order of groups evolved in 1968 on predicted GPA with

the rank of the 1970 groups on this same variable.

Two canonical discriminant analyses, one for each sex, were computed
using the three variables which comprise the predicted GPA score to maximally
differentiate the groups formed using the Ss tested in 1968. The extent to
which the 1970 groups were colinear with the 1968 groups in the discriminant
space was taken as the degree to which the subgroup structure was generalizable
with respect to predicted GPA.

Results

The Groups. Using the procedure described, 15 female and 23 male sub-
groups were formed. Approximately 75% of the total sample was allocated
to one of the groups with the remaining Ss either not fitting any of the
groups or, alternately, matching two or more groups.

As might be expected differences between the groups on the biographical
factors were highly significant, thus allowing the characterization of each
group in terms of the biographical dimensions that distinguish it from all
or most of the remaining groups. Specifically, Newman-Keuls multiple range
tests were computed comparing the groups on each factor. The results are
presented in Tables 3 (females) and 4 (males).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Sixty-five percent of the females and 63% of the males tested in 1970
could be clearly classified to one and only one of the groups evolved using
the 1968 Ss. As can be seen from Table 5, male groups 3 and 9 had fewer
Ss classified to them in 1970 than would have been expected on the basis
of the group Ns in 1968, whereas groups 8 and 22 had more Ss. For

the females, groups 2, 10. and 15 had fewer Ss while groups 9 and 11

had more than expected.

- - - - - - -- - - - - - -
Insert Table 5 about here
- - - - - - -- - - - - - -

Group differences on the educational criteria. For the females

(Table 3), there was a significant relationship between group membership

and the dichotomized criteria of arts-science ($\chi^2 = 33.3$, p <.01),

dean's list ($\chi^2 = 39.9$, p <.001), and probations ($\chi^2 = 51.2$, p<.001). The

relationship betweem group membership and enrollment in the Fall of 1969

(dropout); was not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 22.5$, p<.10), and

is not included on Table 3. All four criteria were significant for the

males (Table 4), arts-science ($\chi^2 = 37.1$, p<.05), dean's list ($\chi^2 = 103.8$,

p<.001), probations ($\chi^2 = 90.1$, p<.001, and dropout ($\chi^2 = 42.3$, p<.01).

Cross-validation. Table 5 contains the group means on predicted GPA

for the 1968 Ss, from which the groups were formed, and 1970 Ss classified

to the groups. The range in group means decreased slightly, going from

1.14 for the males in 1968 to 1.06 in 1970 and .78 to .66 for the females.

For both sexes at both time periods the F ratios resulting from single

factor ANOVs were highly significant, a necessary but insufficient con-

dition for meaningful prediction. More importantly, the rank order cor-

relation between group means on predicted GPA in 1968 and 1970 was .89

(p <.001) for the males and .73 (p < .01) for the females, indicating

that the group structure was generalizable across the two year period.

The known 1968 groups and variables of high school GPA, SAT-verbal

and SAT- math make discriminant analysis possible. Two analyses were run,

one for each sex, using the three variables to maximally differentiate the
21 male (Groups 3 and 6 were deleted since they did not replicate) and
14 female groups (Group 10 was deleted). The canonical procedure examines
the interrelations between two sets of measurements made on the same Ss,
the test scores and roster of group codes. Each discriminant function is
a linear composite of the tests that correlates maximally with a linear
of the groups codes, given that each linear combination is uncorrelated
with any previously computed (Cooley & Lohnes, 1962).

For both sexes, two of a possible three functions were significant
(see Table 6). These functions accounted for 78% of the discriminating
variance in the battery for the males and 73% for the females. As can be
seen in Table 6, for each sex the first function was high school GPA and
the second SAT. The dots on Figures 1 (females) and 2 (males) indicate
the centroids of the 1968 groups in the respective two dimensional spaces.
The small squares indicate the location in the discriminant space of the
Ss classified to each group from the 1970 sample. For the females, all
but one of the 1970 groups was in the same quadrant as the 1968 counter-
part. Group 5 was below the origin on the high school GPA dimension in
1968 and above in 1970. Four of the 21 male groups formed in 1970, Groups
5, 8, 9, and 11, were in different quadrants from the the corresponding
1968 groups.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 6 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Discussion

It was possible to form homogeneous groups well differentiates on the
life history factors, and to characterize these groups in terms of the

factors. Ss administered a shortened version of the biographical question-

naire were classified to the groups formed on the basis of data collected

two years earlier.

Four of the 1968 subgroups had few or none of the Ss tested in 1970

classified to them. One of the four, male group 6, contained only two

percent of the classified Ss in 1968, so the decrease could easily be

the result of fewer Ss in 1970. Preliminary indications are that the

other three groups (male groups 3 and 9, female group 10) were different

types of response bias. Groups 3 and 9 (male) were the only groups with

distinctly high means on the fifth factor, Pseudointellectualism (see

Table 4).

The relationship between group membership and selected educational

criteria was confirmed, thus showing that knowledge of a person's past

behavior can allow for meaningful prediction of educational progress. This

was true for both sexes.

Knowledge of previous research in the area of progress through the

educational system leads to certain expectations with regard to patterns

of behavior. For example, at the institution involved Arts and Sciences

is the tougher curriculum and tends to attract better students, who inturn

are less likely to dropout or go on probation. As can be seen from Tables

3 and 4, this tends to be the case with the exceptions of male groups 20,

22, 23 and female groups 8, 9, 14. In terms of the biographical factors

which characterize these groups, there could be as many as six explanations

for these deviations from the norm. Realistically there are probably two

or three, each of which is a hypothesis for an additional study. For

example, some Ss may be miscounceled into Arts and Science because of high

Science Interest and despite low Academic

Achievement, as seems to be the case with male group 20. However, another
explanation may revolve around a pattern seen for three of the groups,
male groups 22, 23 and female group 14. Each is low on the first factor,
Parental or Maternal Warmth, and high on the Parental Control factor.

One would think that dean's list and probation-dropout would represent
opposite extremes of the academic continuum, yet it is possible to find
groups that were below average on both (no groups were above average on both),
or groups that went in opposite directions on probations and dropout. The
several hypotheses that could be advanced to explain these deviations need
to be explored by means of additional research.

The discriminant analysis of the groups formed in 1968 and subsequent
location of the 1970 groups in the discriminant space provided a double
srinkage cross-validation. Chance factors influencing both the groups
interrelationships and idiosyncracies in the 1968 sample were corrected,
with the result that the dynamics involved were illustrated in a dramatic
way. For example, high SAT does not seem to compensate for low high school
GPA, as per male groups 22 and 23. The notable exception is male group 1
which was low on both dimensions yet had fewer dropouts (but more probations)
than average. The biographical profile of this group seems to confirm that
they are: (a) handicapped academically, (b) serious students (low Athletic
Interest), and (c) motivated to continue (high SES).

Conclusions

The results obtained suggest the following conclusions:

(1) The life history subgroups formed were related to selected educa-
tional criteria. The strength of this relationship between the subgroups
and criteria to be equal to or greater than that obtained by any variables

and/or predictive procedure currently being advocated.

(2) Comprehension of relationships was considerably enhanced, making possible the development of hypotheses for observed patterns of performance on the educational criteria.

(3) The subgroup structure was stable over a two year period. Approximately 65% of the Ss surveyed in 1970 were classified to one of the groups, only slightly less than the percentage of 1968 Ss that fit one and only group.

(4) The intergroup relationships cross validated. This was true for both the univariate and multivariate analyses.

The model suggested by Owens (1968) is suggested as a method of relating nontest variables to educational progress. Subgroups homogeneous with respect to the nontest variables can be compared on the educational criteria with an improvement in comprehension and no apparent loss in predictive efficiency.

References

Bryson, J. The dimensions of early human experience. In W. A. Owens (Chm.),
    Developmental implications of biographical data. Symposium presented
    at the meeting of the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology,
    Miami, Florida, April, 1969.

Claudy, J. G. An empirical investigation of small sample multiple regres-
    sion and cross-validation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,
    University of Tennessee, 1969.

Cleary, T. A. An individual differences model for multiple regression.
    Psychometrika, 1966, 31, 215-224.

Cooley, W. W. & Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate procedures for the behavioral
    sciences. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Fisk, D. W. The constraints of intro-individual variability in test
    response. Educational and Psychological Mearsurement, 1957, 17, 317-337.

Fisk, D. W. & Kice, L. Intra-individual response variability. Psychological
    Bulletin, 1955, 52, 217-250.

Frederiksen, N. & Melville, S. D. Differential predictability in the use
    of test scores. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1954, 14,
    647-656.

Ghiselli, E. E. Differentiation of individuals in terms of their predict-
    ability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1956, 40, 374-377.

Ghiselli, E. E. The prediction of predictability. Educational and
    Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 3-8. (a)

Ghiselli, E. E. Differentiation of tests in terms of the accuracy with which
    they predict for a given individual. Educational and Psychological
    Measurement, 1960, 20, 675-684. (b)

Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity. Manual for Alpha Biograph-
    ical Inventory. Greensboro, N. C.: Prediction Press, 1968.

Klein, S. P. , Rock, D. A. & Evans, F. R. The use of multiple moderators in
    academic prediction. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1968, 5, 151-160.

Lee, M. C. Interactions, configurations, and nonadditive models. Educational
    and Psychological Measurement, 1961, 21, 797-805.

Lovinger, J. Objective tests as instruments of psychological theory. In
    Jackson, D. N. & Messick, S. (Eds.) Problems in human assessment.
    New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1967.

Owens, W. A. Toward one discipline of scientific psychology. American
    Psychologist, 1968, 23, 782-785.

Owens, W. A. & Henry, E. R. Biographical data in industrial psychology:
    A review and evaluation. Green'boro, N. C.: Creativity Research
    Institute, Richardson Foundation, 1966

Rock, D. A. The identification and utilization of moderator effects in
    prediction systems. Research Pulletin 69-32. Princeton, N. J.:
    Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Schoenfeldt, L. F. Life experience as a moderator in the prediction
    of educational criteria. Paper presented at the meeting of the
    American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March 1970.

Ward, J. H.,Jr. Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function.
    Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1963, 58, 236-244.

Ward, J. H., Jr. & Hook, M. E. Application of an hierarchical grouping
    procedure to a problem of grouping profiles. Educational and
    Psychological Measurement, 1963, 23, 69-81.

Footnote

[1]In Dudek, E. E. (Chm.) , Use of nontest variables in admission, selection, and classification operations. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami, September 1970.

Table 1

Description of Female Biographical Factors in

Terms of High Scoring Individuals

Factor	% Variance Explained	R[b]	ρ_c[c]
1. Warmth of Maternal Relationship In high school, were very close to the mother; mother more often provided emotional support and interest; more often discussed intimate and/or important matters with mother.	4.3	.94	.92
2. Social Leadership More often tended to guide or direct others in group activities; participated in school politics; held more leadership positions in high school.	3.2	.95	.94
3. Academic Achievement High grades; very high standing in h.s. class; more competitive in academic situations; more often expected to be successful in academic tasks.	3.1	.96	.95
4. Socioeconomic Status High educational and occupational level of father, high family income and social class.	2.6	.96	.95
5. Parental Control vs. Freedom (bipolar) Parents were more strict, and allowed less freedom or independence, and were more punitive by taking away privileges.	2.4	.93	.91
6. Cultural-Literary Interests Regularly read national news magazines; did much more non-required reading; often watched TV news programs and special reports.	2.0	.88	.85
7. Athletic Participation Rated past performance in physical activities very high, very active in athletic activities; more often engaged in individual and team sports, enjoyed physical ed. courses.	1.9	.97	.96
8. Scientific-Artistic Interests Enjoyed courses in the sciences, music, or art, more often worked with scientific equipment or apparatus; physical and biological science subjects; active in dramatic, art or music groups	1.8	.92	.90
9. Conformity to Female Role More often suffered "attacks of conscience" when they felt they had done wrong by the standards of society, the church or parents; more often wished to become more socially acceptable, or better prepared as a responsible family member.	1.8	.88	.84
10. Maladjustment Often typically felt downcast and dejected, felt so upset that they brooded over the meaning of life; daydreamed to a greater extent; were more sensitive to criticism.	1.8	.92	.90
11. Expression of Negative Emotions Very often openly expressed anger with a close friend; very often tried to get even when someone close hurt or upset them; more often wanted to "take things out" on friends.	1.7	.87	.84
12. Social Maturity More likely to give help or advice to friends with personal problems; enjoyed complete freedom to work as they pleased in class projects or tasks; were respected by classmates.	1.6	.86	.82
13. Popularity with the Opposite Sex More often went on dates; started dating regularly and started going steady at younger age.	1.6	.90	.88
14. Positive Academic Attitude Teachers were more successful in arousing academic interests, and allowed much class participation and discussion; liked h.s. teachers to a greater degree; felt h.s. education was adequate.	1.5	.92	.90
15. Daddy's Girl Were very close to the father, and spent relatively more time with him, father provided emotional support, interest, and gave more attention.	1.3	.92	.90
Total Variance Explained:	32.6		

[a] Listed in descending order of variance explained.
[b] Multiple correlation using 128 biographical items (short form) to predict each factor score.
[c] The unbiased estimate of the cross-validated population correlation, which is the multiple correlation obtained by applying the sample weights to the entire population (Claudy, 1969).

Table 2

Description of Male Biographical Factors in

Terms of High Scoring Individuals[a]

Factor	% Variance Explained	R[b]	ρ_c[c]
1. Warmth of Parental Relationship Had a close, warm relationshop with both parents; parents were very likely to give affection, praise and attention; wanted to imitate and be like the father.	3.5	.96	.94
2. Academic Achievement High standing in h.s. class; often on the semester honor roll; very competitive and successful in academic situations.	3.1	.96	.95
3. Social Introversion Compared to others in high school: fewer casual friends, fewer dates, less popular, more self-conscious and ineffective in meeting demands of social situations.	3.1	.95	.94
4. Athletic Interest Very active in athletic activities; often engaged in team sports; enjoyed physical education courses, rated past performance in physical activities very high.	2.3	.97	.96
5. Pseudointellectualism Regularly read literary, business, or scientific magazines; watched educational and cultural TV shows.	2.3	.93	.91
6. Aggressiveness/Independence (Verbal) Enjoyed discussion courses, and tended to try to make others see their point of view; questioned teachers on subject matter a lot; were often regarded as radical or unconventional; often wanted to be alone to pursue own thoughts and interests.	2.2	.94	.93
7. Socioeconomic Status High parental educational level, average family income, and father's occupational is high.	2.1	.96	.95
8. Parental Control vs. Freedom (bipolar) Parents were more strict, critical, or punitive; anger was more often shown by or at parents; were allowed much less freedom or independence.	2.0	.94	.92
9. Positive Adjustment Response Bias Rarely wished to become more socially acceptable; less often chose parents or friends as someone to "take things out" on; less often felt downcast, dejected or self-conscious; not typical to daydream.	1.9	.94	.93
10. Scientific Interest Enjoyed science and lab courses, and found them relatively easy; worked with scientific apparatus and equipment, often outside of any required school assignment.	1.8	.95	.94
11. Positive Academic Attitude Liked school and teachers very much; teachers were more successful in arousing academic interests; enjoyed specific courses more; did more hours of homework.	1.5	.94	.92
12. Religious Activity Very active in church, religious or charitable organizations; compared to others of the same age, more often went to church, and had stronger religious belief.	1.3	.91	.88
13. Sibling Friction More often argued or fought with siblings; had more younger brother and sisters, close to their own age; more friction and feelings of competition.	1.1	.96	.95
Total Variance Explained	28.2		

[a] Listed in descending order of variance explained.
[b] Multiple correlation using 118 biographical items (short form) to predict each factor score.
[c] The unbiased estimate of the cross-validated population correlation, which is the multiple correlation obtained by applying the sample weights to the entire population (Claudy, 1969).

16

Table 3

Subgroup Differences on Biographical Factors and Selected Criteria -- Females

		Group Differences on Biographical Data Factors[a]															Grp. Diff's on Criteria			
N Group	Group	1 Matern. Warmth	2 Soc. Ldrshp.	3 Acad. Ach.	4 SES	5 Paren. Contr.	6 Cult. Liter. Inter.	7 Athl. Partic.	8 Sci. Artis. Inter.	9 Female Role	10 Mal-Adjust.	11 Neg. Emot.	12 Social Matur.	13 Popul. Oppos. Sex	14 Pos. Acad. Attit.	15 Dad's Girl	% Arts & Sci. School	% Dean's List	% Proba-tions	Group
73	1	MH*		MH*	ML*			ML*	ML*								39	25	7	1
65	2	H**	EH****/ML*	ML*			L**	ML*	ML*			MH*		MH*			Lo-35	Lo-3	29	2
59	3	ML*		MH*	VL*		ML*	VH*	ML*								Lo-35	17	8	3
38	4	MH*			MH*			H*	VL*				ML**	L***	ML**		50	24	16	4
47	5					MH*		ML*									52	17	9	5
41	6		L**	L**		MH*	VH**	MH*	MH*	VH***	VH****						Hi-68	Lo-0	Hi-37	6
56	7			VL*		ML*	VH**	MH*	MH*	VH**		L*	H*	VL**		L**	51	14	23	7
41	8			VH*			H****	MH*	H*	L***		VH****	MH*		L***		57	5	24	8
22	9			VL*			MH*		VH*		L*	H***	L****				49	6	23	9
35	10				L**						L*								Hi-40	10
42	11	MH*		H*	VH*	ML*		ML*	MH*		H****		VH*	ML**	VL***	L**	61	17	14	11
20	12		VL*	VH*	VL**			L*					H*	ML**	H****		Hi-75	Hi-35	Lo-5	12
70	13				H****		MH*	ML*	ML*	H***			MH*	H***	VH***		59	24	13	13
15	14	L****	H***			H****	VL**	MH*	L**								64	13	Lo-0	14
43	15					L*											40	14	12	15
	Average %																49%	15%	17%	

a/ H, : = Highest Grp., Lowest Grp. (0.57 to 1.55 s.d.'s above mean, or 0.65 to 2.54 s.d.'s below the mean)
   EH, EL= Extremely High, Extremely Low (more than 1 s.d. from mean)
   VH, VL= Very High, Very Low (between .75 and 1 s.d. from mean)
   MH, ML= Moderately High, Moderately Low (between .5 and .75 s.d. from mean)

**** = Group is significantly different from all other groups.
*** = Group is significantly different from 12 to 13 of the remaining groups.
** = Group is significantly different from 10 to 11 of the remaining groups.
* = Group is significantly different from 7 to 9 of the remaining groups.

Significance determined using the .05 level of the Newman-Keuls test.

Table 4

Subgroup Differences on Biographical Factors and Selected Criteria -- Males

N	Group	1 Paren. Warmth	2 Acad. Ach.	3 Soc. Introv.	4 Athl. Inter.	5 Intell.	6 Verb. Agress.	7 SES	8 Paren. Contr.	9 Pos. Adjust.	10 Sci. Inter.	11 Acad. Attit.	12 Relig. Activ.	13 Sib. Fric.	% Arts & Sci. School	% Dean's List	% Probations	% Drop-outs	Group
44	1		EH****	EL**	EL**	L*	VL**	VH*							45	5	39	18	1
48	2			EL**	MH*	H***	VL**								69	17	25	Lo-8	2
73	3		MH*	VL*	EL*										49	Lo-1	Lo-9	25	3
33	4												L***		55	12	Lo-9	24	4
31	5									MH* VL*	EH**			EL**	57	13	35	13	5
17	6		VH*	L***	EL**		EH***			VL* EL**	L*	EH***	H**	EL** VL*	56	12	12	29	6
14	7			H***	MH*			ML* VH*	L**			H***			H1-79	21	Lo-0	Lo-7	7
48	8								MH*	VL*			VL** ML**	VH***	57	4	25	27	8
34	9	VH*		MH*	MH*	EH****				VL*	VL*				47	3	H1-59	24	9
22	10	VH*					H***				ML* VL*		MH**		55	7	28	34	10
25	11	ML*			VH*				MH*	MH*		L*	MH**	H*** ML*	56	8	20	20	11
42	12							VL* L**							45	19	29	31	12
58	13		MH*		L** H*			EL**			VH*** H****			EL** VH*	Lo-40	3	45	36	13
27	14														H1-77	15	18	15	14
25	15				MH*									VH*	52	8	28	32	15
24	16	H*	H****	EH**			H***	H**		H****	MH* ML*				67	H1-55	21	17	16
22	17			EH**						L**					62	5	Lo-9	Lo-9	17
22	18	EL**	MH* VL*	VH*			EH**	VH*	MH* EH***		VH*** VH***	EH***	ML**	L**	50	14	45	23	18
14	19				MH*										H1-93	4	21	21	19
45	20				VH*		L***						ML**		67		H1-53	36	20
25	21	L***	VH*	VH*	VH*				H*** MH*				VL**	EL**	64	H1-40	12	12	21
37	22	ML*	L***	ML*											65	3	H1-54	38	22
24	23												EL**		62	Lo-0	46	H1-50	23
													Average %		55%	10%	33%	25%	

a/ L, L = Highest Grp., Lowest Grp. (0.90 to 2.01 s.d.'s above mean, or 0.79 to 1.57 s.d.'s below mean)
EH, EL = Extremely High, Extremely Low (more than 1 s.d. from mean)
VH, VL = Very High, Very Low (between .75 and 1 s.d. from mean)
MH, ML = Moderately High, Moderately Low (between .5 and .75 s.d. from mean)

**** = Group is significantly different from all other groups.
*** = Group is significantly different from 19 to 21 of the remaining groups.
** = Group is significantly different from 16 to 18 of the remaining groups.
* = Group is significantly different from 12 to 15 of the remaining groups.

Significance determined using the .05 level of the Newman-Keuls test.

Table 5

Group Means on Predicted Grade Point Average; 1968 and 1970

| | Males | | | | Females | | | |
| | 1968 Sample | | 1970 Sample | | 1968 Sample | | 1970 Sample | |
Group	N	Predicted GPA	N	Predicted GPA	N	Predicted GPA	N	Predicted GPA
1	44	2.27	37	2.34	73	2.85	71	2.77
2	48	2.81	38	3.0?	65	2.24	43	2.34
3	73	2.09	6		59	2.76	43	2.69
4	33	2.43	48	2.62	38	2.50	44	2.58
5	31	2.38	11	2.31	47	2.52	50	2.75
6	17	2.56	3		41	2.23	20	2.71
7	14	3.03	14	2.81	56	2.46	62	2.51
8	48	2.27	68	2.29	41	2.36	61	2.37
9	34	2.09	7	2.37	22	2.70	91	2.91
10	29	2.26	30	2.31	35	2.28	1	
11	25	2.59	33	2.66	42	2.58	82	2.70
12	42	2.45	55	2.56	20	3.01	26	2.94
13	58	2.41	38	2.46	70	2.78	69	3.00
14	27	2.85	18	3.18	15	2.56	15	2.87
15	25	2.40	19	2.48	43	2.59	15	2.74
16	24	2.57	21	2.64				
17	22	3.18	21	3.25				
18	22	2.37	25	2.49				
19	14	2.30	12	2.73				
20	45	2.04	47	2.19				
21	25	2.65	34	2.76				
22	37	2.29	60	2.46				
23	24	2.18	43	?.30				
Total	761		688		667		693	

Table 6

Variate Correlations with the Discriminant Functions

	Correlations with Functions			
	Males		Females	
Variables	I	II	I	II
High School GPA	.98	-.12	1.00	-.04
SAT - Verbal	.36	.88	.26	.9ʃ
SAT - Math	.32	.61	.26	.34
Canonical r	.51	.32	.46	.38
Probability	.000	.000	.000	.000
% Variance	40%	38%	38%	35%

Figure Captions

Figure 1   Female group centroids in the predicted GPA discriminant space.

Figure 2   Male group centroids in the predicted GPA discriminant space.