

EXPECTED AND ACTUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT DURING THE COLLEGE
YEARS: PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS

by

SHIREEN “SHERI” POWELL KING

(Under the Direction of Diane L. Cooper)

ABSTRACT

The majority of today’s traditional-age college students are from the Millennial generation, meaning, among other things, that they have a different type of relationship with their parents than previous generations. Typically, their parents have been involved in their school lives throughout their K-12 years. Many parents expect to continue being involved while their sons and daughters are in college. Because there is a changing trend in parent-child relationships and this change is being seen in higher education, administrators need to understand and prepare for the impact of these trends.

In order to meet the challenges surrounding parental involvement and to create avenues for improvement of parent-student-institution relationships, it is important to have a clear understanding of the underpinnings and the expectations of parents and traditional-age college students. Much of what is available in the literature today regarding parental involvement during the college years is anecdotal and conceptual in nature. The purpose of this study was to examine parental involvement from the perspectives of today’s traditional-age college students and their parents, including the examination of several variables (race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first generation to attend

college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, or level of parental involvement in high school) to determine if differences existed in their expectations for involvement. Additionally, 122 parent-student family unit matched pairs were examined for similarities and differences in their perceptions of parental involvement.

Two parallel versions of the College Parent Experience Questionnaire (CPEQ) were administered online: one for college students and one for their parents. Data analysis of the 502 parent respondents and 159 student respondents produced a multitude of significant findings. These findings provide empirical data on parental involvement that will guide institutions in the development of parent programs, parent offices, and guideline for parent interactions. Additionally this information is useful when planning programs for today's Millennial college students.

INDEX WORDS: Parent involvement, parental involvement, expectations for involvement, parents of college students, Millennial college students, college parent perceptions.

EXPECTED AND ACTUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT DURING THE COLLEGE
YEARS: PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS

by

SHIREEN "SHERI" POWELL KING

B.S., New York University, 1973

M.A., University of California, 1974

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

© 2007

Shireen “Sheri” Powell King

All Rights Reserved

EXPECTED AND ACTUAL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT DURING THE COLLEGE
YEARS: PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS

by

SHIREEN "SHERI" POWELL KING

Major Professor: Diane L. Cooper

Committee: Patricia W. Daugherty
Richard H. Mullendore
Pamela O. Paisley

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2007

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my inspirations past and present. To my mother, the late Verna Holt Thompkins and my grandfather, the late John Calvin Holt: I thank you for the love of education you instilled in me and the lessons you taught me. To my sons, Julian Holt King and Kyle Ryan King, nothing means more to me than your love and support. This is for you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

....No man is an island, entire of itself...
--John Dunne

These words come to mind as I reflect on my four-year journey to my doctorate degree; my success is owed to so many who have supported, guided, and consoled me along the way. The road has been demanding, and I firmly believe I completed this journey only because of those who traveled with me over parts of, or the entire, journey. I cannot possibly name all here, but I want to acknowledge several individuals.

My journey began in February of 2003 when an unexpected last-minute schedule change orchestrated a meeting with Diane Cooper. In a matter of 30 minutes she had turned my plan 180 degrees in another direction from that which I intended. She became my major professor, and since that moment she has guided my journey with wisdom and compassion, and with amazing foresight that I often doubted in terms of my abilities but she was right in every decision. Diane, I thank you for believing in me.

My committee members, Pat Daugherty, Dick Mullendore and Pam Paisley provided invaluable insights and suggestions that helped me to craft this dissertation. You are truly experts in your fields and were wonderful to work with. Pat I can't thank you enough for her tutelage as my supervisor and your keen editorial eyes!

Despite the obvious differences in our ages, the CSAA master's cohort of 2005 accepted me as an equal, and often as a sage—or at least a wise motherly person. I learned so much from each of you and I will always remember our long hours working on many group projects.

Andy Wilson, Wanda Gibson, Jan Lloyd, Bobby Woodard, Alicia Coburn, Brandon Frye, and Michael Shutt, the doctoral cohort that I entered with in 2003, and my other cohort, Val Molyneaux, Kathy Alday and Brad Harmon that entered in 2004: your support has been overwhelming. We've persevered through many trials and tribulations together and have managed to maintain our sanity against all odds. I consider all of you friends for life, but some of you have become like family to me as well, and I want to thank each of you individually.

Amy Diepenbrock: how can I ever thank you for seeing through my calm facades, realizing I was ready to run for the hills and reaching out to me to be my mentor and support. You kept me grounded on numerous occasions and your constant reassurances made me actually believe I could do it.

Andy Wilson and Matt Engelhart: who'd have thought we would bond the way we have? You've become my neighbors, and have always been there for me. I could always count on you to cheer me when I was at my wits ends, often with wine and Matt's wonderful cooking. Your love has filled a special chamber in my heart that is only reserved for the closest of family. (And thanks, Andy for schlepping that heavy tome to me from Emory's library!)

Wanda Gibson: there is no way anyone could be a greater friend. Your honesty, willing spirit, great listening skills, generosity, humor, and kindness have made me wonder how I could have gone this far without you in my life. No one has a heart bigger than yours. I am humbled by you on a daily basis and I am honored to call you my dear friend.

Finally to my sons, Julian and Kyle: I thank you for all the lessons I have learned about parenting as your mother. Being a part of your lives during your college years provided insight into the world of college student affairs and has prepared me more for my new career than most textbooks did.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Purpose of Study	4
Research Questions	5
Operational Definitions	6
Limitations.....	7
Summary	7
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Parent-Child Relationships.....	9
Millennial Students and Their Parents	14
Parental Involvement.....	18
Parent and Student Expectations	24
Current Trends.....	27
Summary	29
3 METHODOLOGY	30
Research Design.....	30

Participants	31
Data Collection.....	32
Research Questions and Data Analysis	35
4 RESULTS	37
Findings: Research Question 1	43
Findings: Research Question 2.....	62
Findings: Research Question 3.....	79
Findings: Research Question 4.....	87
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	95
Summary of the Study.....	95
Summary and Discussion of Significant Findings	96
Additional Limitations of the Study.....	110
Implications for Practice	113
Implications for Future Research.....	118
Conclusion.....	121
REFERENCES	122
APPENDICES	128
A LETTER TO PARENTS AND FAMILIES INTEREST GROUP LISTSERV	129
B LETTER TO PARENTS.....	130
C LETTER TO STUDENTS.....	131
D PARENT SURVEY	132
E STUDENT SURVEY	142

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: Institutions in the Study	31
Table 4.1: Demographics of Survey Participants	38
Table 4.2: Types of Questions in the Study	41
Table 4.3: Actual and Expected Parental Involvement.....	44
Table 4.4: Online and Print Communication	45
Table 4.5: Experiences with Faculty	46
Table 4.6: College Finances.....	47
Table 4.7: Housing and Food Services	48
Table 4.8: Mental and Physical Health.....	50
Table 4.9: Parent-Student Contact (Co-curricular).....	51
Table 4.10: Expected Contact from Student.....	52
Table 4.11: Expected Contact from College Personnel	54
Table 4.12: Campus Events	55
Table 4.13: Relationships.....	56
Table 4.14: Type of Contact	58
Table 4.15: Parent-perceived Involvement.....	59
Table 4.16: Satisfaction with Institution.....	59
Table 4.17: RQ1: Parents' Perceptions of their Parental Involvement.....	60
Table 4.18: Students' Perceptions of Actual and Expected Parental Involvement.....	62

Table 4.19: Online and Print Communication	63
Table 4.20: Experiences with Faculty.....	64
Table 4.21: College Finances.....	65
Table 4.22: Housing and Food Services	66
Table 4.23: Mental and Physical Health.....	67
Table 4.24: Parent-Student Contact (Co-curricular).....	69
Table 4.25: Expected Contact from Student.....	70
Table 4.26: Expected Contact from College Personnel	72
Table 4.27: Campus Events	73
Table 4.28: Relationships.....	74
Table 4.29: Type of Contact	75
Table 4.30: Student Perceptions of Parent Involvement.....	76
Table 4.31: Expectations Met by Institution.....	77
Table 4.32: RQ2: Students' Perceptions of Parental Involvement	77
Table 4.33: Matched Pairs with Significant Results.....	80
Table 4.34: RQ3: Matched Pairs for Family Unit.....	86
Table 4.35: Significantly Different Demographic Factors	88
Table 4.36: RQ4: Effects of Demographics on Parental Involvement	93

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The majority of today's traditional-age college students are from the Millennial generation, meaning, among other things, that they have a different type of relationship with their parents than previous generations. Typically, their parents have been involved in their school lives throughout their K-12 years (Choy, 2000; Conklin & Dailey, 1981; Hofferth & Sandberg, 1998). Many parents expect to continue being involved while their sons and daughters are in college. Because there is a changing trend in parent-child relationships, and this change is being seen in higher education, administrators need to understand and prepare for the impact of these trends.

Statement of the Problem

Individuals born from 1982 to 2002 are considered a part of the Millennial Generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Strauss & Howe, 1991) and are commonly referred to as Millennial students. According to Howe and Strauss, these students have certain characteristics that differentiate them from students who comprised previous generations. The majority of parents of Millennials are from the Baby Boomer generation (born from 1943 to 1960). Many of them attended college in the 1960s and 1970s, a time when the college environment was structured differently from today's colleges. Their expectations have been based in part on what they experienced or witnessed over thirty years ago (Galinsky, 1987; Moriarty, 2007). As the Millennials enter college, new challenges have surfaced for parents, students, student affairs professionals, and college administrators (Sandeen & Barr, 2006).

The relationship between the parent and the child has been studied over the years from the perspectives of the parent and the child; some of the studies focused on attachment patterns, dependencies and interdependencies, developmental impact, social interactions, and the impact of separation (Ainsworth, 1989; Galinsky, 1987; Weidman, 1989). These relationships are present at some level when the child enters college (Austin, 2003). In developing theories and models of college student development, some theorists discussed the developmental patterns in terms of the student growth into independence from their parents (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). The Theory of Identity Development by Chickering and Reisser (1993) is one such example of a theoretical view of a student's transition away from parental influence and toward autonomy. In order to develop a theory on how an individual transitions away from parental influence, it must be acknowledged that there was a parent-child relationship before the child reached college.

During the K-12 years parents were told that their involvement in the educational process was essential to the success of their children, and literature supports this claim (Choy, 2000; Conklin & Dailey, 1981). They were given numerous opportunities to become involved, and they received guidance and parameters to follow. As a result, this generation of parents is child-centered and has devoted much time to their children. They have structured their children's activities and free time (Hofferth & Sandberg, 1998). The college years for many of them provided a natural opportunity for continuation of their pattern of involvement.

As a result of parent involvement, it is suspected that Millennial students have grown up closer to their parents than other recent generations (Cawthon & Miller, 2003; Gerardy, 2002; Howe & Strauss, 2003; Mastrodicasa, 2006). Their parents have sheltered them, and many students tend to rely on their parents for a variety of things, which they see as needs. With the

multitude of technological inventions, students can remain in touch with their parents through cell phones, email, instant messenger, and text messaging (Merriman, 2006). In fact, most of these methods allow for rapid if not immediate connections and responses, which lead today's students to expect to be able to reach their parents expeditiously whenever the need for guidance, assistance or just comfort arises.

Student affairs professionals, many of whom are from the previous two generations—Generation X (born 1961 – 1981), and Baby Boomer (born 1943 – 1960)—find themselves in situations that are different from the experiences they had while in college in terms of interactions with parents. Parents are calling the institutions on matters ranging from trivial (such as wanting the temperature in a daughter's room adjusted) to serious (such as being concerned about signs of clinical depression) (Merriman, 2006). As a consumer-oriented population, parents expect answers and assistance from the first person with whom they come into contact, which is often someone in student affairs (Johnson, 2004; Keppler, Mullendore & Carey, 2005). Without a clear understanding of legal constraints such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), or specific procedures and guidelines from their institutions, these professionals are left perplexed and frustrated (Lowery, 2005). Many professionals are concerned that *in loco parentis*, a policy in existence until the early 1970s, is returning (Johnson, 2004).

In recent years there has been a trend in higher education to develop policies that address the parent factor in the lives of college students. Parent offices, parent associations, and parent councils are on the rise (Keppler, Mullendore & Carey, 2005; Merriman, 2006). Professional development programs are surfacing that address the role of parents, although some of them are developed from a negative stance towards parents. One institution, The University of Vermont,

hired and trained students to be “parent bouncers” during orientation to keep parents away from the academic advising sessions (Wills, 2005). Many refer to the parents as *helicopter parents*, a term created by a college administrator at Wake Forest University that portrays them as hovering above their children, waiting to swoop in to solve every problem (Howe & Strauss, 2003).

Currently there is a lack of consensus within the field on what is considered to be an appropriate level of parental involvement. According to Johnson (2004),

To be involved is to be included as a part of the whole, to be drawn in as a participant in a clearly defined relationship. To be enmeshed is to become entangled in a relationship in which there are unclear boundaries and an unhealthy sense of dependence. (p.2)

Parents are often misunderstood. In her research on parent development, Galinsky (1987) found a variety of support programs for parents with children of all ages but no clear delineation of parent development stages, the knowledge of which can impact the development of these programs. As Galinsky put it, “...one thing, however, has not changed: the extent to which parents’ feelings and actions are misinterpreted when there is little or no knowledge of parent development” (p. xv). In order to develop clear working relationships, definitions and guidelines are needed for parents, students and institutions. An examination of parental involvement and expectations from the perspectives of the parents and the students is needed to help establish proper guidelines.

Purpose of the Study

With the conversion of the traditional college student to the Millennial generation, many new challenges exist in higher education today. In order to meet the challenges surrounding parental involvement and to create avenues for improvement of parent-student-institution relationships, it is important to have a clear understanding of the underpinnings and the

expectations of parents and traditional-age college students. Much of what is available in the literature today regarding parental involvement during the college years is anecdotal and conceptual in nature. The purpose of this study was to examine parental involvement from the perspectives of today's traditional-age college students and their parents, including the examination of several variables to determine if differences existed in their expectations for involvement.

It was anticipated that the results of this study would provide empirical data to support institutions' desire to improve parent-student-institution relationships in their shared goal of developing mature, independent college graduates.

Research Questions

In order to add to the literature on parental involvement, the researcher proposed the following questions:

1. What do parents want and/or expect in terms of being involved with their student's development and experiences while in college?
2. What do students perceive their parents want and/or expect in terms of involvement with them while in college?
3. Do parents and students in a family unit have the same perceptions of parental involvement?
4. Is there an effect on parent expectations for involvement based on race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first generation to attend college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, or level of parental involvement in high school?

Operational Definitions

Traditional student: For the purposes of this study, a traditional student was defined as an undergraduate student between the ages of 18 and 24 who is currently enrolled full-time at an institution of higher education. This term was used interchangeably with the term Millennial student.

Parent: The term parent included the individual(s) listed in the student's enrollment records as the mother, father, step-mother, step-father, and/or legal guardian.

Non-traditional student: For the purpose of this study, a student over the age of twenty-five, a parent or individual with dependents, or a student working full-time, was considered non-traditional. The focus of this study was on traditional-age students. This definition was included to differentiate non-traditional from traditional-age students.

Involvement: Using a combination of definitions, involvement was defined as parental encouragement towards education (Hossler, Schmit, & Vesper, 1999), support for the student's educational development, participation in or attendance at the student's activities (Trusty, 1998), and contact with the student during the college years (Johnson, 2004).

First generation: A student was considered first generation if neither of his or her parents attended college. It was possible that the student might have had a sibling(s) who was currently enrolled in college or had graduated from college and still be considered a first generation student.

K-12: In this study, the traditional mandatory education years covering kindergarten through 12th grade were referred to as K-12.

Limitations

Several limitations were taken into consideration for the proposed study. A convenience sample was utilized for this study. In order to solicit participants for this study, the researcher had to determine a way to reach parents for an online survey. Institutions do not always have parent information in a separate database from the students' confidential records. One way to access parents was through existing parent association or parent office email lists. The researcher recognized that since the parents in this study were members of parent associations, they had voluntarily joined the associations and expected to have some level of involvement during the college years. This fact could have had an impact on the data collected.

Another limitation was the self-reported nature of this type of study. It was up to the individual participants to answer the questions as they perceived the answers; therefore, the validity and accuracy of their responses were assumed. The researcher considered using a response bias scale such as the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, but determined it was not a good fit for the instrument used in this study.

There are a multitude of institutional characteristics (size, type, mission, etc.). Therefore, it was difficult to generalize involvement to all categories. The researcher attempted to use a cross-section of institutions without making broad statements about parental involvement at *all* institutions.

Summary

Parents of today's traditional-age college students have been involved with their students during the K-12 years. Millennial students have been raised by parents who were involved with their education and experiences and they have seen this involvement as a normal occurrence. As these students enter college, the parent-child relationship continues. Institutions of higher

education have begun to experience the trend being set by the current generation of students and their parents and are creating new programs and policies to address parental involvement. In order to optimize their programs' effectiveness, it was important to get the perspectives of parents and students on their expectations for parental involvement. This study examined their perspectives.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Traditionally, students typically enter college in the United States at or around age eighteen. As early as the 19th century this milestone was seen as a step into adulthood (Cohen, 1998) and a time when students were under the control of the institution in lieu of the parent. However, today many institutions are finding more contact with, and involvement by, parents of these traditional-age students. As with any evolution of customary practices, college administrators, faculty, and student affairs professionals have to adapt. This chapter provides an overview of the literature on parent and student characteristics, current parental involvement trends, and expectations for involvement by today's college students and their parents.

Parent-Child Relationships

According to Austin (2003), “students arrive on campus with many significant relationships in place [including] relationships with parents...Long before and long after new social and collegial attachments form, students rely on these previously established relationships for feedback, reassurance and guidance...” (p.137). Several theories address these relationships and have relevance to parental involvement. Attachment Theory (Ainsworth, 1989) discussed how an individual forms an attachment to another starting in infancy. The Six Stages of Parenthood (Galinsky, 1987) discussed the parent-child relationship from the parent's perspective. Chickering and Reisser's Theory of Identity Development (1993) focused on the psychosocial development of college-age individuals as they move towards independence and adulthood, and

how relationships factor into their development. An understanding of these three theories will facilitate the understanding of parental involvement with adolescents and college students.

Attachment Theory

During the 1950s, animal researchers studied the attachment of infant monkeys to their mothers. John Bowlby (Ainsworth, 1989) furthered the research as it pertained to humans and developed the Attachment Theory. His work was later expanded by others, most notably Mary Ainsworth. Attachment is defined as a connection between two individuals that binds them together in space and endures over time (Ainsworth, 1989). This attachment is biologically rooted; it begins in infancy as a means of survival whereby the infant is protected by a person in close proximity, usually the parent or caregiver. A bond is formed, and communication is established at a primal level by crying or reaching out to facilitate a nearness to the parent. As the child progresses in age, verbal communication patterns develop which allow for negotiation of mutually acceptable plans. According to Ainsworth, when the child reaches adolescence, hormonal changes cause the child to seek attachments to peers and usually to begin searching for a life partner. As the youth enters adulthood and develops autonomy, attachment patterns to another adult figure are strengthened, usually through a need for a sexual pair bond; however, the parent-child bond does not cease. Even though the relationship is altered, the bond between the parent and child usually continues until the death of one of the individuals, and even beyond for many.

Six Stages of Parenthood

Ellen Galinsky (1987) theorized that there are six stages of parenthood. She conducted a study where she interviewed 228 parents across the nation from diverse backgrounds and demographics (age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, family structure, family size, religious

beliefs). They represented a wide array of experiences in parenting, and Galinsky identified common threads to form her theory. Her stages are *image-making* (during pregnancy), *nurturing* (birth to 2 years), *authority* (2 to 5 years), *interpretive* (5 to 12), *interdependent* (teenage years), and *departure* (rising adulthood). Image-making is the process by which parents visualize what they expect. This process is the paramount feature of the first stage, the *image-making* stage; however, it is also present in every stage of parenthood because parents have expectations of what the upcoming ages of childhood will bring and how their relationship with the child will progress. Another key point about Galinsky's theory is that it differed from other life-stage theories since parents can be in the stages concurrently when they have more than one child. Therefore, each stage relates to the age of each child as opposed to the age of the parent.

The next three stages take the parent through the first twelve years of the child's life. The parent becomes attached to the child during the *nurturing* stage and learns how to properly respond to the needs of the child, while balancing his/her own needs. Once the child develops to the point of being able to verbally communicate its needs and wants, the parent enters the *authority* stage where he or she now determines what rules will be set, how they will be enforced, and what consequences will accompany a violation of the rules. By the time the child enters kindergarten or first grade, the parents become reflective and questioning of the reality and success of their parenting to this point. They are also interpreting where their role will take them and the child, determining how to respond to the questions the child will now pose, and what values, knowledge and skills they want for the child.

The last two stages of parenthood are most relevant to parents of traditional-age college students. During the teenage years when the parents are in the *interdependent stage*, parents are forming a new relationship with the child, much of which is a reconstruction of the authority

stage. The child is changing physically and emotionally, parent-child communication patterns are changing, and the parent must face the reality of these changes by letting go of previous images of the child and accepting the new teenager's identity. During this time the parent must also face his or her own changes as a parent, brought on by new challenges and reactions from the teenager. The parent's fears and concerns for the teenager increase at a time when he or she has less control over the teenager. Additionally, in two-parent families or divorced family units where both parents are still involved, the teenager's changes can impact the relationship between the two adults, creating more pressure on the parents. Parents in this stage are constantly comparing the teenager to images from the parents' pasts regarding how they formed their identity as teenagers. Often this causes problems if the two parents had different experiences as teenagers. Throughout this stage the parent forms a new bond with the teenager and begins to prepare for the ultimate separation—a process that increases the stress on the relationship.

In the final stage of parenting, the *departure* stage, the parent anticipates and prepares for the departure, adapts to the departure, and takes on a less controlling role. Additionally, this is a time for the parent to evaluate his or her role as a parent. The images that parents have during each of the phases of this stage vary. Some parents become more attached to the teenager and attempt to delay the separation. Some see it as a time to increase the amount of freedom and independence of their teenagers in an effort to prepare them for their time on their own. Some parents welcome the “empty nest” (if the teenager's departure will leave the home without additional children) as a time for them to focus more on themselves, while others see it as a large void in their lives that will be difficult to fill. With all of these images, parents are faced with accepting the reality of the changes in their teenager and abandoning their own images for

existing reality. When the separation actually comes to fruition, the parents begin to form images of what the reunion with the now young adult will bring and when it will occur.

Theory of Identity Development

With its focus on the college years, Arthur Chickering's theory on identity development was introduced in 1969 after he researched college sophomores and seniors over a seven year span. His theory was revised and updated in 1993 with the assistance of Linda Reisser (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). According to Chickering and Reisser, there are seven vectors—developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy towards independence, maintaining mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. The stages of this theory are referred to as vectors because they have both direction (although not always in a straight line) and magnitude. Students move through these vectors at different paces, and often an issue or circumstance can cause them to revisit a stage previously mastered, even though they have moved on to another vector.

In the first vector, *developing competence*, students are developing competence on three levels—intellectual, physical and interpersonal. They are learning how to study, to think about tasks, and to manage their time; they are faced with how to take care of their bodies and live healthy lifestyles now that they are away from home and their parents; and they are learning how to work with others as both team members and leaders. Students experiencing the second vector, *managing emotions*, face their emotional issues. Student must learn to recognize and accept their emotions and learn how to properly control and express them. They are learning how to be responsible for their actions and to reduce their impulsiveness. When *moving through autonomy toward interdependence*, the third vector, students are becoming more independent (autonomous) while recognizing the importance of their interconnection (interdependency) with their peers and

others. They are developing emotional independence as they adjust to their separation from their parents and begin to function without constantly needing reassurance and approval from others. The fourth vector, *developing mature interpersonal relationships*, is the time when students begin to develop tolerance, respect and appreciation for individuals regardless of their differences.

Building on the previous vectors, the student entering the *establishing identity* vector is beginning to come into his own and accept his/her identity in terms of physical attributes, gender and sexual orientation, social and cultural constructs, and self-esteem. In the next vector, *developing purpose*, the individual has a clearer understanding of his personal interests, career plans, and interpersonal and family commitments. College students who reach the final vector, *developing integrity*, develop humanized and personalized value systems and develop congruence with these systems and their personal actions.

Millennial Students and Their Parents

Millennial Students

Although not developmental theorists, William Strauss and Neil Howe are noted for their research and analyses regarding generational differences. Strauss (2006) described a generation as a cohort group whose length approximates the ages from birth to adulthood, a span of approximately 21 years. Each generation shares three traits: 1) a common age and location in history; 2) a common attitude and behavioral traits; and 3) a common collective identity (Strauss & Howe, 1991; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Strauss, 2006). Today's traditional-age college students fall into the generation commonly referred to as the Millennial generation, which includes individuals born from 1982 to 2002. In contrast, students born prior to 1982 who are currently enrolled in college are referred to as non-traditional students because they attend college later in

life. The non-traditional term can also refer to students who attend college part time or while raising families (Clinton, 2005; McBride, 2006). Considering all classifications of institutions of higher education, and when the latter two definitions are included, non-traditional students represent the majority of students in college (Clinton, 2005; Daniel, Evans & Ross, 2001; McGuire, 2006). However, since non-traditional students are usually independent adults living on their own, typically their parents are not involved.

According to Strauss and Howe (1991) there are four phases of life: youth (ages 0-21), rising adulthood (ages 22-43), midlife (ages 44-65), and elderhood (ages 66-87). Another representation of the phases of life has slightly different age groupings and adds a phase, late elderhood, to cover those individuals who live beyond age 84 (Gerardy, 2002). By either account, Millennial students in college today are in a transition from youth to rising adulthood. During this transition they are “setting the tone” for the decade with a set of values and focal points that differs somewhat from the previous generations. Reports show that there is a decline in substance abuse, crime, suicide, teen pregnancies and truancy and an increase in community and civic involvement, achievements by women, and stronger religious beliefs (Gerardy). Millennial students are actively involved in many civic causes and feel it is up to them to change the world (Jayson, 2006).

Seven key traits have been attributed to Millennials (Howe & Strauss, 2003). They have been *sheltered* and protected by their parents since birth with amenities such as padded playgrounds, car seats and bicycle helmets. They are *confident* in their abilities and expect to succeed. They take a *team-oriented* approach to their activities from sports to studying and dating in groups. They have *conventional*, traditional value systems and a strong family orientation. They are accustomed to *achieving* their goals and often expect to reach the highest

levels quickly. Throughout life they have been *pressured* to excel by parents and peers. Finally, they see themselves as being *special* because they have been instilled with a sense of collectively being vital to the nation and its future (Gerardy, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2003).

Demographically, Millennials are the most diverse group of students to enter college. To this generation, diversity does not just mean black and white; it encompasses a wide array of ethnicities (Howe & Strauss, 2000) and includes a rapidly increasing number of women. In fact, today's colleges have more women enrolled than men (DeBard, 2004). Family income levels are diverse as well. The number of wealthy families (over \$100,000) with college students has increased, but so has the number of students from families with low income levels (under \$25,000) (DeBard; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2000a).

Parents of Millennials

Although some of the parents of today's traditional-age college students are from the generation referred to as Generation X (born from 1961 to 1981), the majority of the parents of today's traditional-age college students are members of the Baby Boomer generation (born from 1943 to 1960), so named because of the sharp increase in children being born after servicemen returned home from World War II (Howe & Strauss, 2003). During Boomers' early youth, family structures were typically traditional with working fathers and stay-at-home mothers who nurtured them. Boomers reached the end of their youth phase of life and the beginning of their rising adulthood phase during the 1960s and 1970s, which was another era marked by a war—the Vietnam War (Strauss, 2006). This was also a major time for the feminist movement, and the family unit began to change with more mothers entering the workforce (Strauss).

Known for their sometimes rebellious behavior and the multitude of causes taken on by Boomers, it is understandable that these individuals fought for a change within higher education.

Student protests targeted college dress codes, visitation rules for members of the opposite sex, and curfews—typical of their quest to be considered free from parental control (Johnson, 2004). The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), also known then as the Buckley Amendment, is credited with the ultimate demise of *in loco parentis*, the practice where institutions of higher education accepted students with the understanding that they were stepping into the role of parenting the students (Cohen, 1998; Lowery, 2005). FERPA has been revised several times since 1974, and the current form regulates the type of contact parents can have with their son's or daughter's institution—something many Boomers wanted as young adults but challenge now.

Boomers entered into parenthood and, according to Howe and Strauss (2000), became *passionate, protective, involved, concerned, intelligent, and knowledgeable* parents. These factors in turn developed the traits in their children that identify them as being Millennials. Some researchers have been concerned that parents are stunting the developmental growth of their children and causing psychological and emotional breakdowns in their children (Marano, 2004) by being overprotective and micro-managing.

Tight scheduling is an essential part of family life, especially in households where both parents work (Hofferth, 1999). As working parents, parents of Millennials spent more time with their children outside of school by structuring their time, thereby virtually eliminating the old concept of “free time” (Hofferth; Robinson & Godbey, 1997). Parents spent a lot of time cheering on their children at sporting events, watching them in performances, and transporting them to lessons and tutoring sessions. This made the child a central point in family life (Cawthon & Miller, 2003).

Parental Involvement

The concept of parental involvement has either not been explicitly defined (Trusty, 1998) or has taken on differing definitions; whether it is seen as a positive behavior or not depends on the person defining it. According to Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2003), involve means "to enfold or envelope so as to encumber"; "to engage as a participant"; "to occupy (as oneself) absorbingly"; "to relate closely"; and "to have an effect on" (p. 617). Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) defined parent involvement as "the dedication of resources by the parent to the child within a given domain" (p. 238). Their definition was designed to emphasize the parent's educational involvement (an overt behavior) as being separate from general involvement that is normally associated with parenting.

In an attempt to determine family influence on educational expectations of high school students, Trusty (1998) included parental attention, support and effective communication in his definition of parent involvement. In a study that examined transition to college for at-risk students, Choy, Horn, Nunez and Chen (2000) defined parent involvement and parent engagement in terms of the frequency at which parents discussed certain topics with their children, helped them select high school courses and activities, and assisted with their college planning.

In a study on parental influence on teen behaviors and alcohol use, Wood, Read, Mitchell and Brand (2004) separated the concept of parent monitoring from parent nurturance and support. They defined parental nurturance as "behaviors that demonstrate caring and acceptance of the child" (p. 20), including encouragement and active involvement. Parental monitoring involves attempts to control and track the activities of the child. In this case, nurturance is seen as assuming a positive role, while monitoring is seen as assuming a negative role.

Johnson (2004) differentiated between being involved or included as a part of a whole (a positive interpretation) and being enmeshed or entangled in a relationship with nebulous boundaries (a negative interpretation). When the media and college administrators use the term helicopter parent they are most often referring to the latter definition of being enmeshed in the lives of the students. The term was originally coined by Mary Gerardy, Assistant Vice President for Student Life at Wake Forest University; she describes these parents as “always hovering—ultra-protective, unwilling to let go...” (Howe & Strauss, 2003, p. 11).

K-12 Parental Involvement

Parents were encouraged throughout the K-12 school years to become involved with their children’s education, both in and out of school. Teachers, school administrators, parent-teacher organizations and the media continually reminded the public of the importance of parental involvement. A search of the World Wide Web for parental involvement at each of the three levels (elementary school, middle school and high school) produced hundreds of thousands of sites to find more information. A narrowed search for “elementary school parent involvement opportunities” produced over seven hundred sites which either offered suggestions and opportunities for involvement or reported on the benefits for children.

These claims of the importance of K-12 parental involvement were based on years of research. The Department of Education released a report that reviewed and synthesized 41 studies on parental involvement (Cotton & Wikelund, 1989). This report found positive effects on student achievement, attitudes, and social behaviors as a result of parental involvement. Additionally, it found evidence of higher achievement levels when parents were more actively involved in the child’s activities, increased positive effects when parents who worked were involved with the child in the home, and even greater benefits when parents combined in-home

involvement with school-related activities. These same patterns emerged when examining their effects on student attitudes and social behaviors. The type of involvement that produced positive effects changed as the students reached middle school and high school because of several factors, including a greater distance to the schools, more challenging courses, and the beginning of the student's independence from parents. Therefore, the parents of older students were encouraged to help by monitoring assignments, attending school activities, and guiding the students along their paths to careers or higher education after high school graduation.

Other studies not included in the Department of Education report found similar results. Conklin & Dailey (1981) examined the consistency of parents' encouragement towards higher education in a longitudinal study involving 2,700 high school students over a five year period, with the last contact being six months after high school graduation. They found that the more consistent parents were over time, the greater the chance that the students would enroll in college, particularly four-year institutions. Furthermore, they found that when parents took it for granted that their children would attend college (i.e. their aspirations were expressed frequently in the home, or the parents assumed their children would attend college as one or both of the parents had done), there was a greater likelihood that the students would enroll in college.

School teachers do not have the sole nor primary responsibility for educating school-age children; parents share the responsibility (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). In a series of eight studies from 1980 to 1983, over 1000 middle school and high school students were surveyed or interviewed to examine many variables of the parent-child relationship. Youniss and Smollar found the bond between mother and child to have a positive impact on the child's education. The researchers also found that both parents' expectations for educational success are presented to the child as goals that are non-negotiable. Additionally, their studies produced valuable

perspectives on such things as how parents control the timing of adolescents' gaining independence from parental authority, adolescents' maintaining connections with their parents even during the process of separation, and communication with parents as an essential part of the adolescent's quest for identity, autonomy and independence. The impact of the gender of the parent has been studied to determine its effect on educational achievement in adolescents. Smith (1981) found that students tend to adopt the maternal figure's goals for educational attainment at a much larger rate than that of the paternal figure. Smith also found that the parent's level of education has an impact on the student's attainment as well.

Recent articles follow the same patterns of findings. Using several instruments designed to assess behavioral, personal and cognitive/intellectual involvement, Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) surveyed 302 sixth, seventh and eighth graders and their parents. The results of a multiple regression analysis found that the parents' educational levels had a strong correlation to the cognitive/intellectual factor. They also found that there was a slightly higher correlation to parents' educational levels for behavioral involvement by fathers, although mothers were found to be more involved behaviorally than fathers when parents' educational level was not included.

Trusty (1998) examined parents' expectations for educational achievement of teenagers in term of several demographic and parenting variables using the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) dataset from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This comprehensive study of 14,673 students began by surveying them in eighth grade and continuing at two-year intervals through 2000 (NELS, 2000b). Trusty found strong correlations for socioeconomic status levels (SES) and gender. Furthermore, he found higher correlations for parents' attendance at school-sponsored events and for the teenager's perceptions of the parents' support for education.

Another study that utilized the NELS:88 data (from the 1992, 1994 and 1996 datasets) looked at the parents' education levels, particularly those who had not attended college (Choy, et al. 2000). Children whose parents did not attend college were identified as first-generation college students. The study also compared this variable to at-risk factors for students with a potential to drop out of high school. The findings "suggested that parents, peers and school personnel can all contribute to increasing the college enrollment rates of students at risk of dropping out of high school and of students whose parents had no college experience" (p. 51). Choy et al. emphasized the importance of parent-child-school partnerships.

Following up on previous studies that purported the importance of family-school partnerships at the high school level and that interest in parents' being involved was consistent across ethnic and SES groups, Mitra (2006) researched the impacts of parental involvement and student voice (the input from the student) in low-income Latino families. She found that the desire for involvement was present, but many parents needed to be taught how to partner with the schools. This raised the importance of the student voice in families where a language barrier exists. Her study noted that the students encouraged parental involvement.

Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper (1999) also examined demographic and educational variables in relation to adolescents' quests for college and the decisions they made in a nine-year mixed methods longitudinal study of high school students. They found the highest correlations for parents' expectations and encouragement. They determined that students whose parents started encouraging education when the students were young were the most likely to go to college. Additionally, they found that third on the list of correlations was the parents' educational level variable (after student achievement, which was second). Their findings were highly consistent throughout the nine-year study.

College Parental Involvement

Once students enroll in college, parental influence and opportunities for involvement continue. Weidman (1999) found the parent-child relationship to be an integral part of the socialization process during college because parents help shape the student's choices. In one study, 150 sets of parents agreed to participate in a project designed to elicit their help to boost retention rates (Boyd, Hunt, Hunt, Magoon & Van Brunt, 1997). During orientation these parents were told of the importance of their acting as "referral agents" for their children by acting as a resource for their needs during the first year. These parents received a resource directory; 180 sets of parents in a control group did not. Boyd et al. found that "encouraging and equipping parents... to take an active interest in their children's undergraduate experience [and] to act as informed referral agents for them has a demonstrably positive effect on their children's academic performance ..." (p. 84).

In a qualitative study of African-American mothers of first-semester female students at a large institution in the Southeast, King (2006) found that technology helped the parents keep in touch with their daughters. The frequency of mother-initiated phone calls, text messages and/or emails varied from once a week to every day; the purpose of the contacts was to monitor their daughters' academic progress and to remind them of upcoming events. The primary concern for each of these mothers was their daughter's accessibility to classes and ability to create the proper schedule of classes for the upcoming semester. Pearson and Dellmann-Jenkins (1997) surveyed 655 incoming freshmen to see if they could find statistical support for the notion that parents helped students choose college majors. They found statistically-significant indicators that parental encouragement was a major factor in the students' decision to go to college and their desires to get a degree, but those findings did not hold up for choosing a major. However, they

did find that if the student's mother had attended college, a high percentage of students had decided their major in their first year of college.

Other studies addressed additional demographic-based differences. A special report from the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* discussed the declining trend of African-American male enrollment in colleges and universities. The researchers attributed this trend in part to the lack of positive male role models in many homes today and the lack of male parental involvement in their children's educational experiences. In a study mentioned previously, Mitra (2006) found similar gender and ethnic concerns in Latino families. Both studies mentioned the impact of being a first-generation student. Pritchard and Wilson (2003) surveyed 218 students at a predominately white private institution in the Midwest. They found supporting evidence that the educational level of the parents was significantly related to the academic success of the students.

McCarron and Inkelas (2006) used the NELS:88/2000 longitudinal data to investigate educational aspirations and attainment for students whose parents did not attend college, as well as any differences based on gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. They also examined the role parental involvement played in the aspirations and success of these students. They found that parental involvement played a greater role in the aspirations and attainment of first-generation students when compared to non-first generation students, but its role was significant for both groups. All in all, students supported the belief that parental involvement is a major factor in shaping educational aspirations and success (Hossler, et al. 1999).

Parent and Student Expectations

When students enter college, both parents and students have a set of expectations they bring with them. Every year during late summer and early fall the media include exposés on

college life and preparing for college. Numerous books can be found in the book stores and libraries offering what to expect. Yet expectations are based on many variables beyond the public conception of the college experience, media reports, and admissions materials. Daniel, Evans and Scott (2001) attributed many expectations to the parents' educational levels, parents' experiences in college, and family structure (fewer siblings at home, divorce rates among parents, and new familial/partnership configurations that can include extended family members, step-parents and unmarried partners).

In a study of 1,382 parents of entering college students over a two-year period, Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, & Ward-Roof (2000) examined parental wants and expectations. They found consistency of results across institution type, classification, gender, and residential status. The most important expectations for the college experience of the parents in the study were job preparation, quality education, maturity and independence, fun/enjoyment, graduation, academic success, and developing friendships/networks. Of only minimal importance were experiencing diversity, preparation for graduate school, a stimulating learning environment, health and safety, preparation for citizenship, improving social skills, and developing faith/values.

Some things are not expected by parents. For example, parents are often unaware of or are confused by the restrictions placed on them by federal regulations such as FERPA and HIPAA (Lowery, 2005). Financial expenditures for college are often the largest amount spent by families other than their own housing needs (Lange & Stone, 2001). The extra costs that are not mentioned in admissions brochures or covered in financial aid packages often come as a surprise and cause hardships for the families. Cell phone bills are often extremely high and the parents are expected to pay them (Carey, 2006). In addition, as Eileen McNamara wrote in a *Boston*

Globe editorial, parents are often asked to finance pre-orientation outdoor activity trips, computer purchases, and even a supplemental laundry/dry cleaning service for the students (McNamara, 2006).

Students come with their own sets of expectations. Having grown up in today's society where good customer service is expected in all aspects of life, they have high expectations for fast responses to needs and requests (Mastrodicasa, 2006). If the institution does not meet their expectations, today's students frequently entertain the idea of transferring to a different institution (Zwenike, 2006). They are accustomed to multi-tasking and interactive learning; rapid access to friends and family through cell phones, email and text messaging are second nature to this generation (Barker, 2006; Cornwell, 2006; Mastrodicasa). They speak to their parents frequently on topics ranging from academic success matters to finances to meetings with advisors (Mastrodicasa). Some institutions have recognized that since so many students have cell phones, there is little need to provide land-line phones. Instead, they are using cell phones and emails as the primary contact with the students (Cornwell, 2006).

Although there is little research that examines the differences in parent and student perspectives, a recent article in *Time* magazine focused on the differing views of parents and their college students for post-graduation. Grossman (2005) found that parents expected their children to prepare to enter the workforce with meaningful jobs right out of college—something they saw as a justification for the amount of money spent on a college degree. Yet if the Millennial students follow the current patterns of the generation before them who have recently graduated, this will not be the case. Instead, they will take longer to earn a degree, have more debt, and experiment with several jobs before settling on a career path. However, family ties will

still be important, and the students will spend time with their parents or communicate frequently, if not daily (Grossman).

Current Trends

Many recent works tout the importance of colleges' partnering with parents. *New Directions for Student Services* has published two journals since 2001 dedicated entirely to Millennial college students and their parents (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Daniel & Scott, 2001), as well as several chapters in other editions. The National Association of Student Affairs Administrators (NASPA) recently published its best-selling monograph ever on the subject (Keppler, Mullendore & Carey, 2005). There has been an increase in conference presentations at annual meetings of key student affairs organizations such as NASPA, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA). These organizations also have listservs and forums specifically for members interested in parent and family relations. There is even one organization, Administrators Promoting Parent Involvement (APPI), that is dedicated to advising administrators on forming parent programs and offices on their campuses (Hoover, 2004). This organization began as a branch of a nonprofit group called College Parents of America, which is a national clearinghouse of information for parents with children in college. They have found an increase in parent programs and parent offices on campuses over the past two decades (Hoover).

Parent programs have been reported to have positive impacts on student experiences and college life. For example, George Washington University parents were able to convince the administration to provide a meal plan with more flexibility; parents at West Virginia University brought about the initiation of an airport shuttle service between campus and the nearest major airport, and Northeastern University parents now assist incoming parents during move-in day

(Hoover, 2004). In their monograph, Keppler, Mullendore, and Carey (2005) provide a resource list for parents and administrators, examples of model programs, and guidelines for parent orientation programs and activities.

A recent study by Merriman (2006) of doctoral research institutions across the nation found that 60% of the 310 institutions surveyed have parent associations, boards, or councils. Additionally, she found that they offer an abundance of publications and web-based resources (e.g., newsletters, brochures, handbooks, financial aid planning, commencement guides and FERPA guides). Communication with parents during crisis situations (such as the Katrina hurricane or 9/11 tragedy) or student incidents (such as alcohol/drug violations or medical emergencies) was also studied. Merriman found that while large percentages of institutions had parental notification policies for some form of student incidents, only 38% of the participating administrators were able to report that their crisis management protocols for crisis situations included a policy for parental notification. Sixty-two percent either had no protocol or were unaware of its existence.

Unfortunately, some parental involvement and interactions with institutions are not seen as a positive experience. Parents are often referred to negatively as helicopter parents because of their over-involvement with their students. These parents call administrators for trivial matters, write or edit admissions applications, or try to be involved in every aspect of the student's college experience starting with the registration process (Hoover, 2004; Mullendore, et al., 2005; Wills, 2005). Some institutions have taken a negative approach to parental involvement. As previously noted, The University of Vermont hired students to be "parent bouncers" during orientation in order to keep parents away from the "target location" (the academic advising session). The University of California at Santa Barbara trained its orientation advisors to keep

parents “at bay” while the students registered for classes (Wills, 2005). Even though FERPA regulations allow for parental access to student academic records if the student is a dependent or the student signs a waiver (FERPA, n.d.), many institutions opt to not allow it or to not inform parents of the option (King, 2006).

Summary

This review of the literature provided information on the Millennial generation and their parents, an overview of theoretical frameworks involving parent-child relationships, parental involvement with their children’s education beginning with preschool and into college, parent and student expectations, and current trends in today’s collegiate environments. Based on the literature presented, there is little information available that compares parent and student expectations for parental involvement during the college years. The proposed study will focus on that topic in order to add to the empirical literature and provide institutions of higher education with material that will help with current and future plans and policies for parental involvement and interactions.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore expectations for and perceptions of parental involvement with college students during the college years. The study used data collected from parents and students in an effort to compare their respective perceptions for similarities and differences, based on several variables. A supplemental component of this study was an analysis of the information gathered pertaining to current parental involvement. The parents in this study had children currently classified as first-year, sophomore, junior, or senior-year students at their institutions. As such, some of the parents had an opportunity for involvement prior to participating in this study. Therefore, some of the questions included in the instrument pertained to actual parental involvement while the student was in college. Finally, the data collected were analyzed to determine the impact of demographic variables on parental involvement. This chapter will describe the design of the study, including the participants, research questions, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis techniques.

Research Design

This study was a cross-sectional survey of parental involvement utilizing data from parents and students. A survey was the chosen method because of the ability to reach a large number of respondents and the capability to analyze multiple variables using standard computer software. The dependent variables in this study were *parent perceptions* and *student perceptions* of parental involvement. The independent variables were gender, race/ethnicity, family income level, educational background of the parent, other children (of the parents)/siblings (of the

student) in or through college, first generation in college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, and level of parental involvement in high school.

Participants

The participants in this study were a stratified random sample drawn from a population of students enrolled at the time of the study in seven institutions of higher education and parents of students enrolled in these institutions. An important requirement for each institution was that it had a parent association, a parents' office, a parents' email list, or some other means of contacting parents directly (rather than through their students). All parent participants for this study were obtained through the participating institutions by email or postal mail. Students for this study were obtained with the assistance of their parents. Parents received an invitation to participate and were asked to forward a similar invitation to their son or daughter. From these two databases (parent participants and student participants) family pairs were coded using a unique coding marker that would not be identifiable by anyone other than the family members themselves. This allowed for confidential and anonymous matching of the parent and student from a family.

The institutions selected were four-year institutions, both public and private, across the nation. Pseudonyms are used for the purpose of anonymity. Table 3.1 describes each of the institutions. A third state university was originally included in the study but was unable to remain due to time constraints.

Table 3.1

Institutions in the Study

Institution	Description
One State University (OSU)	large public research institution in the Southeast

	with approximately 33,000 students
Two State University (TSU)	large public research institution in the West with approximately 20,500 students.
One Private College (OPC)	small private liberal arts college in the Southeast with approximately 1,000 students
Two Private University (TPU)	small, master's university in the Midwest with approximately 2900 students
Three Private College (TPC)	small private master's college in the Midwest with approximately 3000 students
Four Private University (FoPU)	midsize private research institution in the Southeast with approximately 6500 students
Five Private University (FiPU)	small private master's university in the Midwest with approximately 1500 students

Data Collection

Two participant samples were needed for this study: parents and students. To obtain both samples, the researcher began by utilizing a national listserv to request volunteers at institutions with parent email lists to give permission to contact their parents about participating in the study (Appendix A). Upon reviewing the characteristics of the responding institutions, the researcher determined which institutions best fit the criteria for the study in terms of size of the institution and public or private status. Initially only one small private school agreed to participate; additional requests were made through colleague referrals and the use of a list of institutions with parent programs/offices (Savage, 2005). A contact person at each institution was identified; the researcher completed the respective institutional review board applications. This process ultimately yielded three public and five private institutions representing six states and three regions of the country.

Once permission was granted these parents received a letter explaining the study and inviting them to participate (Appendix B). If the household included more than one parent, the researcher requested the parent who was more involved with the college student to participate in the study. In order to participate, the parents had to be willing to ask their son or daughter enrolled at that institution to participate in the study and to forward a letter to him or her from the researcher explaining the study and directing him or her to the survey site (Appendix C). This method allowed the researcher to gain students and parents for the sample that could be matched by families. Additionally, the researcher asked a representative of the institution to send an introductory letter to the parents supporting the survey, and a reminder letter one week after the initial letter had been sent. Prior to beginning the study the researcher requested assistance from the unit at the institution that housed the parent program or office in obtaining access to a student database in the event additional students were needed, although ultimately this assistance was not needed.

The instrument used in this study was the College Parent Experience Questionnaire (CPEQ). The CPEQ is a 127 question, 4-point Likert scale survey that queries participants about their frequency of involvement in behaviors organized around ten topics. To determine instrument reliability/validity, the instrument was piloted in 2003 and used in a full study in 2004 (Carney, 2004). The alpha coefficient values supported the reliability and validity of the CPEQ. The CPEQ was used to “explore the effects of parent background characteristics and student characteristics on parent expectations of and involvement with the student and the institution” at one liberal arts institution in the Midwest (Carney). This researcher expanded the use of the original instrument to include several institutions. With the permission of the developer of the CPEQ, the researcher modified the instrument to fit the purposes of this study. The modified

instrument has 119 questions that use Likert scale ranges that vary from 2 to 4 points (Appendix D), and 21 demographic questions. Additionally, this study incorporated a similar and parallel version of the modified instrument to give to the students (Appendix E). This allowed for an analysis of the similarities and differences in perceptions of the parents and students.

The modified CPEQ was made available to participants through an online web site. Demographic information was collected at the same time. In order to match the student and parent participants and still maintain anonymity of the participants, a unique code marker assigned to each participant was included at the beginning of the survey. This marker consisted of: (a) the student's middle initial, (b) the three-digit parent's home area code, and (c) the two-digit representation of the student's day of birth. For example, if the student's name were John Q. Student, his parents lived in Atlanta, Georgia with a home telephone area code of 404, and he was born on March 13th 1988, his identifying marker would be "Q40413." The characteristics of the marker were designed to be easily answered by both the parent and the student. If successful, this would allow the researcher to examine similarities in perceptions of participants within a family unit.

The sample size for this study was determined using Cohen's "ES Indexes for Their Values for Small, Medium and Large Effects" (Cohen, 1992). The desired number of participants for a descriptive statistical analysis using t-tests was 64 for each group. This will be explained in detail in the next section. Due to the varying timelines for each institution's IRB, the survey remained online for six weeks to allow ample time for participants to access the survey. The required number of parent participants was reached after 13 days, and the required number of student participants was received after 15 days; therefore, it was determined that no additional method needed to be employed to contact additional students.

Research Questions and Data Analysis

In order to add to the literature on parent expectations and involvement, the researcher proposed the following questions.

Research Question 1:

What do parents want and/or expect in terms of being involved with their student's development and experiences while in college?

Research Question 2:

What do students perceive their parents want and/or expect in terms of involvement with them while in college?

Research questions 1 and 2 were analyzed using descriptive statistics and frequencies. The responses to the survey were separated into categories of parental involvement in order to obtain a clearer picture of the type/level of involvement. The researcher looked at sample means and standard deviations for each category. Additionally, t-tests were run to compare actual involvement to expected involvement in several categories.

Research Question 3:

Do parents and students in a family unit have the same perceptions of parental involvement?

For research question 3 the researcher conducted matched pairs t-tests to determine similarities and differences of the responses in parent-student matched family units in the sample. The null hypothesis for these tests was that the mean for parents equals the mean for students ($H_0: \mu_p = \mu_s$). The acceptable significance level was $\alpha=.05$. This level represented that the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if it were true (a Type I error) was 5% or less. To minimize the risk of a Type II error where the null hypothesis was not rejected when it was false, the acceptable effect size for this study was $ES = .15$ (medium). The power of the t-test ($1 - \beta$)

was set at .80. Using Cohen's formula for determining a sample size, the number of participants needed for each group was 64.

Research Question 4:

Is there a difference in parent expectations for involvement based on race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first generation to attend college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, type of high school attended, or level of parental involvement in high school?

The remaining question in this study was analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) to look for any relationships among the nine independent variables (race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first generation to attend college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, or level of parental involvement in high school), as well as statistical significances of the findings. The researcher wanted to determine if any of these variables revealed patterns of parental involvement. By employing Cohen's formulas again and maintaining the same alpha level, effect size, and power level as used in research question 3, the number of participants in each group for the analysis of variance was set at 64 for each group. The variables above are all categorical variables. Because of the large number of variables included, it was possible that some of the participants would not fall into all categories on a frequency table, making interaction effects undeterminable for each group. Instead, only the main effects were examined, which showed which independent variables had the most impact on the dependent variable (parental involvement).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of data analyses. The results are presented in order of the research questions. Research question one focuses on the parents' perceptions of their expectations and involvement with their sons or daughters and the institutions in which the students are enrolled during the college years. Research question two focuses on the student perceptions of their parents' involvement with them and the institutions in which the students are enrolled. Research question three compares the perceptions of parents and students within a family unit in terms of parental involvement. Research question four focuses on the impact of nine demographic characteristics on parental involvement. Findings are presented for each research question in the same format for consistency and ease of review.

Survey Participants

As a result of efforts previously described, 502 parents accepted the invitation to participate in this study. Additionally, 159 of their sons and daughters participated in the student version of the survey. Using the unique code markers, 122 parent-student family pairs were identified. Demographically, the majority of the parent participants were female, Caucasian, college-educated, and with family income levels over \$100,000. Most of the students who participated were female, Caucasian, on-campus residents and evenly dispersed over all four student classifications from first-year through senior-year. Table 4.1 shows a detailed breakdown of all the demographic variables.

Table 4.1

Demographics of Survey Participants

Category	Number	
	Parent Survey	Student Survey
Student Gender		
Male	157	40
Female	340	119
Relationship to Student		
Mother	397	119
Father	98	40
Step-mother	4	--
Step-father	2	--
Female Guardian	--	--
Male Guardian	--	--
Year of Birth—Female Parent		
Before 1943	1	--
1943 - 1964	478	148
1965 or later	16	10
Year of Birth—Male Parent		
Before 1943	11	4
1943 - 1964	456	146
1965 or later	12	7

Year of Birth--Student		
Before 1982	3	1
1982 or later	497	158
Education Attained—Female Parent		
Less than high school	1	2
High school diploma	36	14
Some college	67	16
Associate or technical degree	47	14
Bachelor's degree	184	61
Graduate degree	161	52
Education Attained—Male Parent		
Less than high school	2	1
High school diploma	26	9
Some college	26	1
Associate or technical degree	29	17
Bachelor's degree	179	59
Graduate degree	179	60
Family Income		
Less than \$30,000	7	4
\$30,001 – 50,000	24	6
\$50,001 – 75,000	56	29
\$75,001 – 100,000	83	35
\$100,001 +	310	77

Family Structure		
Single parent	31	13
Biological parents living together	385	128
Biological parents divorced, not remarried	21	7
Biological parents divorced, at least one remarried	63	10
Ethnicity of Student		
African American/Black	14	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	10	4
Caucasian/White	456	154
Hispanic/Latino/a	9	--
Other	10	4
Classification		
Freshman	141	40
Sophomore	149	44
Junior	91	39
Senior	118	36
Student Residence		
At home with parents	24	6
On campus apartment	248	91
Apartment/house near campus	228	62
Other children (siblings) currently in college		
Yes	152	53

No	350	103
First to attend college		
Yes	123	49
No	140	59
Institution Type		
Public	354	85
Private	148	74

Instrument Details

Two online surveys were conducted, one for parents and one for students. There are four types of questions in each survey: what are the parents' expectations for involvement; how does the parent perceive his or her actual parental involvement; are the institutions meeting the parent's expectations in terms of the category; and how is the participant categorized in specific demographic categories. Table 4.2 has a breakdown of the four question types and the categories in which they can be found.

Table 4.2

Types of Questions in the Study

Type of Question	Category	# of Questions
Expectations for Involvement	Experiences with Faculty	1
	College Finances	1
	Housing and Food Services	1
	Mental and Physical Health	1
	Parent-Student Contact	1
	Expects Student to Tell	25

	Expects Personnel to Tell Relationships	16 13
Actual Involvement	Online & Print Communication Experiences with Faculty College Finance Housing and Food Services Mental and Physical Health Parent-Student Contact Campus Events Type of Contact Perceived Involvement	5 4 10 7 12 2 5 6 4
Institution Satisfaction	Online & Print Communication Experience with Faculty College Finances Housing & Food Service Mental & Physical Health Expects Personnel to Tell If... Campus Events	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Demographic Information		17

Each instrument includes 119 questions that relate to parent or student perceptions; they are categorized into 12 groups: online and print communication (OPC), experiences with faculty (EWF), college finances (FIN), housing and food service (HFS), mental and physical health concerns (MPH), parent-student contact (PSC), campus events (CE), relationships (RMEET), expectations to be told by student (EST), expectations to be told by personnel (EPT), fall semester contact (CONT), and self-described involvement (INV). Some of the categories include questions on actual *and* expected parental involvement, while some contain only one type of question (actual *or* expected parental involvement).

The remaining 21 questions pertain to demographic variables. For the purpose of this study nine demographic variables were used in the analysis.

Findings for research questions one and two are reported in terms of descriptive statistics (frequencies, means and standard deviations) for the 12 categories. Within certain categories, statistics were computed to show the mean (M) of actual involvement that the parent had with his or her college student (i.e., OPC, EWF, FIN, HFS, MPH, PSC, CE, CONT, and INV). Questions that pertained to expectations for involvement or satisfaction with the institution were not included in these computations. Three categories related solely to parental expectations (RMEET, EST, and EPT); computations for involvement means were not computed for these categories. Paired t-test findings that are statistically significant were included for research question number three. Research question four also includes analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistics, t-tests, and a table of demographic information.

Data were analyzed using SPSS software, version 14.0. The Likert-scale rankings were reversed from the original survey format in order to make the means more meaningful, i.e., the higher the score, the more important (or positive) the response. Therefore, on a four-point Likert scale, a score of 1 is the lowest possible score and a score of 4 is the highest possible score, similar to grade-point averages.

Findings: Research Question 1

What do parents want and/or expect in terms of being involved with their student's development and experiences while in college?

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, were used to analyze each of the 119 perception questions. These questions were divided into twelve categories: online and print communication, experiences with faculty, college finances, housing and food service, mental and physical health, parent-student contact, expectations for student to tell parent, contact with college personnel, fall campus events, relationships, types of contact,

and perceived involvement. The total sample (N = 502) of parent surveys entered online were analyzed.

Overall Parental Involvement

Findings show that parents' expectations for involvement and their actual involvement are not always the same in terms of importance and frequency. Table 4.3 lists seven categories in terms of the actual involvement from most reported to least reported. However, when the expectations for involvement are added to the table, the order is not the same. Almost all of the parents in this survey greatly anticipated their involvement in financial matters (M = 3.70) and mental and physical health concerns (M = 3.44); however, the most frequent forms of actual involvement were parent-student discussions for co-curricular activities (M = 3.29) and housing and food service matters (M = 2.94). Matters of least importance to the parents in the survey were attending campus events (M = 1.34) and experiences with faculty (M = 1.42). A more detailed account of all categories in the survey follows this section.

Table 4.3

Actual and Expected Parental Involvement

Category	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Expected</u>		<u>Paired t-test</u>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Parent-Student Contact	3.29	.72	2.52	.95	20.38	.000
Housing & Food Service	2.94	.61	2.22	.96	13.09	.000
College Finances	2.87	.43	3.70	.60	-32.64	.000
Mental & Physical Health	2.85	.44	3.44	.71	-20.43	.000
Online & Print Communication	2.54	.56	--	--	--	--
Experiences with Faculty	1.42	.54	1.88	.87	-13.34	.000

Campus Events	1.34	.28	--	--	--	--
---------------	------	-----	----	----	----	----

Note. df = 501.

Online and Print Communication (OPC)

More than half of the parents surveyed (58.4%) felt the institution their son or daughter attended met their expectations for online and print communication (Table 4.4). The four parental involvement variables in this category yielded a mean of 2.54, with a standard deviation of .56. The most common method of communication for parents was the use of the institution's website to access information (53.2%). A large number of the parents did not make use of popular books on parenting during the college years (a combined 77.3% selected *rarely* or *never*); in contrast, the institutions' parent guides were used frequently (a combined 61.9% selected *very often* or *sometimes*).

Table 4.4

Online and Print Communication

Variable	Very often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)
Use webpage	136	(27.1)	267	(53.2)	84	(16.7)	15	(3.0)
Check deadlines	58	(11.6)	202	(40.2)	171	(34.1)	71	(14.1)
Check campus events	47	(9.4)	232	(46.2)	168	(33.5)	55	(11.0)
Read parent's guide	91	(18.1)	220	(43.8)	141	(28.1)	50	(10.0)
Read college parenting books	23	(4.6)	90	(17.9)	225	(44.8)	163	(32.5)
OPC Expectations met	293	(58.4)	176	(35.1)	27	(5.4)	5	(1.0)

Note. OPC involvement for variables 1-5: $M = 2.54$, $SD = .56$.

Experiences with Faculty (EWF)

Parent responses to the four questions regarding their interactions with faculty members as seen in Table 4.5 exhibited that parents do not interact with faculty on academic matters ($M=1.42$, $SD = .54$). This finding is slightly lower than the self-reported expectations for involvement ($M=1.88$, $SD =.87$). The results of a paired t-test show this difference to be statistically significant ($t = -13.34$, $p < .000$).

The majority of parents never discuss student progress (75.9%), academic program or course selection (84.9%), or career plans (82.3%). To a lesser degree, parents reported *never* socializing with faculty during campus events (59.0%). When asked if they expected to have interactions with faculty, 75.7% of parents responded *rarely* (35.3%) or *never* (40.4%). The parents in this study were *very often*, or at least *sometimes*, satisfied with the institutions regarding their expectations for involvement with faculty (44.0% and 32.9% respectively).

Table 4.5

Experiences with Faculty

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Discuss course progress	69 (13.7)	23 (4.6)	29 (5.8)	381 (75.9)
Discuss program or course selection	3 (.6)	17 (3.4)	56 (11.2)	426 (84.9)
Discuss career plans	2 (.4)	26 (5.2)	61 (12.2)	413 (82.3)
Socialize at campus events	20 (4.0)	94 (18.7)	92 (18.3)	296 (59.0)
Expect faculty contact	21 (4.2)	101 (20.1)	177 (35.3)	203 (40.4)
EWF expectations met	221 (44.0)	165 (32.9)	60 (12.0)	56 (11.2)

Note. EWF involvement for variables 1-4: $M= 1.42$, $SD = .54$. EWF expect contact with faculty: $M=1.88$, $SD =.87$

College Finances (FIN)

Parents in this survey expect to be involved *very often* with the financial aspects of their college student (75.9%) and feel the institutions meet their expectations (60.8%). The mean expectation for involvement with the students' college finances ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .60$) is nearly one unit higher than the mean for the ten involvement variables ($M = 2.87$, $SD = .43$); this finding is statistically significant ($t = -32.64$, $p < .000$).

Although the findings show that typically parents *never* meet with a financial aid counselor (53.8%), there is consistent evidence of involvement in every other financial aspect either *sometimes* or *very often*, as is demonstrated in Table 4.6. Combining the top two responses in each of the following areas, there is overwhelming evidence that parents believe they have explained to their students the mechanics of credit card debt (97.0 %) and balancing a checkbook (91.2%). Additionally, 73.9% of the parents surveyed do not assist their students in paying off credit card debt.

Table 4.6

College Finances

Variable	Very often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)
Talk with financial aid counselor	12	(2.4)	99	(19.7)	121	(24.1)	270	(53.8)
Keep track of deadlines	245	(48.8)	95	(19.1)	45	(9.0)	116	(23.1)
Provide regular spending money	307	(61.2)	110	(21.9)	59	(11.8)	26	(5.2)
Provide money upon request	212	(42.2)	215	(42.8)	60	(12.0)	15	(3.0)
Complete financial aid paperwork	172	(34.3)	100	(19.9)	57	(11.4)	173	(34.5)
Assist with paying bills	215	(42.8)	151	(30.1)	87	(17.3)	49	(9.8)

Teach/taught balancing checkbook	332 (66.1)	126 (25.1)	24 (3.8)	20 (4.9)
Explained credit card debt	418 (83.3)	69 (13.7)	7 (1.4)	8 (1.6)
Assisted paying off credit card	74 (14.7)	58 (11.6)	45 (9.0)	325 (64.7)
Made donation to institution	140 (27.9)	192 (38.2)	72 (4.3)	98 (19.5)
Expect to be involved financially	381 (75.9)	95 (18.9)	21 (4.2)	5 (1.0)
FIN expectations met	305 (60.8)	165 (32.9)	23 (4.6)	9 (1.8)

Note. FIN involvement for variables 1-10: $M = 2.87$, $SD = .43$. FIN expect involvement with college finances: $M = 3.70$, $SD = .60$

Housing and Food Service (HFS)

Parent participants in this survey reported (Table 4.7) that they do not expect to be involved in the housing and/or food services for their students (37.3% *rarely* and 25.9% *never*), and with the exceptions of discussing housing options (75.5% *very often*) and giving advice on roommate concerns (36.9% *sometimes*), the individual involvement variables support the reported expectations of the parents. However, the combined mean for the involvement variables ($M = 2.94$) makes housing and food service the most involved category for parents in the survey. The difference between the actual and expected involvement is statistically different ($t = 13.09$, $p < .000$).

Table 4.7

Housing and Food Services

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Discuss where student will live	379 (75.5)	98 (19.5)	9 (1.8)	16 (3.2)

Contact residence hall staff about maintenance or facility concerns	11 (2.2)	39 (7.8)	81 (16.1)	371 (73.9)
Advise student on resolving maintenance or facility concerns	60 (12.0)	157 (31.3)	127 (25.3)	158 (31.5)
Contact staff about roommate concerns	6 (1.2)	17 (3.4)	43 (8.6)	436 (86.9)
Advise student on resolving roommate concerns	70 (13.9)	185 (36.9)	125 (24.9)	122 (24.3)
Contact food service staff about meal concerns	1 (.2)	11 (2.2)	34 (6.8)	456 (90.8)
Contact residence life staff about community behavior concerns	--	10 (2.0)	38 (7.6)	454 (90.4)
Expect to be involved in housing/food service experience	57 (11.4)	128 (25.5)	187 (37.3)	130 (25.9)
HFS expectations met	301 (60.0)	152 (30.3)	29 (5.8)	20 (4.0)

Note. HFS involvement for variables 1-7: $M = 2.94$, and $SD = .61$. HFS expectation: $M = 2.22$, $SD = .96$.

Mental and Physical Health (MPH)

Overall, parents in this survey expect to be involved in most aspects of the students' health issues and concerns. The reported expectations ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .71$) are higher than the mean for the combined involvement variables ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .44$); this difference is statistically significant ($t = -20.43$, $p < .000$). However, four of the twelve variables in this category have skewed the computation. The most frequent responses for each variable were at either end of the scales (eight of the most frequent responses were the *very often* selection, while four of the responses were the *never* selection). When parents responded to queries 1, 6, 7, and 9 (see Table 4.8), they most frequently selected the *never* option. Three of these four variables involved the parents' contacting personnel to report physical or mental health concerns. By re-

computing the mean for the remaining eight involvement variables, the new figure ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .47$) is almost identical to the parents' expectations for involvement ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .71$), making the difference not statistically significant ($t = .068$, $p = .945$).

Table 4.8

Mental and Physical Health

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Come to campus if student is sick	35 (7.0)	118 (23.5)	150 (29.9)	199 (39.6)
Arrange for student's health insurance	416 (82.9)	33 (6.6)	16 (3.2)	37 (7.4)
Make sure student has health card	447 (89.0)	16 (3.2)	6 (1.2)	33 (6.6)
Pay for student health insurance	421 (83.9)	44 (8.8)	16 (3.2)	21 (4.2)
Complete student's immunization and/or physical forms	226 (45.0)	121 (24.1)	77 (15.3)	78 (15.5)
Inform staff about previous health concerns	79 (15.7)	57 (11.4)	101 (20.1)	265 (52.8)
Inform counseling center about previous mental health concerns	23 (4.6)	21 (4.2)	61 (12.2)	397 (79.1)
Talk with student about consistent use of medication	165 (32.9)	158 (31.5)	76 (15.1)	103 (20.5)
Contact student affairs staff if concerned about student's health	25 (5.0)	49 (9.8)	83 (16.5)	345 (68.7)
Encourage preventative health	329 (65.5)	123 (24.5)	31 (6.2)	19 (3.8)
Talk with student about drug/alcohol choices	369 (73.5)	113 (22.5)	16 (3.2)	4 (.8)
Talk with student about sexual decision-making	273 (74.4)	166 (33.1)	52 (10.4)	11 (2.2)

Expect to be involved in student's health decisions	275 (54.8)	180 (35.9)	38 (7.6)	9 (1.8)
Expectations for MPH met	288 (57.4)	169 (33.7)	34 (6.8)	11 (2.2)

Note. MPH involvement for variables 1-12: $M=2.84$, $SD = .44$. MPH expectation $M = 3.44$, $SD = .71$

Parent-Student Contact (PST)

This brief category is actually a preface to the next category, EST; however, since the scales are different they will be discussed separately. The three variables in this category pertain to the parents' discussions with their students about co-curricular activities (Table 4.9). Most parents reported discussing participation in campus events (91.8% *very often* and *sometimes* combined) and their students' choices for co-curricular activities (82% *very often* and *sometimes* combined). However, when asked if parents expected to be involved with the students' co-curricular activities, the parents selected almost equally *sometimes* (35.3%) and *rarely* (32.3%) ($M = 2.52$, $SD = .95$). The difference between the mean of expected involvement and the mean of actual involvement ($M = 3.29$, $SD = .72$) was found to be statistically significant ($t = 2.038$, $p < .000$).

Table 4.9

Parent-Student Contact (Co-curricular)

Category	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Discuss student participation in campus events	265 (52.8)	196 (39.0)	31 (6.2)	9 (1.8)
Discuss student choices for co-curricular activities	196 (39.0)	216 (43.0)	65 (12.9)	22 (4.4)
Expectations for involvement with	82 (16.3)	177 (35.3)	162 (32.3)	80 (15.9)

 co-curricular involvement

Note. PST involvement for variables 1-2: $M = 3.29$, $SD = .72$. PSC expectation: $M = 2.52$, $SD = .95$

Expected Contact from Student (EST)

This entire category reports under what circumstances the parents expect their students to tell them of occurrences at college. Parents *strongly agreed* they expected their students to inform them on 23 of the 24 expectation variables (Table 4.10). The only variable upon which the parents varied greatly was when the student skips a class (37.3% *disagree*, 33.1% *agree* and only 21.5% *strongly agree*). When asked if their expectations for contact from their students were met, 80.9% *strongly agreed*.

Table 4.10

Expected Contact from Student (Parent expects student to tell parent if he/she...)

Variable	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Joins club or organization	272 (54.2)	204 (40.6)	25 (5.0)	1 (.2)
Wins an award	411 (81.9)	89 (17.7)	1 (.2)	1 (.2)
Gets nominated for honor society	410 (81.7)	89 (17.7)	2 (.4)	1 (.2)
Is selected for leadership award	411 (81.9)	89 (17.7)	1 (.2)	1 (.2)
Declares a major	416 (82.9)	83 (16.5)	2 (.4)	1 (.2)
Meets with his/her advisor	175 (34.9)	230 (45.8)	92 (18.3)	5 (1.0)
Skips class	108 (21.5)	166 (33.1)	189 (37.6)	39 (7.8)
Fails an assignment	179 (35.7)	181 (36.1)	124 (24.7)	18 (3.6)

Fails a course	397 (79.1)	96 (19.1)	5 (1.0)	4 (.8)
Is placed on academic probation	420 (83.7)	75 (14.9)	5 (1.0)	2 (.4)
Violates any campus policy	304 (60.6)	125 (24.9)	64 (12.7)	9 (1.8)
Violates major campus policy	355 (70.7)	102 (20.3)	37 (7.4)	8 (1.6)
Is placed on disciplinary probation	422 (84.1)	69 (13.7)	9 (1.8)	2 (.4)
Is suspended	447 (89.0)	52 (10.4)	1 (.2)	2 (.4)
Is sick enough to see a physician	414 (82.5)	79 (15.7)	7 (1.4)	2 (.4)
Is hospitalized	481 (95.8)	20 (4.0)	---	1 (.2)
Is suicidal	460 (91.6)	37 (7.4)	2 (.4)	3 (.6)
Is having major mental health difficulty	456 (90.8)	42 (8.4)	2 (.4)	2 (.4)
Is having a roommate problem	260 (51.8)	191 (38.0)	43 (8.6)	8 (1.6)
Applies for a credit card	273 (54.4)	170 (33.9)	47 (9.4)	12 (2.4)
Takes out a loan	374 (74.5)	101 (20.1)	22 (4.4)	5 (1.0)
Bounces a check	283 (56.4)	136 (27.1)	67 (13.3)	16 (3.2)
Needs money	346 (68.9)	146 (29.1)	9 (1.8)	1 (.2)
Gets a part time job	331 (65.9)	153 (30.5)	16 (3.2)	2 (.4)
Expectations for EST met	406 (80.9)	89 (17.7)	5 (1.0)	2 (.4)

Note: EST expectations for variables 1-24: $M=3.61$, and $SD = .36$

Expected Contact from Personnel

Similar to the previous category, parents were asked to report their expectations for contact from college personnel under 17 specific circumstances (EPT) and whether those expectations were being met (Table 4.11). Parents *strongly agreed* on nine variables that

involved perceived problems for their students: failing a course, being placed on academic probation, violating major campus policies, violating any campus policy, being placed on disciplinary probation, being suspended, being hospitalized, being suicidal, and having major mental difficulties. Parents also felt they should be contacted by personnel if their student received an award or were nominated for an honor society. Parents did not expect to be contacted by personnel if their student took a leadership position, skipped class, failed an assignment, or were sick enough to visit a doctor. A combined 82.5% of the parents' overall expectations for contact from college personnel were met (*strongly agree* 41% and *agree* 41.4%).

Table 4.11

Expected Contact from College Personnel (personnel will contact parent if student...)

Variable	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Wins an award	153 (30.5)	192 (38.2)	125 (24.9)	32 (6.4)
Gets nominated for honor society	152 (30.3)	175 (34.9)	142 (28.3)	33 (6.6)
Is selected for leadership award	132 (26.3)	143 (28.5)	171 (34.1)	56 (11.2)
Skips class	36 (7.2)	58 (11.6)	298 (59.4)	110 (21.9)
Fails an assignment	42 (8.4)	63 (12.5)	287 (57.2)	110 (21.9)
Fails a course	144 (28.7)	141 (28.1)	157 (31.3)	60 (12.0)
Is placed on academic probation	241 (48.0)	152 (30.3)	71 (14.1)	38 (7.6)
Violates any campus policy	166 (33.1)	129 (25.7)	164 (32.7)	43 (8.6)
Violates major campus policy	253 (50.4)	162 (32.3)	58 (11.6)	29 (5.8)
Is placed on disciplinary	281 (56.0)	146 (29.1)	49 (9.8)	26 (5.2)

probation				
Is suspended	325 (64.7)	125 (24.9)	28 (5.5)	24 (4.8)
Is sick enough to see a physician	149 (29.7)	110 (21.9)	195 (38.8)	48 (9.6)
Is hospitalized	351 (69.9)	97 (19.3)	39 (7.8)	15 (3.0)
Is suicidal	401 (79.9)	77 (15.3)	17 (3.4)	7 (1.4)
Is having major mental health difficulty	368 (73.3)	100 (19.9)	27 (5.4)	7 (1.4)
Is having a roommate problem	61 (12.2)	99 (19.7)	253 (50.4)	89 (17.7)
Expectations for EST met	206 (41.0)	208 (41.4)	57 (11.4)	31 (6.2)

Note. EPT expectations for variables 1-17: $M = 2.97$, and $SD = .62$

Campus Events (CE)

Parents were asked to report their attendance at campus events during the previous Fall semester if offered (Table 4.12). According to their responses, the majority of parents attended athletic events (54.2%), and less than half (40.8%) attended family weekend activities.

Attending lectures, exhibits, and concerts was not important. Expectations for availability of campus events were met for most parents (96.8%).

Table 4.12

Campus Events

Variable	Yes	No
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Attended family weekend	205 (40.8)	297 (59.2)
Attended art exhibit, theatre performance	149 (29.7)	353 (70.3)

Attended concert or music event	96 (19.1)	406 (80.9)
Attended lecture or panel discussion	120 (23.9)	382 (76.1)
Attended athletic event	272 (54.2)	230 (45.8)
CE expectations met	486 (96.8)	16 (3.2)

Note: CE involvement for variables 1-5: $M=1.34$, and $SD = .28$

Relationships (RMEET)

Parents were asked to report the importance of relationships (i.e., whether it was important for them to meet specific individuals). Table 4.13 demonstrates their responses to the 13 variables. Parents felt it was *very important* to meet individuals close to their students (roommate = 74.5%; friends = 56.6%; and significant other = 90.2%). However, parents did not feel it was important to meet faculty, staff or administrators.

Table 4.13

Relationships

Variable	Very important n (%)	Somewhat important n (%)	Not important n (%)
Meet roommate	374 (74.5)	112 (22.3)	16 (3.2)
Meet friends	284 (56.6)	209 (41.6)	9 (1.8)
Meet significant other	453 (90.2)	41 (8.2)	2 (.4)
Meet parents of friends	117 (23.3)	248 (49.4)	135 (26.9)
Meet academic advisor	83 (16.5)	216 (43.0)	202 (40.2)

Meet faculty	32 (6.4)	212 (42.2)	256 (51.0)
Meet resident assistant	70 (13.9)	203 (40.4)	221 (44.0)
Meet residence hall director	49 (9.8)	181 (36.1)	256 (52.0)
Meet sports team coach	151 (30.1)	163 (32.5)	160 (31.9)
Meet club/organization advisor	35 (7.0)	150 (29.9)	316 (62.9)
Meet Dean of Students	92 (18.3)	185 (36.9)	223 (44.4)
Meet Academic Dean	89 (17.7)	185 (36.9)	228 (45.4)
Meet President	88 (17.5)	166 (33.1)	246 (49.0)

Types of Contact (CONT)

Findings in this category assessed the level and mode of contact parents had with their students (Table 4.14). Parents frequently communicated with their students via email (59.6% used email 1-2 times weekly) and via postal mail (44.4% used postal mail 1-2 times monthly). The majority of parents did not use two methods that are popular with their students: instant messaging (77.9%) or text messaging (56.2%). Face-to-face contact with students occurred when the student went home during the fall semester, but not at other off-campus venues. The largest number of students went home more than 4 times (26.5%).

Table 4.14

Type of Contact

Variable	Percentage				
	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-7 times	More than 7 times	Do not communicate via this method
Weekly Email	59.6	22.9	3.8	4.6	8.2
Weekly Instant messaging	12.9	3.8	1.0	2.6	77.9
Weekly Text messaging	23.1	10.8	2.8	5.6	56.2

Parent-perceived Involvement (INV)

The final category in this section asked the parents to rate their level of involvement during the college years and during high school (Table 4.15). Most parents considered themselves to have been *very involved* with the students' high school experiences (65.1%) and to a lesser extent with the high school (49.6%). The same parents considered their involvement with their students during the college years to be only *moderate* (41.2%), and reported being *not involved* with the institutions (37.1%). On average, parents reported being more involved with their students' high school experiences ($M = 3.55$) and with the high school ($M = 3.21$) than during the students' college experiences ($M = 3.16$) or with the college institution ($M = 2.04$).

Table 4.15

Parent-perceived Involvement

Variable	Very involved <i>n (%)</i>	Moderately involved <i>n (%)</i>	Fairly involved <i>n (%)</i>	Not involved <i>n (%)</i>
Involvement with student's college experience	197 (39.2)	207 (41.2)	79 (15.7)	19 (3.8)
Involvement with institution	40 (8.0)	128 (25.5)	147 (29.3)	186 (37.1)
Involvement with student's high school experience	327 (65.1)	128 (25.5)	43 (8.6)	3 (.6)
Involvement with high school	249 (49.6)	142 (28.3)	81 (16.1)	27 (5.4)

Satisfaction with Institution

Parents were asked in seven categories (OPC, EWF, FIN, HFS, MPH, EPT, and CE) to rate whether the institution in which their students were enrolled met their expectations. Table 4.16 contains the results.

Table 4.16

Expectations Met by Institution

Category	Most frequent response	<i>n (%)</i>
Online & print and communication	Very often	293 (58.4)
Experiences with faculty	Very often	221 (44.0)
College finances	Very often	305 (60.8)
Housing and food services	Very often	301 (60.0)
Mental and physical health	Very often	288 (57.4)
Contact with college personnel	Strongly agree	206 (41.0)

	Agree	208 (41.4)
Campus Events	Yes	486 (96.8)

Summary of Research Question 1

Table 4.17.1 is a summary of findings for Research Question 1 in an abbreviated format for each category.

Table 4.17

RQ1: Parents' perceptions of their parental involvement

Category	Frequencies
Highest actual	PSC, HFS, FIN
Highest expected	FIN, MPH PSC
OPC	Highest—use website to access information Strong—use of parent guide Lowest—use of popular parenting books
EWF	Less involvement than expected Institution satisfaction = 93.7%
FIN	Less involvement than parents expected Provide money regularly upon request Teach/taught children to manage money; won't pay credit card debt Keep track of deadlines and complete financial aid forms Make donations to institution Don't meet with financial aid counselor
HSF	More involvement than parents expected Most involved category Greatest involvement: discussing housing options and giving advice on roommate concerns

	Very low on contact with housing staff Institution satisfaction = 90.3%
MPH	Involvement less than parents expected Most expected category Skewed findings—parents don't contact staff (#6, 7, 9), or come if sick (1) Without responses #1, 6, 7, & 9 the recomputed <i>actual</i> vs. <i>expected</i> is not significant Institution satisfaction = 91.1%
PSC	Involvement greater than parents expected Parents discussed co-curricular activities but didn't believe they were involved
EST	Parents expect students to tell almost everything (strongly agreed on 23 out of 24) 'Skip classes' response was split between <i>agree</i> and <i>disagree</i> Expectations met—i.e. students are telling them!
EPT	Expected personnel to contact them on 9 variables pertaining to academic or health problems and 2 pertaining to awards/honors Expectations met—82.5%
CE	Attend sports events (slightly more than half) Parent weekend attendance—40%
RMEET	Important to meet friends, roommate, significant other Not important to meet personnel (highest = team coach 32.5%)
CON	Use email, but not text messaging or IM Saw son/daughter during home visits (4 time in Fall)
INV	Very involved with HS experience & with the HS Moderately with COL experience, but not involved with institution
Satisfaction	Satisfied with the institution at the highest level in every category

Findings: Research Question 2

What do students perceive their parents want and/or expect in terms of involvement with them while in college?

Similar to research question one, descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means and standard deviations, were used to analyze each of the 119 perception questions. These questions were divided into twelve categories: online and print communication, experiences with faculty, college finances, housing and food service, mental and physical health, parent-student contact, expectations for student to tell parent, contact with college personnel, fall campus events, relationships, types of contact, and perceived involvement. For the categories that included questions on parents' expected involvement, t-tests were run against the actual involvement. The total sample (N = 159) of student surveys entered online were analyzed.

Overall Student Perception of Parental Involvement

Table 4.18 lists seven categories in terms of the actual involvement, from most reported to least reported. According to the students' perceptions, their parents are most involved with their housing and food services (M = 3.18), followed by online and print communications (M = 2.45) and mental and physical health concerns (M = 2.41). In contrast, students perceive their parents expect to be highly involved with their finances while in college (M = 3.60), yet they do not believe their actual involvement (M = 2.10) in their finances is as high as parents expected.

Table 4.18

Students' Perceptions of Actual and Expected Parental Involvement

Category	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Expected</u>		<u>T-test</u>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Housing & Food Services	3.18	.55	1.92	.98	11.78	.000

Online & Print Communication	2.46	.69	--	--	--	--
Mental & Physical Health	2.41	.55	3.18	.86	-7.80	.000
Experiences with Faculty	2.31	1.18	1.69	.82	6.62	.000
College Finances	2.10	.52	3.60	.77	-17.32	.000
Parent-Student Contact	1.95	.85	2.45	1.12	-3.60	.000
Campus Events	1.69	.26	--	--	--	--

Online and Print Communications (OPC)

As demonstrated in Table 4.19, students perceived that their parents' most frequent use of online and print communications was to check the institutions' web pages for information (53.5% selected *sometimes*). They also reported that their parents *sometimes* read the institutions' parent guides (40.9%) but *never* read popular books on parenting during the college years (46.5%). According to the students, the average rating for actual involvement in this category was $M = 2.46$.

Table 4.19

Online and Print Communication

Variable	Very often <i>n (%)</i>	Sometimes <i>n (%)</i>	Rarely <i>n (%)</i>	Never <i>n (%)</i>
Use webpage	30 (18.9)	85 (53.5)	33 (20.8)	11 (6.9)
Check deadlines	23 (14.1)	52 (32.7)	55 (34.6)	29 (18.2)
Check campus events	16 (10.1)	46 (28.9)	68 (42.8)	29 (18.2)
Read parent guides	25 (15.7)	65 (40.9)	43 (27.0)	26 (16.4)

Read college parenting books	8 (5.0)	33 (20.8)	44 (27.7)	74 (46.5)
OPC Expectations met	83 (52.2)	67 (42.1)	8 (5.0)	1 (.6)

Note. OPC involvement for variables 1-5: $M = 2.46$, $SD = .69$.

Experiences with Faculty (EWF)

Student responses to the four questions regarding their parents' interactions with faculty members (Table 4.20) show that they do not believe their parents interact with faculty on academic matters ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.18$). This finding is higher than the students' perceptions of their parents' expectations for involvement with faculty ($M = 1.69$, $SD = .84$). This finding is statistically significant ($t = 6.62$, $p < .01$), demonstrating that students feel their parents are more involved than they expect.

Table 4.20

Experiences with Faculty

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Discuss course progress	4 (2.5)	2 (1.3)	17 (10.7)	136 (85.5)
Discuss program or course selection	--	10 (6.3)	24 (15.5)	125 (78.6)
Discuss career plans	1 (.6)	9 (5.7)	24 (15.1)	125 (78.6)
Socialize at campus events	19 (11.9)	23 (14.5)	48 (30.2)	69 (43.4)
Expect faculty contact	6 (3.8)	21 (13.2)	50 (31.4)	82 (51.6)
EWF expectations met	63 (39.6)	59 (37.1)	23 (14.5)	14 (8.8)

Note. EWF involvement for variables 1-4: $M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.18$; expectation for faculty contact: $M = 1.69$, $SD = .84$.

College Finances (FIN)

Students reported they believe their parents *very often* expect to be involved in their college finances (73.6%), as shown in Table 4.21. Parents have taught them how to balance a checkbook (70.4% *very often*) and about credit card usage (74.8% *very often*). Parents are involved with tracking financial deadlines (54.1% *very often*) and completing forms (39.5% *very often*). There were three areas where the students did not feel their parents expected to be involved: talking with a financial counselor (44.7% *never*), helping the student pay off a credit card (49.7% *never*), and making a donation to the institution (30.2% *never*).

Table 4.21

College Finances

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Talk with financial aid counselor	8 (5.0)	35 (22.0)	45 (28.3)	71 (44.4)
Keep track of deadlines	86 (54.1)	31 (19.5)	14 (8.8)	28 (17.6)
Provide regular spending money	73 (45.9)	40 (25.2)	30 (18.9)	16 (10.1)
Provide money upon request	63 (39.6)	59 (37.1)	29 (18.2)	8 (5.0)
Complete financial aid paperwork	61 (38.4)	42 (26.4)	16 (10.1)	40 (25.2)
Assist with paying bills	99 (62.3)	34 (21.4)	12 (7.5)	14 (8.8)
Teach/taught balancing checkbook	112 (70.4)	27 (17.0)	10 (6.3)	10 (6.3)
Explain credit card debt	119 (74.8)	25 (15.7)	8 (5.0)	7 (4.4)
Assist with paying off credit card	49 (30.8)	19 (11.9)	12 (7.5)	79 (49.7)
Made donation to institution	25 (15.7)	46 (28.9)	40 (25.2)	48 (30.2)
Expect to be involved financially	117 (73.6)	28 (17.6)	7 (4.4)	7 (4.4)

FIN expectations met	91 (57.2)	58 (36.5)	9 (5.7)	1 (.6)
----------------------	-----------	-----------	---------	--------

Note. FIN involvement for variables 1-10: $M = 2.10$, $SD = .52$; expectation for involvement: $M = 3.60$, $SD = .77$.

Housing and Food Service (HFS)

Students reported (Table 4. 22) they did not believe their parents expected to be involved in matters concerning housing and food services at a combined rate of 73.6% (42.8% *never* and 30.8% *rarely*). However, the perceived actual involvement ($M = 3.18$) was significantly higher than the perceived expected involvement ($M = 1.92$) at $t_{(158)} = 11.78$, $p < .01$. The combined score made this category the one where students perceived their parents to be most involved.

Individual responses showed that students perceived their parents were *very often* involved with discussing housing choices and only *sometimes* involved by giving advice on roommate concerns (32.1%).

Table 4.22

Housing and Food Service

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Discuss where student will live	97 (61.0)	41 (25.8)	16 (10.1)	5 (3.1)
Contact residence hall staff about maintenance or facility concerns	4 (2.5)	16 (10.1)	23 (14.5)	116 (73.0)
Advise student on resolving maintenance or facility concerns	18 (11.3)	37 (23.3)	36 (22.6)	68 (42.8)
Contact staff about roommate concerns	5 (3.1)	5 (3.1)	14 (8.8)	135 (84.9)

Advise student on resolving roommate concerns	22 (13.8)	51 (32.1)	29 (18.2)	57 (35.8)
Contact food service staff about meal concerns	3 (1.9)	8 (5.0)	10 (6.3)	138 (86.8)
Contact residence life staff about community behavior concerns	2 (1.3)	5 (3.1)	10 (6.3)	142 (89.3)
Expect to be involved in housing/food service experience	14 (8.8)	28 (17.5)	49 (30.8)	68 (42.8)
HFS expectations met	74 (46.5)	65 (40.9)	10 (6.3)	10 (6.3)

Note. HFS involvement for variables 1-7: $M = 3.18$, $SD = .55$; expectations for involvement: $M = 1.92$, $SD = .98$.

Mental and Physical Health (MPH)

Unlike the previous category, student perceptions of their parents' actual involvement ($M = 2.41$) in mental and physical health concerns are significantly lower ($t_{(158)} = -7.80$, $p < .01$) than their perceived parental expectations for involvement ($M = 3.18$) in this area. Table 4.22 shows that students felt their parents did expect to get involved in four items pertaining to insurance (students selected *very often* 72.3%, 84.9%, 84.3% and 42.8% for items 2-5 respectively), and by talking to them about preventative health (46.5% *very often*) and the use of alcohol or drugs (38.4% *very often*). However, in one variable, talking about the students' sexual decisions, the students were split almost evenly across the four options.

Table 4.23

Mental and Physical Health

Variable	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Come to campus if student is sick	6 (3.8)	20 (12.6)	46 (28.9)	87 (54.7)

Arrange for student's health insurance	115 (72.3)	16 (10.1)	6 (3.8)	22 (13.8)
Make sure student has health card	134 (84.3)	13 (8.2)	4 (2.5)	8 (5.0)
Pay for student health insurance	135 (84.9)	10 (6.3)	2 (1.3)	12 (7.5)
Complete student's immunization and/or physical forms	68 (42.8)	41 (25.8)	27 (17.0)	23 (14.5)
Inform staff about previous health concerns	28 (17.6)	20 (12.6)	27 (17.0)	84 (52.8)
Inform counseling center about previous mental health concerns	13 (8.2)	7 (4.4)	13 (8.2)	126 (79.2)
Talk with student about consistent use of medication	42 (26.4)	29 (18.2)	29 (18.2)	59 (37.1)
Contact student affairs staff if concerned about student's health	9 (5.7)	10 (6.3)	16 (10.1)	124 (78.0)
Encourage preventative health	74 (46.5)	42 (26.4)	21 (13.2)	22 (13.8)
Talk with student about drug/alcohol choices	61 (38.4)	44 (27.7)	38 (23.9)	16 (10.1)
Talk with student about sexual decision-making	41 (25.8)	38 (23.9)	42 (26.4)	38 (23.9)
Expect to be involved in student's health decisions	66 (41.5)	65 (40.9)	19 (11.9)	9 (5.7)
Expectations for MPH met	89 (56.0)	56 (35.2)	13 (8.2)	1 (.6)

Note. MPH involvement for variables 1-12: $M=2.41$, $SD = .55$; expectation for involvement: $M = 3.18$, $SD = .86$

Parent-Student Contact (PSC)

This brief category prefaces the next category, EST; however, the scales are different so they will be discussed separately. The three variables in this category pertain to the parents'

discussions with their students about co-curricular activities (Table 4.24). Students perceived their parents discussed participation in campus events (85.6% *very often* and *sometimes* combined) and their choices for co-curricular activities (71% *very often* and *sometimes* combined). However, when asked if they felt their parents expected to be involved with their co-curricular activities, the students selected all four options almost equally. The difference between actual ($M = 3.18$) and expected ($M = 1.92$) involvement was found to be statistically significant ($t = 11.78, p < .00$).

Table 4.24

Parent-Student Contact (Co-curricular)

Category	Very often <i>n (%)</i>	Sometimes <i>n (%)</i>	Rarely <i>n (%)</i>	Never <i>n (%)</i>
Discuss student participation in campus events	64 (40.3)	72 (45.3)	14 (8.8)	9 (5.7)
Discuss student choices for co-curricular activities	50 (31.4)	63 (39.6)	22 (13.8)	23 (14.5)
Expectations for involvement with co-curricular involvement	36 (26.6)	42 (26.4)	38 (23.9)	43 (27.0)

Note. PST involvement for variables 1-2: $M = 1.95$, and $SD = .85$; expectation for involvement: $M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.12$.

Expected Contact from Student (EST)

In this category students report under what circumstances their parents would expect them to tell their parents of occurrences at college. Students perceived their parents would *strongly agree* that they expected their students to inform them on 20 of the 24 expectation variables and *agree* on three others (Table 4.25). Students were 100% in agreement (when *strongly agree* and *agree* were combined) on three of these variables: receiving an award,

declaring a major, or being hospitalized. The only variable upon which the students did not feel they were expected to tell their parents was when the student skips a class (50.3% *disagreed*, and 23.3% *strongly disagreed*).

Table 4.25

Expected Contact from Student (Parent expects student to tell parent if he/she...)

Variable	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Joins club or organization	78 (49.1)	68 (42.8)	11 (6.9)	2 (1.3)
Wins an award	127 (79.9)	32 (20.1)	--	--
Gets nominated for honor society	119 (74.8)	37 (23.3)	3 (1.9)	--
Is selected for leadership award	125 (78.6)	33 (20.8)	1 (.6)	--
Declares a major	127 (79.9)	32 (20.1)	--	--
Meets with his/her advisor	39 (24.5)	67 (42.1)	39 (24.5)	14 (18.8)
Skips class	12 (7.5)	30 (18.9)	80 (50.3)	37 (23.3)
Fails an assignment	26 (16.4)	62 (39.0)	55 (34.6)	16 (10.1)
Fails a course	123 (77.4)	33 (20.8)	3 (1.9)	--
Is placed on academic probation	133 (83.6)	24 (15.1)	2 (1.3)	--
Violates any campus policy	74 (46.5)	54 (34.0)	25 (15.7)	6 (3.8)
Violates major campus policy	111 (69.8)	41 (25.8)	4 (2.5)	3 (1.9)
Is placed on disciplinary probation	130 (81.8)	26 (16.4)	3 (1.9)	--
Is suspended	138 (86.8)	19 (11.9)	2 (1.3)	--

Is sick enough to see a physician	115 (72.3)	38 (23.9)	6 (3.8)	--
Is hospitalized	149 (93.7)	10 (6.3)	--	--
Is suicidal	140 (88.1)	16 (10.1)	3 (1.9)	--
Is having major mental health difficulty	137 (86.2)	22 (13.8)	--	--
Is having a roommate problem	54 (34.0)	83 (52.2)	18 (11.3)	4 (2.5)
Applies for a credit card	84 (52.8)	56 (35.2)	16 (10.1)	3 (1.9)
Takes out a loan	125 (78.6)	31 (19.5)	1 (.6)	2 (1.3)
Bounces a check	81 (50.9)	60 (37.7)	17 (10.7)	1 (.6)
Needs money	100 (62.9)	50 (31.4)	8 (5.0)	1 (.6)
Gets a part time job	102 (64.2)	54 (34.0)	3 (1.9)	--
Expectations for EST met	118 (74.2)	37 (23.3)	4 (2.5)	--

Note: EST involvement for variables 1-24: $M = 1.48$, $SD = .34$

Expected Contact from College Personnel (EPT)

Similar to the previous category, students were asked to report their parents' expectations for contact from college personnel under 17 specific circumstances (EPT) and whether those expectations were being met (Table 4.26). Students felt their parents *disagreed* on nine variables: received an award, was nominated for an honor society, took a leadership position, skipped class, failed an assignment, failed a course, violated any campus policy, was sick enough to visit a doctor, or had roommate problems. Students felt their parents expected to be notified by college personnel only if the student were placed on academic probation, violated only major campus policies, were placed on disciplinary probation, were suspended, were hospitalized, were

suicidal, or had major mental difficulties. A combined 91.2% of the students felt their parents' overall expectations for contact from college personnel were met (*strongly agree* 38.4% and *agree* 52.8%).

Table 4.26

Expected Contact from College Personnel

Variable	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Wins an award	11 (6.9)	37 (23.3)	83 (52.2)	28 (17.6)
Gets nominated for honor society	13 (8.2)	31 (19.5)	84 (52.8)	31 (19.5)
Is selected for leadership award	7 (4.4)	26 (16.4)	87 (54.7)	39 (24.5)
Skips class	1 (.6)	4 (2.5)	90 (56.6)	64 (40.3)
Fails an assignment	3 (1.9)	10 (6.3)	85 (53.5)	61 (38.4)
Fails a course	27 (17.0)	46 (28.9)	53 (33.3)	33 (20.8)
Is placed on academic probation	46 (28.9)	69 (43.4)	24 (15.1)	20 (12.6)
Violates any campus policy	26 (16.4)	40 (25.2)	67 (42.1)	26 (16.4)
Violates major campus policy	46 (28.9)	64 (40.3)	32 (20.1)	17 (10.7)
Is placed on disciplinary probation	53 (33.3)	70 (44.0)	24 (15.1)	12 (7.5)
Is suspended	64 (40.3)	62 (39.0)	22 (13.8)	11 (6.9)
Is sick enough to see a physician	22 (13.8)	31 (19.5)	80 (50.3)	26 (16.4)
Is hospitalized	62 (39.0)	58 (36.5)	29 (18.2)	10 (6.3)
Is suicidal	70 (44.0)	57 (35.8)	22 (13.8)	10 (6.3)
Is having major mental health difficulty	62 (39.0)	56 (35.2)	30 (18.9)	11 (6.9)

Is having a roommate problem	6 (3.8)	14 (8.8)	80 (50.3)	59 (37.1)
Expectations for EST met	61 (38.4)	84 (52.8)	7 (4.4)	7 (4.4)

Note. EPT involvement for variables 1-17: $M=2.51$, and $SD = .58$

Campus Events

In this category students were asked what types of events their parents attended on campus during the fall semester. According to the students the majority of their parents did not attend any events on campus during the fall semester (Table 4.27). The largest percentage of parents who visited campus came for an athletic event (47.8%). The students felt that their parents' expectations for campus events available to them were met (95%).

Table 4.27

Campus Events

Variable	Yes	No
	<i>n (%)</i>	<i>n (%)</i>
Attended family weekend	61 (38.4)	98 (61.6)
Attended art exhibit, theatre performance	43 (27.0)	116 (73.0)
Attended concert or music event	23 (14.5)	132 (85.5)
Attended lecture or panel discussion	40 (25.2)	119 (74.8)
Attended athletic event	76 (47.8)	83 (52.2)
CE expectations met	152 (95.6)	7 (4.4)

Note: CE involvement for variables 1-5: $M=1.69$, and $SD = .26$

Relationships (RMEET)

Students were asked to report which relationships their parents felt were important (i.e., if it were important for their parents to meet specific individuals). Students did not think their parents found it important to meet any campus personnel (Table 4.28). However, the students did feel it was *very important* to their parents to meet their roommates (61.6%), friends (49.7%), and significant others (84.3%) and *somewhat important* for them to meet the parents of their friends (52.2%).

Table 4.28

Relationships

Variable	Very important <i>n</i> (%)	Somewhat important <i>n</i> (%)	Not important <i>n</i> (%)
Meet roommate	98 (61.6)	53 (33.3)	8 (5.0)
Meet friends	79 (49.7)	71 (44.7)	9 (5.7)
Meet significant other	134 (84.3)	22 (13.8)	3 (1.9)
Meet parents of friends	21 (13.2)	83 (52.2)	55 (34.6)
Meet academic advisor	21 (13.2)	47 (29.6)	91 (57.2)
Meet faculty	7 (4.4)	57 (35.8)	95 (59.7)
Meet resident assistant	14 (8.8)	44 (27.7)	99 (62.3)
Meet residence hall director	4 (2.5)	37 (23.3)	117 (73.6)
Meet sports team coach	45 (28.3)	46 (28.9)	62 (39.0)
Meet club/organization advisor	5 (3.1)	39 (24.5)	114 (71.7)
Meet Dean of Students	20 (12.6)	44 (27.7)	95 (59.7)

Meet Academic Dean	19 (11.9)	48 (30.2)	92 (57.9)
Meet President	26 (16.4)	50 (31.4)	83 (52.2)

Type of Contact (CONT)

According to the students in this survey, their parents communicate with them by email 1-2 or 3-5 times per week (49.1% and 27%, respectively), or 1-2 times per month by postal mail (56%). Students reported going home more than four times during the fall semester (32.1%).

Table 4.29 displays the frequency of contact by the three electronic methods listed in the survey.

Table 4.29

Type of Contact

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Percentage</u>				
	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-7 times	More than 7 times	Do not communicate via this method
Weekly Email	78	43	14	14	10
Weekly Instant messaging	16	10	1	2	129
Weekly Text messaging	25	11	7	4	112

Parent-perceived Involvement (INV)

In this category students were asked to rate their parents' level of involvement during the college years and during high school (Table 4.30). Most students considered their parents to have

been *very involved* with their high school experience (56.0%) and to a lesser extent with the high school (35.2%). The students considered their parents' involvement with them to be *very involved* (47.2%) during the college years, yet only *fairly involved* with the institutions (34%). On average, students reported their parents were more involved with their students' high school experiences ($M = 3.35$) and with the high school ($M = 2.87$) than during the students' college experiences ($M = 3.29$) or with the college institution ($M = 2.22$).

Table 4.30

Student Perceptions of Parental Involvement

Variable	Very involved <i>n (%)</i>	Moderately involved <i>n (%)</i>	Fairly involved <i>n (%)</i>	Not involved <i>n (%)</i>
Involvement with student's college experience	75 (47.2)	58 (36.5)	23 (14.5)	3 (1.9)
Involvement with institution	14 (8.8)	49 (30.8)	54 (34.0)	42 (26.4)
Involvement with student's high school experience	89 (56.0)	42 (26.4)	23 (14.5)	5 (3.1)
Involvement with high school	56 (35.2)	45 (28.3)	39 (24.5)	19 (11.9)

Satisfaction with Institution

Students were asked in seven categories (OPC, EWF, FIN, HFS, MPH, EPT, and CE) to rate whether they believed the institution in which they were enrolled met their parents' expectations. Table 4.31 contains the results.

Table 4.31

Expectations Met by Institution

Category	Most frequent response	<i>n</i> (%)
Online & print and communication	Very often	83 (52.2)
Experiences with faculty	Very often	63 (39.6)
College finances	Very often	91 (57.2)
Housing and food services	Very often	74 (46.5)
Mental and physical health	Very often	89 (56.0)
Contact with college personnel	Agree	84 (52.8)
Campus Events	Yes	152 (95.6)

Summary of Research Question 2

Table 4.32 is a summary of findings for Research Question 2 in an abbreviated format for each category.

Table 4.32

RQ2: Students' perceptions of parental involvement

Category	Frequencies
Highest actual	<i>HFS, OPC, MPH</i>
Highest expected	FIN, MPH, PSC
OPC	Highest—use website to access information Strong—use of parent guide Lowest—use of popular parenting books

EWF	<p><i>More involvement than expected</i> Institution satisfaction = 76.7%</p>
FIN	<p>Less involvement than expected Provide money regularly upon request Teach/taught children to manage money; won't pay credit card debt Keep track of deadlines and complete financial aid forms <i>Don't make donations to institution</i> Don't meet with financial aid counselor Institution satisfaction = 93.7%</p>
HSF	<p>More involvement than expected Most involved category Greatest involvement: discussing housing options <i>Low involvement on giving advice on roommate concerns</i> Very low on contact with housing staff Institution satisfaction = 97.2%</p>
MPH	<p>Less involvement than expected <i>Second-most expected category</i> <i>4-way split on 'talking about sexual decision-making'</i> Institution satisfaction = 91.2%</p>
PSC	<p><i>Less involvement than expected</i> Parents discussed co-curricular activities, but didn't believe they were involved</p>
EST	<p>Parents expect students to tell almost everything (strongly agreed on 20 out of 24; agreed on 3) <i>'Skip classes' response was split between disagree and strongly disagree</i> Expectations met—i.e., students are doing what parents want!</p>
EPT	<p><i>Similar to parents, but responses tended to fall in the middle two categories</i> Expectations met—82.5%</p>
CE	<p><i>No variables reported with high frequencies</i></p>
RMEET	<p>Important to meet friends, roommate, significant other Not important to meet personnel (highest = team coach 28%)</p>
CON	<p>Use email, but not text messaging or IM Saw son/daughter during home visits (4 times in Fall)</p>

INV	Very involved with HS experience & with the HS <i>Very involved with COL experience, and fairly involved with institution</i>
Satisfaction	Satisfied with the institution at the highest level in every category

Note. Findings in *italics* indicate where student survey results differed from parent survey results.

Findings: Research Question 3

Do parents and students in a family unit have the same perceptions of parental involvement?

For the first two research questions, the researcher looked at parent perceptions and student perceptions for parental involvement using two separate samples. There were 502 participants in the parent survey and 159 participants in the student survey. The sample sizes differed because some of the sons and daughters of the parent participants did not take the student survey as requested by their parents. Therefore, findings that were reported did not take into account the parent-student combinations from the same family units. After matching parents and their students from the above databases by using a unique marker, a total of 122 matched pairs were found and entered into a separate database for further analysis.

Matched pairs t-tests were run on all of the perception questions (119 variables). When examining the research questions in terms of hypotheses, the null hypothesis for these tests was that the mean for parents equals the mean for students ($H_0: \mu_p = \mu_s$). The acceptable significance level was $\alpha=.05$. This level represented that the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if it were true (a Type I error) is 5% or less. To minimize the risk of a Type II error where the null hypothesis was not rejected when it was false, the acceptable effect size for this study was $ES = .15$ (medium). The power of the t-test ($1 - \beta$) was set at .80.

The researcher accepted the null hypothesis for 78 of the paired tests since there were no differences in the responses of the parent-student family unit pairs. The researcher failed to

accept the null hypothesis 43 times; slightly more than one-third of the differences were statistically significant; they are reported here by category. Table 4.33 contains the means, standard deviations, *t* value, and significance for each of the significant findings.

Table 4.33

Matched Pairs with Significant Results

Variable	Parent		Student		Matched Pairs <i>t</i> test	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (121)	<i>p</i>
<u>Students Higher</u>						
Online Print & Communication						
Use webpage to access information	1.90	.83	2.11	.77	-2.821	.006
Use of webpage to check events	2.37	.94	2.70	.88	-3.511	.001
Read Parent's Guide	2.24	.82	2.43	.94	-1.974	.051 ^a
Experiences with Faculty						
Ask about course progress	3.38	1.13	3.79	.62	-3.457	.001
Expect contact with faculty	2.98	.93	3.30	.88	-3.482	.001
College Finances						
Provide money regularly	1.71	.96	1.91	1.02	-2.502	.014
Make donation to institution	2.16	1.07	2.62	1.09	-4.433	.000
Housing & Food Services						
Advise student—resolve maintenance	2.70	1.05	2.94	1.12	-2.099	.038
Mental & Physical Health						

Come to campus if sick	3.14	.88	3.37	.83	-2.431	.017
Talk about consistent use of meds	2.20	1.03	2.62	1.22	-3.645	.000
Encourage preventative health	1.35	.59	1.93	1.11	-5.228	.000
Talk about use of alcohol/drugs	1.35	.57	2.02	1.02	-7.267	.000
Talk about sexual decision-making	1.64	.77	2.44	1.11	-7.592	.000
Parent-Student Contact						
Discuss participation—campus events	1.48	.66	1.75	.78	-3.132	.002
Discuss co-curricular choices	1.71	.76	2.03	.94	-3.253	.001
Expect Student to Tell If...						
Meets with advisor	1.90	.74	2.20	.92	-3.104	.002
Skips class	2.48	.85	2.87	.83	-3.700	.000
Fails assignment	2.12	.82	2.34	.85	-2.140	.034
Is suicidal	1.04	.20	1.13	.39	-2.236	.027
Has major mental health difficulty	1.05	.22	1.12	.33	-1.988	.049
Expect Personnel to Tell If...						
Receives award	2.20	.90	2.84	.77	-6.257	.000
Nominated for honor society	2.25	.89	2.84	.81	-5.949	.000
Selected for leadership position	2.38	.93	3.01	.73	-6.472	.000
Skips class	3.04	.71	3.35	.59	-3.942	.000
Fails assignment	3.00	.74	3.27	.68	-3.024	.003
Fails course	2.34	1.02	2.58	1.00	-2.099	.038
Violates any campus policy	1.93	1.01	2.56	.95	-5.005	.000
Violates only major campus policy	1.88	.98	2.15	.98	-2.267	.025

Is sick enough to see doctor	2.48	.94	2.78	.87	-2.539	.012
Is hospitalized	1.47	.75	1.94	.91	-4.648	.000
Is suicidal	1.25	.55	1.83	.91	-6.118	.000
Is having mental health difficulty	1.36	.66	1.97	.94	-6.118	.000
Is having roommate problem	2.87	.87	3.25	.71	-4.257	.000
Campus Events						
Attended concert/music event	1.80	.41	1.88	.33	-2.556	.012
Relationships						
Meet academic advisor	2.14	.75	2.44	.72	-4.125	.000
Meet faculty members	2.38	.66	2.54	.59	-2.403	.018
Meet resident assistant	2.25	.76	2.48	.73	-2.740	.007
Meet hall director	2.40	.74	2.69	.56	-3.696	.000
Meet Dean of Students	2.12	.79	2.46	.72	-4.099	.000
Meet President	2.17	.77	2.43	.72	-3.294	.001
Parent-Perceived Involvement						
Involvement with high school	1.82	1.004	2.13	1.04	-3.068	.003

Parents Higher

College Finances

Completes financial aid paperwork	2.43	1.27	2.20	1.22	2.117	.036
Assists with bill paying	2.11	1.02	1.65	1.00	4.490	.000
Assists with paying off credit card	3.25	1.15	2.77	1.35	4.121	.000

Housing & Food Service

Contact personnel—meal concerns	3.93	.29	3.77	.67	2.623	.010
Parent-perceived Involvement						
Involvement with college institution	2.97	.98	2.76	.95	2.047	.043

Note. ^a *p value* is reported because and discussed even though it is not statistically significant.

Generally, the students' perceptions were significantly greater than their parents' perceptions in 38 tests, while the parents' perceptions were significantly higher in only five of the tests.

Online and Print Communication

The results of the paired samples *t* tests for OPC indicated that two findings in this category were statistically significant: the mean for the parents' perceptions of parental use of the institution's web page to access information was significantly less than the mean for the students' perceptions, and the mean for the parents' perceptions of their use of the web page to check campus events was significantly less than the mean for the students' perceptions. A third test, the use of the Parent's Guide, produced results that were not significant, but the probability was off by only one-one thousandth of a percent; therefore, the results are included in Table 4.31 above.

Experiences with Faculty

Student perceptions regarding their parents' asking faculty about course progress and their parents' expectations to be involved with faculty were significantly greater than the perceptions of their parents on the same topics.

College Finances

Five findings in this section were statistically significant. Two paired variables produced results where the students' perceptions were significantly higher than their parents' perceptions:

providing money on a regular basis and making a donation to the institution. The reverse is true for three pairs in this category; parents' perceptions were significantly higher on completing financial forms, assisting with paying bills, and assisting with paying off the students' credit card debt.

Housing and Food Services

Only two pairs resulted in statistically significant differences in HFS. Student responses were significantly higher for the variable pertaining to advice given on how to resolve maintenance and facility concerns. Parent responses were significantly higher for contact with personnel about meal concerns.

Mental and Physical Health

Five paired tests were statistically significant for this category. In each case the students' perceptions were significantly greater than the parents' perceptions. The variables are: a) coming to campus if the student is sick, b) talking to the student about consistent use of medications, c) encouraging preventative health, d) talking with the student about the use of alcohol and drugs, and e) talking with the student about sexual decision-making.

Parent-Student Contact

Both significant findings in this category showed that the students' perceptions were significantly greater than their parents' perceptions. The variables involved discussing the students' participation in campus events and discussing the students' co-curricular choices.

Expects Student to Tell

Students' perceptions of when their parents expected the students to tell them about five specific variables in this category produced significantly greater findings. The variables are: a)

meets with an advisor, b) skips class, c) fails an assignment, d) is suicidal, and e) has major mental health difficulties.

Expects Personnel to Tell

This category produced the largest number (13) of significant findings; in each case the findings were statistically greater for the students. The variables are: a) receives an award, b) is nominated for an honor society, c) is selected for a leadership position, d) skips class, e) fails an assignment, f) fails a course, g) violates any campus policy, h) violates only a major campus policy, i) is sick enough to see a doctor, j) is hospitalized, k) is suicidal, l) is having mental health difficulty, and m) is having a roommate problem.

Campus Events

Students' perceptions of their parents' attendance at concerts or musical events on campus were statistically greater than the perceptions of their parents.

Relationships

Students had statistically greater perceptions of their parents' expectations to meet staff, specifically the academic advisor, faculty members, the resident assistant, the hall director, the Dean of Students, and the President.

Perceived Involvement

The two statistically significant findings in this category were split. The students' responses were statistically greater when reporting on their parents' involvement with the high school they attended. The parents' responses were significantly greater when reporting their involvement with the higher education institution.

Summary of Research Question 3

Table 4.34 is a summary of findings for Research Question 3 in an abbreviated format for each category.

Table 4.34

RQ3: Matched Pairs for Family Unit

Overall	45 paired questions had significant differences Students felt parents had higher expectations and higher levels of involvement than their parents did 40 times
OPC	Students higher (2): use of web page to access information, and use of web page to check events
EWF	Students higher(2): ask about course progress, and expects contact with faculty
FIN	Students higher(2): provide money regularly, and make donation to institution Parents higher(3): complete financial aid forms, assist with bill-paying, and assist paying off credit card
HSF	Students higher (1): advise student how to resolve maintenance issues Parents higher(1): contact personnel about meal concerns
MPH	Students higher (5): Come to campus if sick, talk about consistent use of meds, encourage preventative health, talk about use of alcohol and drugs, talk about sexual decision-making
PSC	Students higher (2): discuss participation in campus events, and discuss co-curricular choices
EST	Students higher (5): meets with advisor, skips class, fails an assignment, is suicidal, and has major mental health difficulty
EPT	Students higher (13): receives award, nominated for honor society, selected for leadership position, skips class, fails assignment, fails course, violates major campus policy, violates any campus policy, is sick

	enough to see a doctor, is hospitalized, is suicidal, is having mental health difficulty, and is having roommate problem
CE	Students higher (1): attended concert or music event
RMEET	Students higher (6): meet advisor, meet faculty members, meet resident assistant, meet hall director, meet Dean of Students, meet President
INV	Students higher (1): involvement with high school Parents higher (1): involvement with college institution

Findings: Research Question 4

Is there an effect on parent expectations for involvement based on race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first generation to attend college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, or level of parental involvement in high school?

Demographic data were collected in both surveys. Although the number of participants in each survey exceeded the requirements set to satisfy the effect size, power and alpha levels, the researcher used the larger database to determine the effects of nine demographic characteristics on the parents' expectations for involvement. The researcher performed a series of analyses of variance (ANOVAs) on five categories of expectations: a) expects to be involved with the faculty (EWF), b) expects to be involved with college finances (FIN), c) expects to be involved with housing and food services (HSF), d) expects to be involved with mental and physical health matters (MPH), and e) expects parent-student contact regarding co-curricular involvement (PSC).

To determine where the effects lie, the researcher performed the Tukey post hoc comparisons when necessary on each of the variables with statistically significant differences. Fourteen of the F values were found to be significant and are discussed in this section. Table 4.35 shows the demographics that effected expectations for parental involvement.

Table 4.35

Significantly Different Demographic Factors

Category	F value	p	Category Means				
			M_1	M_2	M_3	M_4	
Race/Ethnicity							
EWf	3.656	.013	White 1.87	Black 2.57	Other 1.50		
Gender	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Family Income Level							
FIN	5.103	.000	3.33 ^a	3.50 ^b	3.75 ^c	3.76 ^d	
Education—Male Parent	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Education—Female Parent							
PSC	2.448	.033	HS 2.86	BA 2.39	--	--	--
Other Children in College							
PSC	5.264	.022	Yes 2.37	No 2.58			
First Generation	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Student Classification							
FIN	2.698	.030	Fr. 3.77	Sr. 3.55			
MPH	2.647	.033	--	--			

Type of Institution						
EWF	67.350	.000	Priv. 2.34	Public 1.69		
Involved—HS						
FIN	5.188	.000	3.37 ^e	3.56 ^f	3.79 ^g	
MPH	3.353	.010	3.11 ^e	3.51 ^g		
PSC	6.409	.000	1.93 ^e	2.25 ^f	2.51 ^g	2.66 ^h
Involved—HS Experience						
FIN	5.286	.000	3.51 ⁱ	3.55 ^j	3.78 ^k	
HFS	3.407	.009	1.79 ⁱ	2.32 ^k		
MPH	13.968	.000	2.84 ⁱ	3.30 ^j	3.57 ^k	
PSC	11.695	.000	1.93 ⁱ	2.23 ^j	2.71 ^k	

^a income = \$30-50,000. ^b income = \$50-75,000. ^c income = \$75-100,000. ^d income = \$100,000+. ^e HS = not involved
^f HS =fairly involved. ^g HS =very involved. ^h HS =moderately involved. ⁱ HS experience = fairly involved. ^j HS
experience = moderately involved. ^k HS experience = very involved.

Of the nine demographic factors, seven were found to have significant differences between means of responses in at least one of the five categories (EWF, FIN, HFS, MPH, and PSC) used in the comparisons; therefore, the null hypotheses were rejected. The two factors that produced no significant differences in any category were *gender* and *first generation to attend college*; the null hypotheses in these comparisons were accepted. The most frequent category in which differences were found was *college finances*.

Ethnicity

ANOVA produced evidence of differences in the parents' expectations for involvement with faculty (EWF). The ANOVA was significant, $F_{(3, 486)} = 3.656, p = .013$. The Tukey post hoc test showed that parents of Caucasian students ($M = 1.87$) differed significantly in their

expectations from parents of African American students ($M = 2.57$). Additionally, parents of African American students ($M = 1.87$) differed from parents of students classified as *other* ($M = 1.50$).

Type of Institution

The results of a t-test comparing private and public institutions also produced evidence of differences in the parents' expectations for involvement with faculty (EWF). Parents of students in private institutions ($M = 2.34$) differed significantly ($t = 3.523, p < .000$) in their expectations for involvement with faculty from parents of students in public institutions ($M = 1.69$). No other statistically significant differences were found based on type of institution attended.

Family Income

Survey respondents reported their total family income in one of five ranges. Based on income level, ANOVA produced evidence of differences in the parents' expectations for involvement with *college finances*. The ANOVA was significant, $F_{(4, 475)} = 5.103, p = .000$. A post hoc test found that three pairs of comparisons of income levels produced significant results: a) comparing $\$30,001 - 50,000$ ($M = 3.33$) to $\$75,001 - \$100,000$ ($M = 3.75$); b) comparing $\$30,001 - 50,000$ ($M = 3.33$) to $\$100,000+$ ($M = 3.76$); and c) comparing $\$50,001 - 75,000$ ($M = 3.50$) to $\$100,000+$ ($M = 3.76$).

Education Attained by Parents

No significant results were found by comparing the means of education levels of male parents; however, the comparison of means of the education attained by female parents was significant when examining the expectations of the parents pertaining to *parent-student contact*. The ANOVA was significant, $F_{(5, 490)} = 2.448, p = .033$. The significant differences were between

those mothers with high school diplomas ($M = 2.86$) and those mothers with bachelor's degrees ($M = 2.39$).

Other Children in College

A significant difference was found when comparing means of parents who had other children in college ($M = 2.37$) to those who did not ($M = 2.58$). Similar to the above category, this difference surfaced when examining the parents' expectations for *parent-student contact*. Since there were only two groups in the comparison, a t-test was performed, and it confirmed the results ($t = 18.066, p < .000$).

Student Classification

When examining student classifications, significant findings surfaced in two categories, *college finances* and *mental and physical health matters*. The ANOVA for *college finances* was significant, $F_{(4, 497)} = 2.698, p = .030$. Post hoc tests showed there was a significant difference between the means of parents of freshmen ($M = 3.77$) and parents of seniors ($M = 3.55$). The ANOVA for *mental and physical health* also exhibited significant differences, $F_{(4, 497)} = 2.647, p = .033$. An examination of the Tukey post hoc test did not reveal any specific groups with significant differences.

High School Involvement

By far, the category that produced evidence of the most effects of a demographic factor on the parents' expectations for involvement in the categories of this study is their self-reported levels of involvement during their sons' and daughters' high school years. Parents were asked to report their involvement two ways—in terms of their sons' or daughters' high school experiences and with the high schools they attended. ANOVAs were run for each subset. Significant differences were found in the high school involvement subset for expectations with *college*

finances ($F_{(4, 497)} = 5.188, p = .000$), *mental and physical health* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 3.353, p = .010$), and *parent-student contact* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 6.409, p = .000$). Post hoc tests defined several pairs of comparisons with significant differences. For *college finances* the differences were between *not involved* ($M = 3.37$) and *very involved* ($M = 3.79$), and between *fairly involved* ($M = 3.56$) and *very involved* ($M = 3.79$). For *mental and physical health* the difference was between *not involved* ($M = 3.11$) and *very involved* ($M = 3.51$). Finally, for *parent-student contact* there were three significant differences: between a) *not involved* ($M = 1.93$) and *very involved* ($M = 2.66$), b) *fairly involved* ($M = 2.25$) and *very involved* ($M = 2.66$), and c) *moderately involved* ($M = 2.51$) and *very involved* ($M = 2.66$).

When examining parents' expectations for involvement in terms of their previous involvement with their students' high school experience, four categories produced significant differences: *college finances* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 5.286, p = .000$), *housing and food services* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 3.407, p = .009$), *mental and physical health* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 13.968, p = .000$), and *parent-student contact* ($F_{(4, 497)} = 11.695, p = .000$). For *college finances* the differences were between *fairly involved* ($M = 3.51$) and *moderately involved* ($M = 3.55$), and between *fairly involved* ($M = 3.51$) and *very involved* ($M = 3.78$). For the *housing and food services* category, the differences were between *fairly involved* ($M = 1.79$) and *very involved* ($M = 2.32$). *Mental and physical health* statistics showed differences between *fairly involved* ($M = 2.84$) and *moderately involved* ($M = 3.30$), and between *fairly involved* ($M = 2.84$) and *very involved* ($M = 3.57$). Finally, the *parent-student contact* category found differences between *fairly involved* ($M = 1.93$) and *very involved* ($M = 2.71$), and *fairly involved* ($M = 1.93$) and *moderately involved* ($M = 2.23$).

Summary of Research Question 4

Table 4.36 is a summary of findings for Research Question 4 in an abbreviated format for each category.

Table 4.36

RQ 4: effect of demographics on parental involvement

Overall	7 demographic variables produced a total of 14 significant findings No significant findings for <i>gender</i> and <i>first generation</i>
Ethnicity	EWf: whites lower than blacks; blacks lower than other
Public v. Private	EWf: private higher than public
Family Income	FIN: 75-100K > 30-50K; 100K+ > 30-50K; 100K+ > 50-75K
Parent education— female	PSC: HS diploma higher than BA
Others in college	PSC: none in college higher than those with others in college
Classification	FIN: freshmen higher than seniors MPH: (no specific groups determined)
HS Involvement— w/HS	FIN: Very involved > not involved; and Very involved > fairly involved MPH: Very involved > not involved
HS Involvement— w/HS experience	FIN: Moderately involved > fairly involved; and Very involved > fairly involved HFS: Very involved > fairly involved MPH: moderately involved > fairly involved; and Very involved > fairly involved

PSC: Very involved > fairly involved;
and moderately involved > fairly involved

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides an overall summary of this study, its significant findings, and a discussion of these findings as they relate to existing research as well as their implications for practice in higher education settings. The information in this study adds empirical knowledge to form a basis for institutions seeking to improve parent-student-institution relationships. Finally, this chapter concludes with suggestions for furthering research on the topic of parental involvement.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine expectations for parental involvement from the perspectives of parents of traditional-age college students and the perspectives of their students enrolled in a four-year college or university. Online surveys were used to gather data for analysis. Participants in the study represented seven American institutions: two large public institutions and five private institutions of varying sizes.

This study was guided by four research questions. In two separate but parallel online surveys, parents and students were asked to report their perceptions of the parents' involvement in several categories. In a subset of the two larger participant databases, matched parent-student pairs in a family unit were compared to determine the similarities of responses from the same family. Additionally, nine demographic factors were examined to determine what effects they had on parental involvement during the college years. A multitude of findings surfaced that

revealed expectations for parental involvement and actual levels of parental involvement; these findings have practical significance for student affairs practitioners and college administrators.

Summary and Discussion of Significant Findings

A large amount of data was reported in terms of statistical significance in Chapter 4; a summary of those findings is included in this chapter. Yet it is also important to summarize the significance of the findings in a manner that is free from the cumbersome volume of numerical statistics previously detailed. In this section the discussion centers on the practical significance of the data, as mere numbers and Likert Scale notations are not always clear representations that easily translate to usage.

Parent and Student Perspectives

RQ1: What do parents want and/or expect in terms of being involved with their students' development and experiences while in college?

RQ2: What do students perceive their parents want and/or expect in terms of involvement with them while in college?

Actual vs. expected involvement. An examination of the responses given separately by parents and students revealed in both surveys that the parents' actual involvement was not the same as their expectations for involvement. In none of the five categories examined did the expectations equal the actual involvement reported by the parents (nor those reported by the students). Parents reported their involvement in three categories (*college finances, mental and physical health, and experiences with faculty*) at lower levels than they anticipated, and in two categories (*parent-student contact and housing and food services*) parents reported their involvement was actually higher than anticipated. This incongruity can be explained in part by a lack of information on what to expect, causing the reality of the situation to differ from that

which was anticipated. For example, lacking information about federal regulations that impact the conversations between health center employees and parents will result in parents' having less than anticipated interactions on mental and physical health matters.

The students' perceptions of their parents' involvement differed in two categories: students felt their parents had more *experiences with faculty* than they anticipated, but in the case of *parent-student contact*, parents were less involved than they thought they would be regarding co-curricular activities. Parents and students agreed that the highest categories of *expectations* for parental involvement were *college finances*, *mental and physical health matters*, and *parent-student contact*. However, they disagreed on the top three categories in terms of *actual* perceptions of parental involvement. Parents reported their top areas of involvement as *parent-student contact*, *housing and food services*, and *college finances*, while students felt their parents were most involved in *housing and food services*, *online and print communication*, and *mental and physical health matters*. It is important to remember that the parents were self-reporting their *actual* involvement, while the students were reporting how they perceived (or *observed*) their parents' involvement. As student affairs professionals we must recognize that involved parents believe their involvement is warranted and therefore are often unaware of how others, including their students, perceive their actions.

Online and print communication. The student and parent perspectives here were the same. Both groups reported great use of the institutions' web sites to access information and a strong use of the parent's Guide provided by the institutions, but only a rare use of books on college parenting. Clearly the parents seek information from the institution, and according to Keppler, Mullendore & Carey (2005) expect to get answers quickly. Parents have developed patterns in the K-12 years that they are carrying over to the college years. They seek information

that will help them to subsequently help their children/young adults to succeed, and they seek it from the institutions, not through the popular books on parenting during the college years. The fact that parents in this study sought information from their institutions supports the findings in the study by Boyd, Hunt, Hunt, Magoon & Van Brunt (1997). In that study parents were given resource directories by the institution so they could become referral agents for their college students. The results were positively related to the academic performance of the students.

Experiences with faculty. Parents in this study did not feel their level of interaction with faculty members was as extensive as they had anticipated. Again, parents were expecting a continuance of the involvement trends developed during the K-12 years when they had numerous opportunities for direct contact with high school teachers. Additionally, although parents and students reported nearly equal percentages of a positive level of satisfaction with the institutions, the two groups differed on the actual amount of involvement parents had with the faculty. Parents reported a greater anticipation for involvement than actual involvement, while students reported their parents were more involved than they anticipated. Parents are often unaware of the amount of autonomy faculty members possess in higher education. In rare situations some faculty members might seek parent interaction, but this is hardly the norm. Faculty members see their students as independent adults; accordingly, they plan their interactions with the students, not the parents.

College finances. Parents and students agreed on almost all items regarding college finances. Both groups reported less involvement than expected in this category. Parents financially supported their students on a regular basis, and they provided them with additional money when requested. They had taught their children financial basics such as balancing a checkbook and the specifics of using credit cards. Perhaps because they felt they had prepared

them on money management matters, parents in this study reported they would not pay off a credit card debt for their students. Students confirmed this practice. Parents and students also agreed that typically the parents kept up with financial deadlines and completed required paperwork for financial aid, when applicable. It appears parents have done a good job with financial training and getting the message across to their students; at some point the parents should trust their students to become more independent by letting them have more control over meeting deadlines and completing forms. Financial aid counselors can assist by assuring parents that doing so will help their students develop mature financial practices.

One interesting finding was that a large number of parents reported making donations to the institution. An examination of the family income of the participants in this study showed that an overwhelming majority of the families were above the \$100,000 level for annual income, which made it feasible for them to donate to the institutions. It is unclear whether these donations were made because of a previous relationship with the institution (i.e. alumni status, an older sibling at or graduated from the institution, etc.) or if it was directly related to the current student. Interestingly, the students in this study appeared to be unaware of their parents' financial donations; the majority of them reported that their parents never or at best rarely made donations. In terms of satisfaction with the institution on expectations regarding financial matters the parent and student groups reported a high level of satisfaction equally (93.7% of both groups reported that their expectations were met). The fact that there is such a high level of satisfaction could also be related to the high income levels of the participants in this study. It is possible that these families were in a position to handle the financial obligations of attending the selected institutions and therefore did not have financial concerns. Indeed, although not one of the

demographic questions focused on in this study, data collected showed that nearly half of the parents reported covering 75% or more of the cost of their students' education.

Housing and food services. Parents and students both reported greater involvement than expected in housing and food service matters, and in both cases this proved to be the category with the most reported involvement. This finding is not surprising to anyone who works in housing or anyone who has been exposed to the anecdotal reports in the media. However, neither the parents nor the students felt that parental involvement was going to be as strong in this area. A deeper examination of the data showed that the parents' perceptions of contact with the housing staff were very low. (Three questions asked the parents to report their contact with housing staff.) Was this related to the self-reporting nature of the study? Were the parents unwilling to admit to being what would be considered by many to be helicopter parents? If so, then wouldn't the students' perceptions of their parents' actual involvement contradict the parents' responses (i.e., show higher levels of actual involvement with housing staff)? Yet this was not the case. The students reported similar low levels of parental contact with the housing staff. If both parents and students perceived that their involvement with housing staff was relatively low, then it is possible that the misconceptions about overly-involved, demanding parents stems from exaggerations by student affairs professionals. It is the responsibility of these professionals to monitor the negative messages they send out regarding parental involvement. A good starting point would be to limit the use of potentially damaging catch phrases such as helicopter parents. Similarly, the lack of unilaterally accepted definitions of parental involvement could also cause students and parents to under- or over-estimate their level of involvement. In order to truly understand the nature of one's involvement, clearly defined parameters must be in place and understood by all.

Parents and students also reported a large amount of involvement in deciding where the students would live during the academic year. This finding fit with the previous category in that the parents in the study were financially involved, so it stands to reason that housing options would be an area for parental involvement. Parents also felt they supported their students by giving them advice on how to handle roommate concerns rather than handling them for them. Students agreed that their parents did not handle roommate concerns for them; they also did not feel their parents gave them advice in this area. As reported earlier, students are accustomed to having their parents get involved and handle situations for them (Hossler, et al. 1999); it is possible that the students did not perceive receiving advice as a true solution to the situation and therefore did not report such advice in this study.

Mental and physical health matters. Parents and students had the highest expectations for this category, and they agreed that parental involvement was less than expected. They were in agreement on all but one subject, regardless of whether it pertained to involvement with the student or with personnel at the institution. The one subject where they differed was when talking about sexual decision-making. Parents reported a very high level of involvement with the students, but when the students responded, they were split almost equally (approximately 25%) over each of the four responses. In addition to the restrictions discussed earlier about permissible contact, parents have not been educated on theories of student development during the college years. Traditional-age college students are developing mature interpersonal relationships (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) and might not welcome their parents' input on this subject.

Parent-student contact. Parents reported having high levels of discussions with their students about co-curricular activities; however, when asked about their expectations for involvement they didn't believe they would be as involved. Interestingly, students perceived that

their parents were less involved with their co-curricular choices than they had anticipated. This category was a lead-in to the next two categories: parents expecting the students to tell them if certain conditions existed, and parents expecting college personnel to tell them if these same conditions existed.

Expects student to tell. The closeness between parent and student was exhibited in this category. Parents and students consistently reported parents' having high levels of expectations of the students in almost every condition. In other words, parents expected students to tell them almost everything that happens while in college. The expectations were so strong that when asked about four conditions, the students in this study unilaterally agreed that their parents wanted to hear from them--not one of the students disagreed about winning an award, declaring a major, being hospitalized, and having major mental health difficulty. More importantly, parents and students agreed that the parents' expectations for information from the students was being met, meaning that students were doing what the parents wanted. This was another example of the closeness between parents of traditional-age college students and their students.

Expects college personnel to tell. Parents expected college personnel to tell them about their students regarding two conditions pertaining to awards and honors and nine conditions pertaining to academic or health problems. Much of the information expected is protected by FERPA and HIPAA, so it was surprising to see that 82.5% of the parents felt their expectations of receiving information from college personnel were being met. Although students did not agree with the parents in this study on some of the conditions, they did agree overwhelmingly that their parents' expectations were being met. This raises some questions. Who was telling the parents? Were waivers allowed at the institution? Did the students sign waivers? What specific policies did the institutions have in place for releasing information to parents? According to Lowery

(2005), parents are often unaware of or confused by the restrictions placed on institutions by FERPA and HIPAA; however, personnel at all institutions should be aware of these regulations and should have specific procedures in place to protect the students and ultimately protect the institution.

Campus events. Slightly more than half of the parents in this study reported attending a sports event during the fall semester, and approximately 40% attended the parent weekend offered by the institution. Much smaller numbers of parents reported attending other campus activities, but it is not clear whether any of these events occurred during times when the parents were on campus for other events such as orientation, move-in day, an athletic event, or parents weekend. These findings suggest, however, that parental involvement takes place more than likely from a distance (by phone or mail) as opposed to during campus visits. Since the likelihood is that parents communicate with student affairs professionals via phone, it is essential to train all staff members, including student workers, on both the institution's policies regarding parent contact and the best ways to handle or redirect calls from parents.

Relationships. Parents and students agreed that it was important to parents to meet their students' friends, roommates and significant others, but it was not important for them to meet college personnel. The only exception was that it was somewhat important for them to meet an athletic coach if the student was on a team. This finding supports Howe and Strauss (2000) in their assessment of the protective nature of Boomer parents. Because of their involvement with their sons and daughters during the K-12 years, parents met the friends, teammates, and other children involved in activities with their children. It also shows an inherent trust that parents place in the institutions' personnel, much like during the days of *in loco parentis* (Cohen, 1998; Johnson, 2004).

Type of contact. This survey did not focus on the use of landline or cellular telephones as a means of contact between parents and students; it was assumed that telephone usage is common for all families. Rather, the researchers wanted to examine electronic means of contact—instant messaging, text messaging and email. Parents and students in this study concurred that email was a popular mode of communication, but most students did not use text messaging or instant messaging to communicate with their parents. Several independent studies (Barker, 2006; Cornwell, 2006; King, 2006; Mastrodicasa, 2006; Merriman, 2006) reported the popularity of the latter two communication modes among today's young adults and often as a way to communicate with their parents, but the findings in this study showed that those modes were reserved for their friends. In terms of physical contact, both groups reported that students went home on average four times during the fall semester.

Perceived Involvement. When asked about parents' previous involvement during the high school years, both groups agreed that parents were very involved with both the students' experiences and the students' high school itself. This supports numerous studies that report parental involvement during high school as an indicator of successful college admissions (Choy, 2000; Conklin & Dailey, 1981; Cotton & Weiland, 1989) and academic success while in college (Weidman, 1999; Boyd et al. 1997). Parents also believed that it was important to be involved with their college student but not necessarily with the institution. However, this lower self-perceived involvement with the institutions was not supported by other findings in this study. This raises the importance of the need for a uniform definition of parental involvement (Hossfler, et al. 1999; Johnson, 2004; Trusty, 1998). Because there is no consistent definition, the design of this study intentionally allowed parents to interpret parental involvement according to their own standards. The contradictions here support the need to give guidelines and parameters for

involvement to parents, similar to those received during the K-12 years. Furthermore, Turrentine, et al. (2000) developed a list that ranks the importance of specific expectations that parents have for the college experiences of their college students. Third on their list was maturity and independence; the types of involvement reported by many parents in this study did not always indicate that maturity and independence are goals these parents had for their sons and daughters, or at the least they had not stopped to think what their involvement meant.

This study produced different results between parent and student respondents when asked about the parents' involvement during the college years. Students perceived their parents' involvement as higher than the parents' perceptions in terms of involvement with the college experience and with the college institution. This finding was consistent throughout most of the categories discussed above. It appears that even though parents saw college as a time to pull away from their students, they were not following through by lessening their involvement, at least as seen by their students. This finding supports Galinky's (1987) final stage of parenting, the departure stage, which typically takes place during the college years of traditional-age college students. Parents are often torn between accepting the increasing amount of freedom and independence being developed by their young adult children and becoming more attached in an attempt to delay separation.

Satisfaction. Across the board when asked, parents and students perceived that the institutions met their expectations for involvement in each of the seven categories. The immediate question raised here is whether institutions agree with their assessments. Since getting opinions of professionals was not a goal for this study, future research is warranted on assessing institutional satisfaction from the parents' and institutions' perspectives.

Parent-Student Matched by Family Unit

RQ3: Do parents and students in a family unit have the same perceptions of parental involvement?

The two surveys used in this study had different numbers of participants. Parents were contacted first and asked to forward the request for participation to the son or daughter currently enrolled at one of the seven participating institutions. This method produced 502 parent respondents but only 159 student respondents. The large number of parents who participated can be interpreted as supporting evidence for the notion that parents want (or expect) to be involved and are willing to do so. The researcher expected a lower number of student respondents, yet the fact that the ratio of parent participants to student participants was 3:1 could have led to misleading conclusions. Therefore, in order to add validity to the findings the researcher wanted to have a more even ratio to analyze for significance. The matching of student and parent from a family unit in this study provided the necessary balance by creating an equal number of student and parent participants (122 matched pairs). Their responses were analyzed on the same 119 variables used in the original surveys.

Perceptions of involvement and expectations in eleven categories were examined. In general, the family unit pairs had similar perceptions (i.e. they did not have contradictory perceptions) although the levels of involvement often differed significantly. The results of the matched-pairs analysis produced significant differences 55% of the time. In 87% of those differences the students felt the parents had higher levels of parental involvement and expectations than their parents reported they had. The only times when parents had higher expectations for involvement occurred when responding to questions on *college finances* (three times out of ten), *housing and food services* (one time out of eight), relationships (one time out

of 24), and *perceived involvement* (one time out of four). These findings are evidence that the findings in the first two research questions are indicative of parent and student perceptions regardless of the uneven sample sizes. Also, the findings showed that generally students believed parents had higher expectations for parental involvement than the parents reported. The findings for RQ3 could indicate that students, having witnessed their parents' involvement during the K-12 years, anticipated that the pattern of parental involvement would continue into the college years. As mentioned in the previous section, there is a need for education for the parents on what is acceptable parental involvement during the college years; it appears there is a need to educate the students as well.

The similarity of the responses by parents and students supports recent literature that recognizes the closeness of Millennial college students to their parents, the tendency of these students to rely on their parents, and that students often encourage parental involvement (Cawthon & Miller, 2003; Gerardy, 2002; Howe and Strauss, 2003; Mastrodicasa, 2006; and Mitra, 2006). Student affairs professionals must acknowledge the fact that often students welcome their parents' involvement. Understandably, professionals have concerns that parental involvement can hinder the students' psychosocial development; however, ignoring this reality will only further delay the maturation of the students. Instead, accepting this closeness can guide practitioners in the development of programs and print or web resources that will simultaneously wean parental involvement and increase student independence.

Effect of Demographics on Parental Involvement

RQ4: Is there an effect on parent expectations for involvement based on race/ethnicity, gender, family income level, educational background of the parent, having siblings in college, first

generation to attend college, student classification, type of institution currently attending, or level of parental involvement in high school?

This study produced 14 significant findings regarding the effects of seven variables on five categories of expectations for parental involvement. Only two factors out of the nine studied did not produce significant findings in any category.

The most frequent findings were about the parents' previous involvement with the students during the high school years. The more parents were involved with the students' high school experience, the more they expected to be involved with the college students' *finances, housing and food services, mental and physical health matters, and parent-student contact* regarding co-curricular activities. Similarly, the more the parents were involved with the specific high schools their students attended, the more they expected to be involved with the college students' *finances, mental and physical health matters, and parent-student contact* regarding co-curricular activities.

Family income levels had effects on expectations for parental involvement as well. Generally, those in higher income brackets had higher expectations for involvement with their college students' finances than those from lower income groups. This finding supports the common notion that families with more income can and should contribute more money to the education of their children; however, this study looked at more than just monetary involvement. Parents reported the importance of involvement with financial education matters (e.g. balancing checkbooks), staying abreast of deadlines, and proper completion of paperwork for financial aid when applicable.

Two demographic variables, institution type and ethnic differences, had an impact on expectations for parental involvement in terms of *experiences with faculty*. Parents of students at

private institutions expected greater involvement with faculty than those whose students attended public institutions. In terms of ethnic differences, parents of African American students reported higher expectations for *experiences with faculty* than parents of Caucasian students, or parents of students who identified as “other” (not African American, Asian American, Caucasian or Hispanic). The latter finding contradicts Mitra (2006) who reported that, assuming the opportunity for involvement exists, parental involvement is consistent across ethnic groups. It is possible that African American families, many of whom have embraced the concept that college is an essential component of their quest to provide their children with the means to improve their standard of living, believe that they should continue their previous patterns of involvement with high school teachers on to the college level. Contrarily, the small number of African American students in the current study could have impacted the outcome. Further investigation into the reasons for these differences in expectations based on ethnicity is warranted.

Three other demographic variables had impact on expectations for parental involvement. In terms of the students’ classification, parents of first-year students had greater expectations for involvement with the students’ college finances than parents of seniors. Students become more independent as they go through college so parents do not expect to maintain the same level of involvement by the time they reach senior status. This finding is consistent with research by Weidman (1989) that reports that parental involvement wanes as the student progresses towards his/her senior year. The classification of the student also impacted expectations for parental involvement with mental and physical health matters, although this study was not able to determine the student classifications that produced this finding.

Expectations for *parent-student contact* were affected by two demographic factors: education attained by the female parents, and having other children currently in college. Youniss

& Smollar (1985) and Pearson, et al. (1997) reported strong bonds between mothers and their children. In the current study, there was evidence that the mothers' education levels impacted their expectations to maintain that bond at least in terms of co-curricular involvement. However, the current study did not support the findings of Grolnick & Slowiaczek (1994) regarding the effects of the male parents' education level. Mothers (or stepmothers/female guardians) who had earned a high school diploma had higher expectations for parent-student contact than those who had earned a bachelor's degree. Similarly, parents who had other children in college had lower expectations for parent-student contact than those with no other children in college at the time.

Two demographic factors produced no significant findings in this study: *gender* and *first generation to attend college*. These findings are not consistent with previous studies on first-generation students (Choy, 2000; McCarren & Inkelas, 2006; Mitra, 2006). One possible explanation for the lack of a significant finding regarding first-generation status is a flaw in the design of the survey instrument used. One question asks, "Do you have other children in college?" The question that follows asks, "If yes, is the one who is participating in this survey the first to attend college?" Because of the wording and placement of the second question, almost half (47%) of parents did not answer the question, presumably because the questions implies that only those with more children in college should answer it. Therefore, no conclusions should be drawn from this study regarding first-generation status.

Additional Limitations of the Study

With any study of this size, it is impossible to foresee all limitations prior to implementing the study. As such, several additional limitations surfaced in this study and are reported in this section. These limitations do not invalidate the findings in this study; rather, they are provided here to prepare any researchers who attempt to duplicate or enhance this study.

Locating institutions to participate in the study was a multi-faceted task. Initial requests through national listservs provided many leads; however, most of them did not ultimately come to fruition for a variety of reasons. Institutions need to have access to an email list for parents. The actual number and breakdown of parents varied by institution, and in many cases the exact number of parents on a given list was unknown. Without knowing the potential number of parents who would be reached, it was impossible to estimate a response rate, or to determine if a balanced number of parents from both private and public schools would receive the request to participate. Therefore, the researcher continued to contact institutions through referrals.

Once a reasonable number of willing participants was reached and IRB approval was received, the next challenge was to actually get the email sent out. Parent lists are not always housed in the same area—at some institutions they were housed in non-student affairs areas such as alumni relations, public relations or institutional development offices—and the decision to send the email was rarely in the hands of one individual. Going through proper channels was often time-consuming and caused several delays in activating the survey. Ultimately, the survey was activated in a rolling manner—one institution at a time—thereby causing the survey to remain up longer than anticipated. In the case of one institution, approval had been given by three individuals: the head of the parents association, the head of the alumni association, and the head of orientation. However, when the request was sent to the individual at that institution who managed all listservs, the email was blocked. Repeated attempts, including two letters from the Vice President for Student Affairs at that institution, were unsuccessful in getting the email sent. Ultimately the researcher had to drop the school from the survey due to time constraints.

Another challenge surfaced when one willing institution realized that they could not send the letter to parents through email, but they agreed to send the letter by postal mail. To maintain

confidentiality, letters were prepared by the researcher and then mailed in bulk to the contact person at the institution, who subsequently sent them out to a random selection of parents. Of the 250 parents who received the letters, three participated in the survey. This approach was not time- or cost-effective.

A limitation of any convenience sample is that there is little control over the demographics of the participants. The researcher would have preferred a variety of respondents in terms of ethnicity and family income levels; however, this did not happen. The majority of participants (78%) in this survey had high income levels, and many (62%) had total family incomes over \$100,000. Similarly, 92% of the participants were Caucasian. These heavily skewed populations did not provide the diversity sought for this study.

During data analysis additional limitations surfaced. The details in the design of the surveys may have impacted the results in some areas. Careful attention had been given by the creator of the original survey as well as by this researcher who duplicated the survey for the student participants. Both surveys had been tested for reliability and validity. However, as mentioned previously, the order of the questions impacted some of the respondents' ability to answer the questions.

Additional issues occurred for some of the participants. The contact individuals at the seven institutions, as well as the researcher, received emails and phone calls from willing parents who had difficulty accessing the online survey. It was determined that the hyperlinks in the invitation letters did not work when the emails were opened with certain email programs, and many parents were unaware of the procedure to copy and paste the link into their server's URL address bar. An additional email had to be sent by the institutions. Another issue that concerned some parents was the lack of a "not applicable (n/a)" option for some of the questions. The

surveys contained several questions with the option to answer “never,” “no,” or “strongly disagree”; however, some parents did not equate those options with the n/a response they wanted. The surveys were intentionally designed so that respondents had to select an option for each of the items in the first ten categories (i.e., they could not skip an item). This was done to maximize the amount of data for analysis. Two parents contacted the researcher to apologize for not completing the survey because they felt they just could not answer some of the questions. Another parent left a phone message for the researcher explaining that her daughter was a senior and she had only minimal contact with her so she felt she would not be able to contribute valuable information. All in all, the researcher was pleased that so many parents persisted in their attempts to participate, and by the level of concern they exhibited about being accurately represented.

Implications for Practice

Several findings in this study have implications for future practice at institutions of higher education that have an interest in understanding, improving, and designing programs and policies for parent-student-institution relationships. Parents have a desire to continue their relationships with their college students and, in many cases, to develop a relationship with the institutions their sons and daughters have chosen. Institutions must determine how best to partner with parents for the ultimate benefit of their students.

Clearly, parents seek information from the institution and utilize the internet to access information. If an institution does not have a page designed specifically for parents, creating one that is easily located from the home page would be advantageous. Additionally, parents use parent guide books from the institution more than parenting books found in bookstores. Perhaps parents are unaware that books are available on topics specifically related to parenting during the

college years, or perhaps these parents have focused their book purchases on books to help their students get into college (such as SAT preparation, essay writing, etc.) or to succeed once in college. Whatever the reason, institutions should take advantage of the importance of these guide books to parents, and they should expand them to include information on a variety of topics, including college student development and proper parental involvement during the college years. Print media is a costly option for many institutions, but one relatively inexpensive way to contact parents is through electronic means such as the internet and email. The same material can be easily disseminated to virtually all of the parents with computer access (at home, work, or public libraries). It became apparent while seeking participants that many institutions have not tapped into this medium. Institutions have a prime opportunity to request email addresses from parents during post-admissions mailings, orientation, or when the parents bring their students to campus on move-in day.

Parents have expectations for information that is specific to their sons' or daughters' academic, social, financial, physical, mental, and co-curricular concerns. They foresee getting such information from their student and/or from personnel at the institution. Practitioners recognize there are limitations to and guidelines for the information they can release to parents, and they have the responsibility to ensure that parents have knowledge of these regulations. Unfortunately, many times institutions inform parents of these regulations only when a parent calls to discuss an issue, and there is evidence that this trend is growing (Wills, 2005). A critical component for implementing change is education; parents were accustomed to having guidelines for parental involvement during the K-12 years and would receive information well about their new university parameters, especially if they were educated before a situation arises that they believe warrants contact with personnel. Similarly, institutions should develop clearly-defined

policies for their personnel to follow (including staff, administrators and faculty) regarding accepted interpretations of FERPA and HIPAA. It is not necessary for institutions to fear providing parents with information regarding waivers that students can sign granting access for their parents. As long as parents are given proper parameters, having access to student information does not mean they will have free reign over their students' college experience.

The results in this study emphasized the lack of a clear definition of parental involvement. Johnson (2004) attempted to define involvement by contrasting *being involved* with *being enmeshed* in the college student's life. Student affairs practitioners could improve parent-student-institution relationships by developing a consensus on what acceptable parental involvement entails. Involvement questions in the current study could be categorized into three types of involvement: information-seeking, advising, and actual contact with individuals in the student's environment. Practitioners should begin with a definition that delineates proper involvement on each of these levels.

In similar fashion practitioners must recognize and accept the important role that parents play in the development of their sons and daughters even during the college years, and that today's traditional-age college students expect parental involvement. New programs for parents are beginning to surface at institutions across the nation, but there is still a need for a more defined approach to programming and parent relations. Although receiving financial support through contributions from parents is always beneficial to the institutions, parent offices should be seen as more than just a mechanism to cultivate financial donations from parents. They should contain at least three components: education, support, and resources. Education can be disseminated via informational emails, newsletters, and printed materials, which is a common practice at institutions that have parent offices. However, as institutions of higher education, it

would be easy to tap into existing resources and infrastructures to provide formal education for parents. Since most parents do not make frequent visits to campus, online courses could be offered to parents on topics such as college student development theory and parenting from afar. These courses could be made available to parents through the latest technological devices, including web-based seminars, downloadable podcasts, or even through broadcasts over campus radio stations.

A powerful step for student affairs professionals to take would be for national organizations within the field of student affairs, such as the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (Dean, 2006), to recognize parent relations by including a specific set of guidelines in their publications. Currently, parent programs are mentioned only briefly within larger sections of CAS, but the growing trend of parental involvement during college (and beyond) must be acknowledged by developing a unit dedicated to parent offices, parent programs, and parent associations. NASPA has begun to move in the right direction with its recent publication on partnering with parents (Keppler, et al., 2005) and with its research projects that focus on parents. However, these efforts are still relatively new, and additional efforts must be made by them as well as other national organizations such as the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA).

Typically parents are not exposed to student development theory, but this topic is an excellent one for parents to learn. In addition to web-based courses as mentioned above, a session on student development theory could be added to the offerings during parent orientation or parents' weekend. Imagine the changes in parental involvement if parents understood

Chickering and Reisser's (1993) vectors or even Galinsky's (1987) stages of parenting as they pertain to the young adult years!

Another resource that is overlooked is the high school counselor. Parents and students often look to these counselors for guidance on selecting and getting into college. This is a natural progression of the pattern of seeking advice, guidance and parameters from teachers and administrators that parents have developed since their children entered a formal education setting. These counselors are well-trained in what it takes to *get into* college and many do an excellent job preparing the students for the process, but do they ever offer advice or guidance to the parents on what is expected of them once their son or daughter *enters* college? Student affairs professionals must collaborate with high school counselors directly or through professional organizations to ensure that this important information is disseminated to parents prior to the students' high school graduation.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, student affairs professionals, college administrators, staff and faculty must conduct self-evaluations of the impact they have on the general perceptions of today's parents and parental involvement. Parents do not report being involved with college personnel or with their sons and daughters at levels anywhere near what is reported in the media or in conversations with college personnel. It is possible that parents are in denial, but this researcher believes it is more likely that the common perceptions and media reports are exaggerations of reality. It is natural for individuals (in any field) to discuss problems and frustrating encounters with their colleagues, but these encounters are not as common as one would believe. If positive encounters are not shared with colleagues, then the negative encounters appear to be greater in magnitude. The vast majority of parents do not interfere with college personnel or micro-manage the college careers of their sons and daughters. As

professionals, we have a responsibility to paint a realistic portrait of today's college parents as they are; the first step is to be honest with ourselves and each other.

Implications for Future Research

Several opportunities for future research are suggested as a result of this study. Each of the following suggested studies would add valuable information to the empirical knowledge basis from which institutions develop missions and strategies for parent programs, policies and offices.

As mentioned previously, the samples of parents and students in this study were not as diverse as the researcher had desired. Over 90% of the participants in this study were Caucasian. Expanding this study to include more ethnicities would enable the researchers to determine whether the ethnicity of the participants plays a role in the expectations for parental involvement. Do African American or Hispanic parents anticipate the need for parental involvement during college more than Caucasian parents? Do parents whose primary language is not English have the same expectations for parental involvement? How does language impact parental involvement? Do certain ethnicities shy away from parental involvement for cultural reasons? Having knowledge of these factors would aid in planning parent programs and policies that would recognize the needs of all constituents.

Information in this study on family income levels raised some additional questions. The participants in this study had high income levels; accordingly, many of their students did not qualify (or need) financial assistance. Information from the NELS:88 (NCES, 2000) study suggested differences existed based on the socioeconomic status of families; the researcher believes the results for parental involvement and expectations in this study would have supported the NELS:88 study if a more economically diverse sample had been available. To further this

concept, this study should be replicated with a more inclusive sample. Another extension of this study should include community colleges and technical colleges since the populations in those institutions tend to differ from traditional four-year institutions on several demographic variables.

Demographic information on the participants was gathered in this study. If the sample had been more diverse, multiple regression analyses could have been performed to determine the interaction effects of various combinations of factors. The predictive value of regression analysis provides practitioners with information that would allow planning to be tailored to their specific parent populations.

Parents and students in this study reported consistently good satisfaction rates with their institutions on each of the categories represented in this study. Further research could examine the satisfaction rates that institutions have with their parent interactions, and then compare those rates with the reported parent satisfactions. A comparison of this nature allows the researcher to determine areas where incongruence exists.

Another area to examine is the motivation of parents to get involved with a specific institution. Often parents have a prior relationship with an institution. A parent could have matriculated at or graduated from the institution; he/she could be a member of a Greek organization with a chapter at the institution; he/she could be an employee of the institution; or he/she could have an older child who has/had a relationship with the institution. To what extent do any of the above-mentioned relationships impact the expectations or level of parental involvement? One can speculate that parental involvement would be either greater or less based on any of these factors; a study will increase the knowledge base from which strategic plans for parental involvement are made.

This study examined parents' perceptions of involvement and Millennial students' perceptions of their parents' involvement. Therefore, the voice of the parent was heard, and the opinion of the student regarding his/her parents' actions was heard. The next step will be to examine the Millennial students more thoroughly to determine what exactly these students *want* from their parents during the college years. This will provide practitioners with a clearer understanding of the students' voice, and in turn provide practitioners with a clearer understanding of the parent-student relationships of this generation of college students.

The types of contact between students and parents were examined in the current study. To further explore this topic, the details of the contacts and the impetus for the contacts should be examined. Emails are a common mode of contact, but it is unknown who initiated the contact, whether the contact was for a specific reason or general conversation, how often the contacts were related to the same subject, or how the student felt about the contact.

Finally, FERPA allows institutions to adopt specific policies and remain in compliance with the regulations set forth by the legislation. As such, many institutions inform students and parents during orientation of the students' rights under FERPA to sign (and revoke) waivers, thereby giving parents access to specified information; however, many institutions do not offer information about this allowable option to students or parents. An interesting study would compare institutions with standing waiver policies to those without them to see if there is any significant difference between the groups in terms of parental involvement. In other words, does having access to student records increase the frequency or types of parent-institution contact? Additionally, if there are differences, are there changes in parental involvement as the student progresses towards graduation (i.e., becomes a junior or senior)?

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has begun to delve into a territory that until recently had gone unstudied. Millennial students and parents of Millennial students are presenting new challenges for today's college administrators and faculty. Accordingly, traditional processes and techniques must be examined for their effectiveness, efficiency, and congruence with the missions of institutions of higher education. The foundation provided by this study will provide valuable information for institutions seeking to improve parent-student-institution relationships. The researcher has suggested additional avenues for research to enhance the empirical knowledge of student affairs practitioners and higher education administrators; undoubtedly each of these avenues will lead to new paths as well. As improvements are made in the field, benefits and rewards will abound, with perhaps the most rewarding improvement being the achievement of the common goal (held by parents, faculty and administrators) to develop today's college students into mature, independent and productive members of society.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, (44)4, 709-716.
- Austin, D. M. (2003). The role of family influence on student success. In J. A. Ward-Roof, & C. Hatch, (Eds.), *Designing successful transitions: A guide for orienting students to college* (Monograph No. 13, 2nd ed.) (pp.1-13). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina. National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Barker, O. (2006). Technology leaves teens speechless: Text-messaging is wiping out the art of conversation. *USA Today*. Message posted to NASPA knowledge community listserv.
- Boyd, V. S., Hunt, P. F., Hunt, St. M., Magoon, T.M., & Van Brunt, J. E. (1997). Parents as referral agents for their first year college students: A retention intervention. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(1), 83-84.
- Carey, A. (2006). Text messaging and communication. *NASPA Forum*. Retrieved June 13, 2006 from http://www.naspa.org/forum/topic.asp?TOPIC_ID=1428.
- Carney, K. (2004). *Parent expectations of and involvement with their college student and a liberal arts college*. Unpublished dissertation. Cornell College.
- Cawthon, T. W., & Miller, M. (2003). Today's students and their impact on orientation and first-year programs. In J. A. Ward-Roof, & C. Hatch, (Eds.), *Designing successful transitions: A guide for orienting students to college* (Monograph No. 13, 2nd ed.) (pp.1-13). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina. National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Chickering, A.W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Choy, S.P., Horn, L.J., Nunez, A., & Chen, X. (2000). Transition to college: What helps at-risk students and students whose parents did not attend college. In A. F. Cabrera (ED.), *Understanding the college choice of disadvantaged students* (pp. 45-63). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 107. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clinton, H.R. (2005, March 4). ...and what else has been left out of the reauthorization debates in congress: Help for the growing ranks of nontraditional students. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (51)26, p.B7. Retrieved October 3, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i26/26b00701.htm>.
- Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Conklin, M.E., & Dailey, A. R. (1981). Does consistency of parental educational encouragement matter for secondary school students? *Sociology of Education*, 54(4), 254-262.
- Cornwell, Lisa (2006, July 9). Colleges go cellular to contact students. Retrieved 7/12/2006 from <http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2006/07/09/c>
- Cotton, K. & Wikelund, K. R. (1989). *Parent involvement in education*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved September 12, 2006 from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/3/cu6.html>.
- Daniel, B. V., Evans, S. G., and Scott, B. R. (2001). Understanding family involvement in the college experience today. In B. V. Daniel and B. R. Scott (Eds.), *Consumers, adversaries and partners: Working with the families of undergraduates* (pp. 3-13). New Directions for Student Services, No. 94. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DeBard, R. (2004). Millennials coming to college. In M. D. Coomes, and R. DeBard (Eds.), *Serving the Millennial Generation* (No. 106) (pp. 33-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Retrieved October 10, 2006 from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>.

Galinsky, E. (1987). *The six stages of parenthood*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Gerardy, M. T. (2002). Millennials Rising. Presentation for NASPA Mid-Manager's Institute. June 8, 2002.

Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' involvement in children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development, 65*, 237-252.

Grossman, L. (2005). Grow up? Not so fast [Electronic version]. *Time Magazine, 165*(4).

Hofferth, S.L. (March 1999). Family Life: Changes in American children's time, 1981-1997. *The Brown University Child and Adolescent Behavior Letter, 15*(3), 1-6.

Hoover, E. (2004). Parents united: as more colleges make mom and dad a priority, one group hopes to give them political clout. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(19), A35-36. Retrieved October 11, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i19/19a03501.htm>.

Hossler, D., Schmit, J., & Vesper, N. (1999). *Going to college; How social, economic, and educational factors influence the decisions students make*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next generation*. New York: Random House.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2003). *Millennials go to college*. Great Falls, VA: Lifecourse Associates.
- Jayson, S. (2006). Generation Y gets involved. *USA Today*. Retrieved October 24, 2006 from http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2006-10-23-gen-next-cover_x.htm.
- Johnson, H.E. (2004, January 9). Educating parents about college life. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (50)18, B11. Retrieved October 3, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i18/18b01101.htm>.
- Keppler, K., Mullendore, R. H., & Carey, A. (2005). *Partnering with the parents of today's college students*. Washington, DC: NASPA.
- King, S. (2006). *Parental expectations and experiences during the college student's first semester*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Georgia.
- King, S. (2006). Enhancing your institution's FERPA compliance. *NetResults*. Retrieved October 27, 2006 from <http://www.naspa.org/netresults/index.cfm>.
- Lange, D. K., & Stone, M. E. (2001). Parental involvement in admissions and financial aid. In B. V. Daniel & B. R. Scott (Eds.), *Consumers, adversaries and partners: Working with the families of undergraduates* (pp. 15-26). New Directions for Student Services, No. 94. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lowery, J. W. (2005). Legal issues regarding partnering with parents: Misunderstood federal laws and potential sources of institutional liability. In K Keppler, R. H. Mullendore, & A. Carey (Eds.), *Partnering with the parents of today's college students* (pp. 43-51). Washington, DC: NASPA.

- Marano, H.E. (2004, Nov/Dec). A nation of wimps. [Electronic version] *Psychology Today*.
- Mastrodicasa, J. (2006, May 10). How to meet millennials' expectations (part I). *NetResults*. Retrieved June 6 2006 from <http://www.naspa.org/netresults/index.cfm>.
- McCarron, G. P., & Inkelas, K. K. (2006). The gap between educational aspirations and attainment for first-generation college students and the role of parent involvement. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(5), 534-549.
- McGuire, P. (2006, July 27). For graduation rates, time to carve a new yardstick. *Diverse, 23*(12), 26.
- McNamara, E. (2006, July 26). Making a clean break. *Boston Globe*.
- Merriam-Webster (2003). Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary, 11th edition. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.
- Merriman, L. S. (2006). *Best practices for managing parent concerns: A mixed methods study of student affairs practice at doctoral research institutions*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Mitra, D.L. (2006). Youth and a bridge between home and school: Comparing student voice and parent involvement as strategies for change. *Education and Urban Society, 38*(4), 455-480.
- Moriarty, B. (2007, April). *Parents: Partners in the educational process or obstacles to overcome?* Presentation at ACPA/NASPA Joint Meeting, Orlando, FL.
- Mullendore, R. H., Banahan, L. A., & Ramsey, J. L. (2005). Developing a partnership with today's college parents. In K. Keppler, R. H. Mullendore, & A. Carey (Eds.), *Partnering with the parents of today's college students* (pp. 1-10). Washington, DC: NASPA.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). The condition of education, 2000 [Electronic version]. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2000). NELS:88/2000 fourth follow-up: An overview. Retrieved August 25, 2006 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/2000301.pdf>
- Pearson, C., & Dellmann-Jenkins, M. (1997). Parental influence on a student's selection of a college major. *College Student Journal* 31, 301-313.
- Pritchard, M.E., & Wilson, G.S. (2003). Using emotional and social factors to predict student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(1) 18-28.
- Robinson, J.P., & Godbey, G. (1997). *Time for life: the surprising way Americans use their time*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sandeen, A. & Barr, M. J. (2006). *Critical issues for student affairs: Challenges and opportunities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Savage, M. (2005). *National survey of college and university parent programs*. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Web site: <http://www.parent.umn.edu/ParentSurvey05.pdf>
- Smith, T.E. (1981). Adolescent agreement with perceived maternal and paternal educational goals. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43(1), 85-93.
- Special Report (1999). College degree awards: The ominous gender gap in African-American higher education. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 23, 6-9.
- Strauss, W. (2006, March 14). Millennials: The new collegians. Presentation at NASPA conference, Washington, DC.
- Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: Quill.

- Trusty, J. (1998). Family influences on educational expectations of late adolescents. *Journal of Educational Research, 91*(5), 260-271.
- Turrentine, C.G., Schnure, S.T., Ostroth, D.D., & Ward-Roof, J.A. (2000). The parent project: What parents want from the college experience. *NASPA Journal, 38*(1), 31-44.
- Wiedman, J.C. (1989). Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. Reprinted in J. L. Bess, & D. Webster (Eds.), *Foundations of American higher education: An ASHE reader*, (2nd Edition, 1999), Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Wills, E. (2005, July 22). Parent Trap. *Chronicle of Higher Education (51)*46, A4. Retrieved July 19, 2005 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i46/42a00401.htm>.
- Wood, M.O., Read, J.P., Mitchell, R.E., & Brand, N.H. (2004, March). Do parents still matter? Parent and peer influences on alcohol involvement among recent high school graduates. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 18*(1), 19-30.
- Youniss, J. & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zernike, K. (2006, April 23). College my way. [Electronic version] *New York Times*

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PARENTS AND FAMILIES INTEREST GROUP LISTSERV

NODA Colleagues,

Thanks for responding to my email last week in which I sought institutions to participate in my dissertation research. I am in the process of narrowing down the institutions I will use, and I need to know if you are still interested. As a recap, my study is looking at expectations for parent involvement from the perspectives of both the parents and the students. I plan to include both public and private institutions. After receiving several responses from many of you, I've decided to expand the study to include institutions from any region in the U.S. (not just the southeast). Here are some specifics of the study:

- The research will be in the form of an online survey, and participants will be directed to a website.
- The initial contact will be with the parents through email. To keep it anonymous and confidential, I will send the letter to each of you and request that you forward it to your parents.
- Each parent will be asked to get their son or daughter to complete the student portion of the survey. By using a unique coding system, I will be able to match the parent-student family unit. Again, the coding will keep the participants anonymous and confidential.
- I hope that I will get the required number of participants this way, but as a back-up if the number of students don't come in, I will have to abandon the matching component of the study and request a general mailing to students (With the large number of the institutions participating, I don't expect this to be necessary).
- The study will take place in January or February of 2007.

At this point, I need to know if, after considering the above, you are interested in participating. This means that you will agree to send out my letter to your parents in January, along with a letter from you or someone at your institution in support of the study. I will handle any required IRB paperwork for your institution.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me. Thanks again,

Sheri King

Doctoral candidate

The University of Georgia

sheri7@uga.edu

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PARENTS

Dear Fellow Parent,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Georgia, and I am conducting a research study on parent involvement during the college years. First, I would like to thank [insert contact name] the [insert contact title] at [insert institution name] for recognizing the importance of this study by forwarding this letter to you as a potential participant. I understand how valuable your time is, and I appreciate your willingness to consider participating in this research study. Please allow me to explain the purpose of this study and your role in it.

As a parent of two sons who each have been through four years of college at different universities, and now as a doctoral student at another institution, I am aware of the many opportunities and challenges that accompany your role as a parent of a college student, and the variations of institutional approaches to parent involvement with college students and parent interactions with the schools. I have developed an online survey to better understand what today's parents expect in terms of involvement with their son or daughter while in college, as well as what they expect their interactions to be with the institution where he or she is enrolled.

The exact title of this study is *Parent Involvement and Expectations for Involvement during the College Years: Perspectives of Students and Parents*. As such, I am looking for the student's perspectives for parent involvement as well. By gathering this information I hope to provide colleges and universities with valuable knowledge that will assist them in future planning.

Here is what I need from you:

1. I would like for you to visit [insert web site here] to take a survey that will take about 15-20 minutes to complete. This survey is anonymous and confidential.
2. Because I need your son or daughter to participate as well, I would like to you ask him or her to participate in the student version of this study at [insert web site here]. The student survey mirrors the parent survey; it should take about the same amount of time, and is anonymous and confidential as well. After speaking with your son or daughter, please forward the attached letter to him or her.
3. If there is more than one parent in your household, I request that the parent who participates is the one with the most contact with the student.
4. If you have more than one child at the above-named institution, please have student who has been at the school the longest to complete the student survey.

If you and your son or daughter agree to participate, you will have the opportunity to enter a raffle at the end of the survey for a \$100 gift certificate to either Best Buy or Target.

Thank you again for considering participating in this study. Together, we can have a role in helping institutions to provide great environments for our children, and productive working relationships with parents.

Sheri King
 Doctoral Candidate
 The University of Georgia

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO STUDENTS

Dear Student,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Georgia, and I am conducting a research study on parent involvement during the college years. If you are receiving this letter, then you are aware that your parent has agreed to participate in this study. In order for this study to be successful, I need your participation as well.

The exact title of this study is *Parent Involvement and Expectations for Involvement during the College Years: Perspectives of Students and Parents*. As such, I am looking for the perspectives from both you *and* your parent for parent involvement. By gathering this information I hope to provide colleges and universities with valuable knowledge that will assist them in future planning.

I would like for you to visit [insert web site here] to take a survey that will take about 15-20 minutes to complete. This survey is anonymous and confidential. If you and parent agree to participate, you will have the opportunity to enter a raffle at the end of the survey for a \$100 gift certificate to either Best Buy or Target.

Thank you again for considering participating in this study.


Sheri King
Doctoral Candidate
The University of Georgia

APPENDIX D

PARENT SURVEY

This is an anonymous survey. In order to match parent-student responses in a family unit and still maintain your anonymity, we need a unique code. By entering the following information, a seven-digit code will be created that will apply only to you and you student.


1. What is the middle initial of your student who is participating in this survey? (If there is no middle initial, select *none*.)

initial 

2. What is the home area code for the parent participating in this survey?

area code

3. What is the two-digit day of birth of the student who is participating in this survey? (example: for March 13, 1981, select *13*)

day of birth 

ONLINE AND PRINTED COMMUNICATION

1. *Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.*

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I use the institution's web pages to access information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I check campus deadlines online.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I check campus events listings online.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I read the parent's guide.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I read popular books about parenting a college student.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations regarding online and printed communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY

2. *Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.*

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I ask my son/daughter's instructor about his/her progress in a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I discuss my son/daughter's academic program or course selection with a faculty member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I discuss my son/daughter's career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I socialize with a faculty member during campus events (i.e. new student orientation, family weekends).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I expect to have contact with faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations for experiences with faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COLLEGE FINANCES

3. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I talk with a financial aid counselor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I keep track of my son/daughter's college financial aid deadlines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I provide my son/daughter with regular spending money.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I provide money to my son/daughter upon his/her request.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I complete all my son/daughter's paperwork for financial aid.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I assist my son/daughter with paying his/her bills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I teach/taught my son/daughter how to balance a checkbook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have explained credit card debt to my son/daughter.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I assisted my son/daughter with paying off a credit card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I made a donation to the institution.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I expect to be involved in the financial aspects of my son/daughter's college experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations regarding college finances.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE

4. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I discuss with my son/daughter where he/she will live (type of housing).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contact residence staff with concerns about hall maintenance or facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I advise my son/daughter about resolving hall maintenance and facilities concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contact residence staff about my son/daughter's roommate concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I advise my son/daughter about confronting his/her roommate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contact food service staff about meal concerns (quality, variety, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contact residence life staff about community behavior concerns (noise, vandalism, theft, alcohol use, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I expect to be involved in my son/daughter's housing/food service experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meet my expectations regarding housing and food services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH

5. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I come to campus if my son/daughter is sick.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I arrange for my son/daughter's student health insurance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I pay for my son/daughter's student health insurance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I make sure my son/daughter has his/her health insurance card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I complete my son/daughter's immunization/physical forms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I inform health center staff about my son/daughter's previous health concerns (i.e. allergies, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I inform counseling center staff about my son/daughter's previous mental health concerns (i.e. depression, medications, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I talk with my son/daughter about consistent use of medications (for physical and mental health).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I contact student affairs staff if I am concerned about my son/daughter's health.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I encourage my son/daughter to pursue preventative health care (flu shots, travel vaccines, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I talk with my son/daughter about his/her choices about alcohol and other drugs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I talk with my son/daughter about his/her sexual decision-making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I expect to be involved in my son/daughter's health decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations regarding mental health concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PARENT-STUDENT CONTACT

6. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
I discuss my son/daughter's participation in various campus events with him/her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I discuss choices for co-curricular involvement with my son/daughter.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I expect to be involved with my son/daughter's co-curricular involvement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. I would expect my son/daughter to tell me if he/she:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Joins a club or organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wins an award.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gets nominated for an honor society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is selected for a leadership position.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Declares a major.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meets with his/her advisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skips class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fails an assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fails a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is placed on academic probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violates any campus policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violates only major campus policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is placed on disciplinary probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is suspended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is sick enough to see a physician.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is hospitalized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is suicidal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is having major mental health difficulty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is having a roommate problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Applies for a credit card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Takes out a loan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bounces a check.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Needs money.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gets a part-time job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My contact with my son/daughter meets my expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CONTACT WITH COLLEGE PERSONNEL

8. I expect a faculty or staff member to contact me if my son/daughter:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Wins an award.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gets nominated for an honor society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is selected for a leadership position.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skips class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fails an assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fails a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is placed on academic probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violates any campus policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violates only major campus policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is placed on disciplinary probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is suspended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is sick enough to see a physician.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is hospitalized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is suicidal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is having major mental health difficulty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is having a roommate problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations for contact from personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CAMPUS EVENTS

9. Answer the following questions based on your actions during the Fall 2006 semester:

	Yes	No
I attended the Family Weekend.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I went to an art exhibit/gallery, play, dance or other theatre performance on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I attended a concert or other music event on campus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No
I attended a lecture or panel discussion on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I attended an athletic event.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution my son/daughter attends meets my expectations for availability of campus events.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIPS

10. How important is it for you to do the following:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
Meet my son/daughter's roommate(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's significant other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the parents of my son/daughter's friends and/or roommate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's academic advisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's faculty members.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's resident assistant (if living on campus).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's hall director/professional residence staff member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my son/daughter's sports team coach (if participating in athletics).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet club or organization advisors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the Dean of Students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the Academic Dean.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the President of the College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. On average, how often do you contact your son/daughter--

via email

via instant message


via text message

via postal mail

12. How often did your son/daughter come home during the Fall 2006 semester?

frequency

13. How often did you see your son/daughter other than on campus or at home during the Fall 2006 semester?

frequency 

14. How would you describe your involvement--

Very involved Moderately involved fairly involved not involved

--in your son/daughter's <u>college experience</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--with the <u>college or university</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--in your son/daughter's <u>high school experience</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--with the <u>high school</u> your son/daughter attended?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

15. Relationship to student

- mother
- father
- step-mother
- step-father
- female guardian
- male guardian

16. Parent's Marital Status

- Single parent
- Biological parents living together
- Biological parents divorced; not remarried
- Biological parents divorced; at least one remarried


17. Year of Birth--female parent/guardian

- before 1943
- 1943-1964
- 1965 or later

18. Year of Birth--male parent/guardian

- before 1943
- 1943-1964
- 1965 or later

19. Education completed by female parent/guardian

education 

20. Education completed by male parent/guardianeducation **21. Year of birth--student**

- before 1982
 1982 or later

22. Student's classification

- freshman
 sophomore
 junior
 senior

23. Student's Institutionname of institution **24. Student's gender**

- male
 female

25. Student's ethnicityethnicity **26. Family income**income **27. What percentage of your son/daughter's education are you funding (including tuition, room and board, and spending money)?**

- none
 less than 25%
 26-50%
 51-75%
 76% or more

28. Student residence while in college

- at home/with parents
 on-campus residence hall
 apartment/house near campus

29. Proximity of the college/university to your home

distance

30. Do you have other children currently in college?

yes

no

31. If yes, is the one who is participating in this survey the first to attend college?

yes

no

Powered by SurveySolutions: Conduct your own [internet survey](#)

APPENDIX E

STUDENT SURVEY

ONLINE AND PRINTED COMMUNICATION

1. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent uses the institution's web pages to access information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent checks campus deadlines online.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent checks campus events listings online.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent reads the parent's guide.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent reads popular books about parenting a college student.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations regarding online and printed communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY

2. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent asks my instructor about my progress in a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent discusses my academic program or course selection with a faculty member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent discusses my career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent socializes with a faculty member during campus events (i.e. new student orientation, family weekends).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent expects to have contact with faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations for experiences with faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COLLEGE FINANCES

3. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent talks with a financial aid counselor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent keeps track of my college financial aid deadlines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent provides me with regular spending money.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent provides money to me upon my request.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent completes all my paperwork for financial aid.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent assists me with paying my bills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent taught me how to balance a checkbook.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent has explained credit card debt to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent assisted me with paying off a credit card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent made a donation to the institution.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent expects to be involved in the financial aspects of my college experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations regarding college finances.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE

4. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent discusses with me where I will live (type of housing).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent contacts residence staff with concerns about hall maintenance or facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent advises me about resolving hall maintenance and facilities concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent contacts residence staff about my roommate concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent advises me about confronting my roommate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent contacts food service staff about meal concerns (quality, variety, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent contacts residence life staff about community behavior concerns (noise, vandalism, theft, alcohol use, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent expects to be involved in my housing/food service experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meet my parent's expectations regarding housing and food services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH

5. Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent comes to campus if I am sick.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent arranges for my student health insurance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent pays for my student health insurance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent makes sure I have my health insurance card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent completes my immunization/physical forms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent informs health center staff about my previous health concerns (i.e. allergies, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent inform counseling center staff about my previous mental health concerns (i.e. depression, medications, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent talks with me about consistent use of medications (for physical and mental health).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent contacts student affairs staff if he/she is concerned about my health.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent encourages me to pursue preventative health care (flu shots, travel vaccines, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent talks with me about my choices about alcohol and other drugs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent talks with me about my sexual decision-making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent expects to be involved in my health decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations regarding mental health concerns.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PARENT-STUDENT CONTACT

6. *Select the answer that most closely represents your feelings for each of the following statements.*

	Very Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
My parent discusses my participation in various campus events with me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent discusses choices for co-curricular involvement with me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent expects to be involved with my co-curricular involvement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. My parent would expect me to tell him/her if I:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Join a club or organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Win an award.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Get nominated for an honor society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am selected for a leadership position.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Declare a major.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet with my advisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skip class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fail an assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fail a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am placed on academic probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violate any campus policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violate only major campus policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am placed on disciplinary probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am suspended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am sick enough to see a physician.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am hospitalized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am suicidal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am having major mental health difficulty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am having a roommate problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Apply for a credit card.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Take out a loan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bounce a check.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Need money.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Get a part-time job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My parent's contact with me meets his/her expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CONTACT WITH COLLEGE PERSONNEL

8. My parent expects a faculty or staff member to contact him/her if I:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Win an award.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Get nominated for an honor society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am selected for a leadership position.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skip class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fail an assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fail a course.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am placed on academic probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violate any campus policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Violate only major campus policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am placed on disciplinary probation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am suspended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am sick enough to see a physician.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am hospitalized.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Am suicidal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am having major mental health difficulty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am having a roommate problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations for contact from college personnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CAMPUS EVENTS

9. Answer the following questions based on your actions during the Fall 2006 semester:

	Yes	No
My parent attended the Family Weekend.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent went to an art exhibit/gallery, play, dance or other theatre performance on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent attended a concert or other music event on campus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent attended a lecture or panel discussion on campus.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parent attended an athletic event.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The institution I attend meets my parent's expectations for availability of campus events.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

RELATIONSHIPS

10. How important is it for your parent to do the following:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
Meet my roommate(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my significant other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the parents of my friends and/or roommate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my academic advisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my faculty members.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my resident assistant (if living on campus).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my hall director/professional residence staff member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet my sports team coach (if participating in athletics).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet club or organization advisors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the Dean of Students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the Academic Dean.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meet the President of the College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. On average, how often does your parent contact you--

via email

(Click here to choose)

via instant message

(Click here to choose)

via text message

(Click here to choose)

via postal mail

(Click here to choose)

12. How often did you go home during the Fall 2006 semester?

frequency

(Click here to choose)

13. How often did you see your parent other than on campus or at home during the Fall 2006 semester?

frequency

(Click here to choose)

14. How would you describe your parent's involvement--

	Very involved	Moderately involved	fairly involved	not involved
--in your <u>college experience</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--with the <u>college or university</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--in your <u>high school experience</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--with the <u>high school</u> you attended?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION**15. Relationship to parent**

- daughter
- son
- step-daughter
- step-son

16. Parent's Marital Status

- Single parent
- Biological parents living together
- Biological parents divorced; not remarried
- Biological parents divorced; at least one remarried

17. Year of Birth--female parent/guardian

- before 1943
- 1943-1964
- 1965 or later

18. Year of Birth--male parent/guardian

- before 1943
- 1943-1964
- 1965 or later

19. Education completed by female parent/guardian

education

20. Education completed by male parent/guardian

education

21. Year of birth--student

- before 1982
 1982 or later

22. Student's classification

- freshman
 sophomore
 junior
 senior

23. Student's Institution

name of institution

24. Student's gender

- male
 female

25. Student's ethnicity

ethnicity

26. Family income

income


27. What percentage of your education is your parent funding (including tuition, room and board, and spending money)?

- none
 less than 25%
 26-50%
 51-75%
 76% or more

28. Student residence while in college

- at home/with parents
- on-campus residence hall
- apartment/house near campus

29. Proximity of the college/university to your parent's home

distance 

30. Do you have other siblings currently in college?

- yes
- no

31. If yes, are you the first to attend college?

- yes
- no