University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Open Access Theses and Dissertations from the College of Education and Human Sciences

Education and Human Sciences, College of (CEHS)

11-28-2006

PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF COLLEGIATE TEACHING AND CARING

W. Wayne Young Jr.
University of Nebraska - Lincoln, waynejr@creighton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsdiss

Part of the Education Commons

Young, W. Wayne Jr., "PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF COLLEGIATE TEACHING AND CARING" (2006). *Open Access Theses and Dissertations from the College of Education and Human Sciences.* Paper 6.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsdiss/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education and Human Sciences, College of (CEHS) at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses and Dissertations from the College of Education and Human Sciences by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

PARENT EXPECTATIONS

OF COLLEGIATE TEACHING AND CARING

by

W. Wayne Young, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Educational Studies

(Educational Leadership in Higher Education)

Under the Supervision of Professor Sheldon L. Stick

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 2006

PARENT EXPECTATIONS

OF COLLEGIATE TEACHING AND CARING

W. Wayne Young, Jr.

University of Nebraska, 2006

Advisor: Sheldon L. Stick

This exploratory research determined parent expectations of their traditionally-aged student's postsecondary institution with an investigator developed and validated survey entitled the PECTAC (Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring). The PECTAC instrument was predicated upon a culling from relevant literature to reflect topics and issues related to the teaching and caring functions of a private and religiously-affiliated Midwestern university. Parent participants were asked to provide basic demographic information in addition to ranking each item based on perceived importance.

A web-based survey software package was used to collect data from 475 participants. Dependent variables of parent gender and first-time college parent status were used to investigate differences between and among various sub-populations.

The findings from the study allowed for claiming the following: female parents expected significantly more from the university with regard to caring and teaching functions; status as a first-time college parent was not perceived to be of notable importance; and parents considered the caring functions to be of greater importance than the teaching functions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I – INTRODUCTION	1
A Generational Shift in Parenting	2
Parents as Partners	3
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Site	8
Research Questions and Hypotheses	9
Research Question One	9
Research Question Two	9
Research Question Three	9
Research Question Four	9
Research Question Five	10
Method	10
Definition of Terms	10
Assumptions	14
Delimitations	15
Limitations	15
Significance of the Study	16
II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE	18
Literature Review, Introduction	18
The First Academies and Schools in North America	19
The Influence of In Loco Parentis	21
Critical Psychosocial Evidence	25
Erik Erikson and Adult Development	26
Contemporary Points of View	29
Self-Help Literature for College Parents	32
Behavior Changes of Students and Parents	35
A Generation More Connected	35
Technology as a Socio-Cultural Influence	36
A More Involved Parent	42
The Largest Generation Ever: Millennials	43
A Lack of Information on Parents and their Expectations	47
Parent Literature: What We Know About Parents	47
Landmark Initiatives Investigating College Parents	57
Literature Review, Conclusion	59

CHAPTER	PAGE
III – METHODOLOGY	62
Restatement of Research Questions and Hypotheses	62
Research Question One	62
Research Question Two	63
Research Question Three	63
Research Question Four	63
Research Question Five	63
Development of the PECTAC	64
Instrument Validity	66
Expert Panel Review	69
Parent Pilot Studies and Focus Group	73
Faculty Focus Group	76
Student and Parent Gender	77
Concerns Regarding Parent Orientation	77
Existing Item Amendments	78
Proposed New Items	79
Research Study Administration, Introduction	80
Survey Population and Administration	80
Data Analysis Rationale	82
Statistical Procedures	83
IV – RESULTS	84
Survey Administration Summary	84
Demographic Item Findings	84
Sub-Section Most Important Items, Findings	93
Principal Component Analysis	99
PECTAC Reliability	101
Variable Correlations	103
Findings for Research Questions 1 and 2	105
Research Question One	108
Research Question Two	109
Findings for Research Questions 3 and 4	110
Research Question Three	113
Research Question Four	113
Findings for Research Question 5	114
Research Question Five	114
V – DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	117
PECTAC Sub-Sections Revisited	117
Three Significant Themes	119
Parental Involvement	120

CHAPTER PAGE

Female versus Male Parents 121
Caring Functions versus Teaching Functions 125
Recommendations for Practice 126
Recommendation for Practice I 127
Recommendation for Practice II 131
Recommendation for Practice III 132
Recommendations for Future Research 134
Recommendation I 134
Recommendation II 135
Recommendation III 136
Conclusion: A Parental Involvement Model for Higher Education 136

VI – SUMMARY 140
Concluding Themes 141

REFERENCES 142

APPENDICES

Appendix A: PECTAC Survey 155

Appendix B: Human Subject Research (CITI) Certificate 159

Appendix C: University of Nebraska - Lincoln IRB Approval 161

Appendix D: Creighton University IRB Approval 163

Appendix E: Participant Invitation Letter 165

Appendix F: PECTAC Survey after Factor Analysis 167

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
2.1	Parent Literature Findings	48
4.1	PECTAC Parent Gender	85
4.2	PECTAC Parent Marital Status	86
4.3	PECTAC Student Gender	87
4.4	PECTAC Parent Ethnicity	88
4.5	PECTAC Parent First Language as English	88
4.6	PECTAC Parent Highest Level of Education Completed	89
4.7	PECTAC Parent Number of Children	90
4.8	PECTAC Parent First-time College Parent	90
4.9	PECTAC College/School Student is Entering	91
4.10	PECTAC Parent Involvement in College Selection Process	92
4.11	PECTAC Number of Household Computers	92
4.12	PECTAC Type of Internet Access	93
4.13	Items by Importance for ‘Technology Resources’	94
4.14	Items by Importance for ‘Active and Team Learning’	95
4.15	Items by Importance for ‘Out of Class Learning Opportunities’	96
4.16	Items by Importance for ‘A Caring Faculty’	97
4.17	Items by Importance for ‘A Caring University Community’	98
4.18	Items by Importance for ‘Being in Partnership with Parents’	99
4.19	PECTAC Teaching Sub-Section Reliability	102

LIST OF TABLES
(CONTINUED)

TABLE		PAGE
4.20	PECTAC Caring Sub-Section Reliability	102
4.21	PECTAC Reliability of Teaching and Caring Items	103
4.22	PECTAC Teaching Variables Correlations	104
4.23	PECTAC Caring Variables Correlations	105
4.24	PECTAC Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Items	106
4.25	PECTAC Multivariate Tests on Teaching Items	108
4.26	PECTAC Descriptive Statistics for Caring Items	111
4.27	PECTAC Multivariate Tests on Caring Items	112
4.28	Paired Samples Statistics	115
4.29	Paired Differences	116
5.1	Key Items in PECTAC Teaching Sub-Sections	118
5.2	Key Items in PECTAC Caring Sub-Sections	119
5.3	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Teaching	122
5.4	Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Caring	123

LIST OF MODELS

MODEL		PAGE
5.1	Parental Involvement	138

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The journey of a doctoral student could easily be described through countless analogies and creative examples—and as one who not only enjoys a good story, but takes joy in storytelling, please indulge me for a moment. In my journey, I continually remarked that my path was similar to a mountain climber embarking on the sport's greatest challenge: Everest. So it was fitting that I employed the use of that imagery in this acknowledgment.

As I began my Program of Studies at UNL, I often considered my advisor, Dr. Sheldon Stick, my wise and experienced outfitter. Indeed, Sheldon was the perfect, well-traveled guide, someone who knew where I could befall danger or take a rest and a deep breath. His support of me and challenge to me was distributed perfectly, balanced and yet comprehensive.

The corporate sponsors for my climb were many—and my parka had room for all their logos and names. First, to those mentors in my life who helped me discover and reaffirm student affairs as a calling in my life: Mr. Corday Goddard, Dr. Ronald Slepitza, Dr. John Cernech, Dr. Bill Kibler, Dr. Stan Carpenter, Dr. Darby Roberts, and Rev. Andrew Thon, S.J. Second, to my friends, the staff in the Division of Student Services at Creighton, several faculty members at Creighton, my expert panel, Creighton University's Parent Council members, and my Supervisory Committee—Drs. Miles Bryant, David Brooks, and Stan Vasa—all had a hand in moving me up my mountain. Third, to my current supervisor and mentor Dr. Richard Rossi of Creighton University; his gift to me was one of unwavering support, guidance, and humor.

The inspiration for my journey towards a Doctoral Degree sprung from those closest to me: Dr. W. Wayne Young, Sr., my father; Ms. Chris Young, my mother; my extended family; and most definitely, my children—Kayla, Jackson, Bradley and William. Truly, it was the example of my parents, the encouragement from my siblings and in-laws, and the unconditional love of my children that continually pushed me to continue the climb.

But perhaps most important to a climb such as Everest, is the role of the porter. On Everest, a porter is often a member of the Sherpa, an ethnic group with original roots in Nepal. Sherpa serve as porters and guides to the climbers who venture up the mountain carrying climbers' extra gear, oxygen, and water into the highest of altitudes accessible to man. During my journey I often told those who asked that applying to a doctoral program, the coursework, and written exams were analogous to flying into base camp and meeting your Sherpa porter—the person who will be your most significant support and at times your lifeline. This dissertation, in my simple example, was the real climb, the real challenge. And my wife, Heather Young, was my porter. She shouldered my insecurities, listened to literally hundreds of updates on my progress, and carried the brunt of work at home more than I care to admit. I am blessed to have such a wonderful partner—someone I am thankful to share the journey with throughout my life.

Once again, I thank everyone for their help with this study and my pursuit of the Doctoral Degree. I know that I stand on the shoulders of family, friends, faculty, and colleagues. To all, a most sincere and humble thank you.

WWYJR

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the higher education environment, academic administrators, faculty, and particularly student affairs administrators are presented with the challenges of assisting students and their parents with the selection of a college and the ensuing transition to collegiate life. Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000) claimed that, "Parents are an important constituency for colleges…" and "…are a major influence as high school students select a college (2000, p. 31)." Turrentine, et al, referenced the work of Dubble (1995); Galotti and Mark (1994); Litten and Hall (1989); and McGinty (1992) to corroborate the positive influence parents have on the consumer end of selecting an institution. Howe and Strauss (2003) referred to such parental involvement in the college selection process as one that was consultative in nature or of a co-purchasing role.

This involvement or influence by parents also can be seen outside the co-purchasing role after a student has selected a school and begun the ensuing transition to college. During the mid-1970s many postsecondary institutions began orientation sessions or other initiatives to assist parents with the ensuing collegiate journey their student was embarking upon (Austin, 1987). Austin said that many schools conducted sessions for parents only to help provide information and assurance during this transitional time. Recognizing that it was a time of significant change for both student and parent, increased institutional attention was directed toward the event, and gradually a sensitivity grew regarding the role, needs, and interests of respective parents.

A Generational Shift in Parenting

Today's college student commonly is referred to as a 'millennial'. The term, 'Millennials', was coined by the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) and referred to any student born after 1982 (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Howe and Strauss (2003) claimed such students "…make decisions jointly with parents…" and "…have very demanding parents (p. 4)." Furthermore, Millennials' parents had an unprecedented amount of involvement in their students' lives—involvement never seen in any previous generation of traditional-aged college-bound students (Howe & Strauss, 2003).

Scott and Daniel (2001) said parental influence did not stop at the point of selecting a college or university. "From the changing dynamics of families emerges the growing phenomenon of parental involvement in the college student's experience. Although institutions may resist, the parents of today's college students clearly expect to exercise that prerogative (Scott & Daniel, p. 83)." Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2006) claimed these parents never were out of touch with their college student and, "With the help of technology like cell phones and email communication, they are never far away (p. 6)."

Richard Mullendore, a University of Georgia professor and former vice president of student affairs, offered the humorous thought that cell phones on college campuses were 'the world's longest umbilical cords' (Shellenbarger, 2005). His reference was to the growth of mobile phone usage by college students since the late 1990s, while also indicating much greater intrusiveness by parents. Another perspective came from TIME magazine in February 2005. In that issue, TIME coined the phrase that parents hover over their young much like a 'helicopter' and thus Millennials' parents were often

identified as ‘helicopter’ parents. Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward expanded on that analogy when they wrote, “Their ‘helicopter’ parents are always hovering over campus ready and willing on a moment’s notice to become involved in the affairs of their son or daughter (2006, p. 6).”

Such a high level of parental involvement has had ripple effects on higher education. “Our sense is that parents are redefining the relationship between the institution and the student in ways that none of us yet understand because the behavior we are seeing is so recent (Jackson & Murphy, 2005, p. 54).” They further wrote, “College and university leaders must also understand that today’s parents want to play an important role in the continuing developmental and educational process of students enrolled in their institutions (p.54).”

Parents as Partners

Mullendore, Banahan, and Ramsey provided an additional perspective to the image of a ‘hovering’ parent. They wrote, “As parents continue to increase their level of involvement, we have the opportunity to think differently about the way we work with them to build an effective alliance (2005, p. 1).” Keppler, Mullendore, and Carey (2005) investigated the changing nature between the college and parent, and discussed the need to view parents as partners, while assisting them to understand the developmental issues for both the student and themselves, legal issues surrounding student confidentiality, and the processes related to matriculation. To accomplish such a goal led many postsecondary institutions to develop and provide orientation planning opportunities for parents with knowledgeable institutional personnel.

In 1993, Sandeen contended that, “When parents feel a real sense of involvement in the activities of their children’s university, they are more likely to be helpful participants (p. 306).” His intent was to encourage developing, creating, and nurturing dynamic and interdependent relationships on campus and throughout a local community. The thrust of the message was that colleges and universities needed to bring parents into the lives of their matriculating children and not hold them at arm’s length. Jackson and Murphy seemingly echoed Sandeen’s recommendation when they suggested that educators needed to, “Develop a personal understanding of how parents are now involving themselves in the lives of students on your campuses (2005, p. 58).” Jackson and Murphy’s suggestion implied parents would be involved in their child’s academic journey, whether it was through intentional developmental activities planned and carried forth by administrators and educators or whether it was left to the parent and student. Furthermore the authors said that if higher education took the time to understand parental involvement, administrators and educators might be able to more intentionally (and successfully) encourage parents to be helpful participants in their child’s collegiate journey. Thus, their recommendation was to include instead of exclude parents.

Statement of the Problem

“On campuses with significant numbers of traditional-age students, establishing strong ties to parents can be very helpful to student affairs (Sandeen, 1993, p. 306).” Working from the premise that higher education needed to work more collaboratively with parents of students, the issue of parental expectations arose. Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska is an institution where most of the students attending were of

traditional-age (18-24 years of age). Creighton, like many other postsecondary institutions, had no history of any academic or student services administrator, nor any faculty member having made the effort to ask parents what they expected from the university with regards to their matriculant. Understanding parents and their expectations had not been a Creighton University issue; nor had it been an issue for many other postsecondary institutions. Turrentine, et al, (2000), supported the earlier work of Habben (1997) who had determined that there was little in the way of research or writing on parents of college students.

More recently Forbes (2001) concluded, "Although a fair amount of research exists on the impact of parenting on college students, the literature contains virtually no information about what parents expect from the college experience (p. 15)." Forbes made that claim in her (2001) article, "Students and Parents: Where do campuses fit in?" In that article she detailed the legal end to *in loco parentis* encouraging higher education to adhere to a 'facilitator' model of operation, and mentioned a parent survey she had conducted with a colleague to further understand parent expectations. "The more striking results of the survey are in the area of parental expectations about when and for what reason the college would notify them about their child's activities (p. 15)." Forbes quoted one of her parent participants as saying "In some cases, it is my son's responsibility to inform us. Of course, if he did not, I would appreciate hearing from the school (p. 15)." That was a revealing statement and illustrated the profound problem higher education continues to face with its parent stakeholders. Parents want to be involved and if possible participatory. But, laws, regulations, and conventions often impede communication.

For parents to be helpful to student affairs and to the academic enterprise at Creighton University, the institution first had to establish stronger ties with its parents by seeking to understand what they expected from it, as suggested by Sandeen (1993), Forbes (2001), and Jackson and Murphy (2005). And while many studies may be of interest based on the questions they ask and the findings they report, a study can be enhanced if it tells a reader why and how something works versus being simply declarative (Bryant, 2004). Therefore, in this study, the investigator worked from the premise that when parents send their students to college they have a basic assumption of care—while also assuming a reasonable level of instruction and academic learning.

The basis for this belief is evidenced in the literature review chapter, and its main arguments are summarized here: (a) historical documents regarding the establishment of higher education in North America pointed to the view that institutions of higher education initially were to be paternal (Henderson & Henderson, 1974; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Bickel & Lake 1999; Honigman, 2003), (b) parents had a developmental need to remain in a caring stance with their emerging adult child (Erikson, 1959; Newman & Newman, 1992; Austin, 1993; Mullendore & Hatch, 2000; Arnett, 2000; Forbes, 2001), (c) there are observable behavior changes in tomorrow's college student and their parents when compared to previous generations, (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Forbes, 2001; Scott & Daniel, 2001), and (d) considerable study is needed on the parent partner and their expectations (Habben, 1997; Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, & Ward-Roof, 2000; Forbes, 2001).

As Sandeen (1993) has suggested, campuses where student populations are overwhelmingly traditional-aged, such as Creighton University, must create stronger ties

with parents so that parents can be helpful to student affairs practitioners. Student affairs practitioners and faculty members should foster stronger ties with parents for two reasons. First, parents will be involved in their child's life during the higher education experience. So, the choice for an administrator becomes whether they wish to have that involvement be intentional, developmentally helpful, and proactive to the educational process or allow it to be haphazard and without guidance from knowledgeable University personnel. Second, as was asserted by Sandeen (1993) and Jackson and Murphy (2005), parents can be helpful participants during their child's collegiate journey if higher education works to intentionally involve them as partners. Creighton University's history of not seeking to learn the expectations of parents placed it in the position of not being able to establish a helpful parent-institution partnership for the very students it has decreed that it serves.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to learn parent expectations of their student's postsecondary institution using an instrument entitled the PECTAC (Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring). This non-experimental, explorative, quantitative study invited the parents of all first-year students accepted into the fall 2005 class at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, to report the importance parents placed on a private and religiously-oriented University's ability to teach and care for their son or daughter. The study's intent was to compare results from participants based on gender of a parent and status as a first-time college parent. Additionally, the investigator wanted to determine whether a university's teaching or caring functions were of greater importance to parents.

Research Site

This study was conducted on the campus of Creighton University, a Jesuit, Catholic, comprehensive university in the Midwest. Creighton University provides four-year undergraduate degrees through three undergraduate colleges as well as professional degrees in law, medicine, dentistry, and a number of health-related professions. The University provides learning opportunities to over 6,100 students and is one of the twenty-eight Jesuit, Catholic institutions of higher education in North America. Half of the total enrollment at Creighton is comprised of undergraduate students between 18 and 24 years-of-age.

Creighton University is an accredited institution of higher education as confirmed by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, and is listed as a Master's College and University in classification by the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching. A snapshot of the Fall 2005 entering freshmen class showed 972 students with a mean ACT score of 25.9; 42.1% were male and 57.9% were female; 60.7% were Catholic; 16.5% were Protestant; and 81.4% self-reported as Caucasian (Wernig, 2005 Report available on-line at http://www.creighton.edu/Factbook). That site was chosen for ease of discovery in the research process, need for the institution to acquire the information, as well as for its history of attracting students often considered the traditional college age.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question One:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent? H1-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent.

Research Question Two:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent? H2-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

Research Question Three:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent? H3-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent.

Research Question Four:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent? H4-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

Research Question Five:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student? H5-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student.

Method

To examine the research questions the investigator developed, piloted, and validated a survey instrument entitled the Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC). The goal was to gather specific data from parents of new, first-year students admitted to Creighton University. Chapter Three explains that this exploratory study asked parents to answer a number of demographic questions and to report the importance of various items related to a college or university's ability to teach and to care for their offspring. Parents were asked to individually complete the instrument via a secure website. Results and analyses from the demographic items as well as the teaching and caring items are reported later in Chapter Four.

Definition of Terms

Terms used in this manuscript holding meanings related to this study are defined in the following section.

Applied Student:

An applied student was a prospective student who had fully completed a written or on-line application, had produced all information necessary for acceptance, and the material had been received by the University.

Accepted Student:

An accepted student was one who had applied and been granted formal acceptance into the University community.

Deposited Student:

A prospective student from whom the University had received a monetary deposit, which allowed the prospective student to register for classes, apply for university housing, and be assured a spot in the fall first-year class.

Expectation:

The relative importance a parent had on how a college taught or cared for students.

First-time College Parent:

Any parent who was sending their first offspring to a college or university. (The definition of a parent is presented later in this section.)

In Loco Parentis:

A legal concept developed in early English common law that referred to ‘standing’ or ‘acting’ in place of the parent.

Listwise Deletion:

Listwise deletion was a process used to handle missing data in a research study and involves removing those participants’ scores who do not complete all items. While

Listwise deletion results in a decrease in the sample size that is available for analysis, it was assumed that missing data occurred randomly.

Mean:

The Mean is the arithmetic average (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). It was derived by adding all the scores in a sequence or distribution and dividing that total by the number of items.

Median:

The Median is the score that divided the sequence or distribution approximately in half. It was determined in each case by examining the full range of scores and then finding the midway point of the distribution.

Mode:

The Mode is the score with the greatest frequency (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). There can be more than one modal score in a distribution.

Null Hypothesis:

A hypothesis used to guide the investigator's study. A null hypothesis, for example, can be supported or rejected by a statistical analysis of the data collected in a study.

Parent(s):

A parent in this study was an adult who may be a mother, father, grandparent, aunt, uncle, legal guardian, or a person legally responsible for a student entering a college or university.

Principal Components Analysis:

A data reduction technique which identifies maximum variance in a data set by looking at the data in a manner whereby the data are rotated around certain assumed interrelated factors.

Reliability:

How well an instrument yielded the same information each time it was used with the same subjects, under the same conditions and without Type I or Type II errors involved.

Significance:

Significance refers to whether effects of a study were caused by chance. Determining significance was done by application of appropriate statistical tests.

Statistical Inference:

This term, "…involves using sample statistics to help answer questions about population parameters (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000, p. 369)."

T-test for Dependent Samples:

A t-test is a statistical method used to observe differences in the means between groups. A dependent samples t-test is a specific use of the t-test where the groups to be observed are within the same sample.

Type I Error:

A Type I Error occurs when an investigator rejects a null hypothesis when it actually was true. Gravetter and Wallnau (2000) wrote, "In a typical research situation, a Type I error means that the investigator concludes that a treatment does have an effect when in fact the treatment has no effect (p. 253)."

Type II Error:

This is the reverse of a Type I error or, "In a typical research situation, a Type II error means that a treatment effect really exists, but the hypothesis failed to detect it (Gravetter & Wallnau, p. 254)."

Validity:

Does a survey instrument measure that which it was intended to measure?

Assumptions

The investigator made two types of assumptions while carrying out the study. The first focused on the sample population itself. The second centered in on the stability of findings gathered at one point in time. Both points are explained below.

Three assumptions about the sample population were relevant. First, it was believed that participants would be honest and forthright when responding to items in the survey. Second, it was believed a majority of traditional-aged college students attending Creighton University had at least one adult individual who could be labeled as that particular student's parent, and who would be able to provide a parental perspective on that student's ensuing collegiate journey. Third, it was believed that each parent would complete their survey and do so candidly.

Two assumptions about the stability of findings were relevant. First, it was believed that parents were more involved with their children's lives than previous generations. As Howe and Strauss (2003) and others have suggested, no other generation has had parents as demanding (or as hovering) as this Millennial generation. Second, it was believed that parents expected their children to be educated in and with the use of

technology. Support and further information for these assumptions are presented in chapter two.

Delimitations

Delimitations are important insofar as they help to define what factors stop an investigator from generalizing the results to other populations. This study's delimitations stemmed from the population chosen as well as from the research site being a faith-based, private university.

This study was limited to the parents of accepted, first-year students for the incoming fall 2005 first-year class at Creighton University. All parents of students accepted by the University as of May 1, 2005 were asked via email or letter to participate in this study. Hence, all findings in this study were particular to parents who had a student accepted to Creighton University as of that date, and any generalization of the findings to other populations should be done with considerable caution. It is also important to note that the survey was administered before any summer college orientation sessions occurred.

Limitations

Limitations are restrictions inherent to the type of methodology used. This study asked parents to rank their perceived importance of various items using an instrument that could only be accessed via the web. Thus, if a parent did not have a computer at home or at work, they likely had to make an additional effort to find computer access or request a hard-copy of the survey.

The survey was made available on the web via a StudentVoice.com server. Parents of first-year students who were accepted and deposited as of May 1st, 2005 were invited to participate by email or letter. Approximately 97% of the fall first-year 2005 class was deposited by that date. On May 26, 2005 an initial email went out to all parents who had registered an email address with the University. Parents who had not registered an email address with the University were mailed a letter inviting their participation. Reminders also were sent to both groups. However, those who were not contacted by email had to make an additional effort to take the hard-copy letter, open their web browser, and type in the web address to access the survey. Those users who received the email merely had to click on a web link in the body of the email which then initiated the automatic opening of their web browser at the prescribed survey location.

The survey return rate was influenced by the willingness of those parents to voluntarily enter the website and complete the survey tool. The investigator believed that the return rate also was detrimentally affected by the number of emails or spam emails that come to Internet users with surveys or questionnaires. The survey offered no type of reward, neither intra-personal or monetary, so participation on the part of parents was purely a personal decision.

Significance of the Study

Habben's (1997) work, and later the work from Turrentine, et al (2000) claimed a lack of research on parents of college students. This was also corroborated by Forbes (2001). Additionally, Creighton University never formally asked its parents about the expectations they held of the institution with regard to their son's or daughter's collegiate

journey. The investigator sought to fill that lacuna in postsecondary literature while also bringing new knowledge to an institution increasingly vested in the issue. Of note is this investigation led to the development of an instrument (PECTAC) designed to gauge parental expectations of the teaching and caring functions of a college or university with regard to their matriculating child. It was an effort that provides valuable information on an increasingly important subject, and provides an instrument for use and additional research. In so doing, it helps address gaps in knowledge and also provides a platform for additional scholarship.

As Howe and Strauss (2003) suggested, parents of today's college student are more involved in their student's lives than any generation previously. This study directly responded to the claimed generational shift by investigating what this means for a postsecondary setting; how parents perceived the importance of teaching and caring by a postsecondary institution.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature Review, Introduction

In Chapter One, it was suggested that an assumption of care is at the core of a parent's expectations from a College or University with regard to their matriculating child. Chapter Two examines relevant literature providing a foundation for that position; which was evidenced by the following themes: (a) historical documents regarding the establishment of higher education in North America point to the view that institutions of higher education initially were to be paternal, (b) parents had a developmental need to remain in a caring stance with their emerging adult child, (c) there are observable behavior changes in tomorrow's college student and their parents as compared to previous generations, and (d) considerable study is needed on the parent partner and their expectations from a postsecondary institution.

The objective of Chapter Two is to build a case for the research questions and null hypotheses of this study. It begins with a historical look at the creation of higher education in North America, how that history established a precedent of care, and how in loco parentis continues to influence higher education today. Second, this chapter reports how the work of selected psychosocial researchers and scholars (Erikson, 1959; Newman & Newman, 1992; Austin, 1993; Mullendore & Hatch, 2000; Arnett, 2000; Forbes, 2001) support the belief that parents have a need to continue caring for and guiding their emerging young adults past the start to their collegiate experience. Information then is presented from (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Forbes, 2001; Scott

& Daniel, 2001) on how today's parents are more involved with their college-aged children than during previous generations. This chapter's last major section addresses the dearth of scholarship on the parent partner (Habben, 1997; Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, & Ward-Roof, 2000; Forbes, 2001). This chapter concludes with a summary of the major points covered and identifies a pathway for addressing the issue, detailed in Chapter Three.

The First Academies and Schools in North America

The first theme that provides support for this study comes from the historical context of the beginnings of higher education in North America. In their 1974 text, *Higher Education in America*, Henderson and Henderson detailed the early beginnings and underpinnings of American higher education. They wrote that American post-secondary institutions borrowed and implemented many ideas from the English and German models of education, which helped establish a paternalistic culture (Henderson & Henderson, 1974).

"The early colonists established academies and colleges so that their children might understand the laws of the land and receive training for employment, and so that the children learn the principles of their religion (Henderson & Henderson, 1974, p. 74)." Those educational outcomes for the first schools and academies were indicative of parents' expectations that a postsecondary institution should act as a surrogate parent. An example of that paternal model is found with Harvard University's establishment in 1636. Headmasters taught students arithmetic and reading, but also taught students about religion, etiquette, and the laws of the government (Henderson & Henderson, 1974). In

many cases, the instructors lived with students, served as models of behavior, and acted as surrogate parents.

Henderson and Henderson (1974) pointed out that the early schools and academies of higher education in North America were indicative of the English influence, because of the emphasis given to groom the off-spring of the wealthy to move forward and assume leadership roles in politics, religion, and other pivotal positions such as business. School was not just a place to learn reading and writing, but a place to learn religion, values, networking, and discipline.

Other scholars (Fenske, 1989; Honigman, 2003) agreed with Henderson and Henderson (1974) that the early beginnings of higher education in North America had a paternalistic flavor. As Fenske wrote, "In the beginning was the term in loco parentis. This term signified that, by acting in place of the parent, the entire staff of the early American colleges was expected to carry out the holistic approach to education inherited from the English residential university system of the seventeenth century (1989, p.5)." When referring to the early development of religious and boarding-type institutions established to help shape young men for society from a certain moral and religious stance, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) wrote, "Historically, America's colleges and universities have had an educational and social mission to 'educate' in a sense that extends beyond the cognitive and intellectual development of students (p. 162)." Honigman (2003) echoed that historical viewpoint and posited, "…early American colleges were paternalistic (p. 24).…" Honigman further claimed the paternalism was influenced more by the English student-centered model of education than the German

research-centered model again, supporting the same conclusion made by Henderson and Henderson (1974).

Honigman (2003) said the postsecondary institutions acted in the place of a parent from the early beginnings of higher education until well into the 20th century. He said, "…in the 1930s, universities began to build huge dormitory complexes on their campuses for all their undergraduate women as well as for freshman males. They also began to provide counselors, resident advisers, deans of men and women (p. 24)…." Those complexes were evidence that, "…major universities were rededicating themselves to the English tradition of nurturing the student beyond the classroom (p. 24)." An alternative view is the institutions realized it was necessary to provide living accommodations in order to attract students from beyond an immediate radius, and the dormitories addressed the issue. But by engaging in such enterprises there was tacit acknowledgement the residents would have additional 'care' provided by an institution.

To review, the English, student-centered model of education impacted U.S. higher education giving it a paternalistic flavor. The paternalistic culture of early American higher education stemming from an English influence (Henderson & Henderson, 1974; Pascarella & Terenizini, 1991; Fenske, 1989; Honigman, 2003) was birthed out of England's common law, which is explained with the doctrine of *in loco parentis* in the next section.

The Influence of *In Loco Parentis*

In 1999, Bickel and Lake published *The Rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University: Who Assumes the Risks of College Life?* In their text, they

chronicled the beginnings of law and higher education in North America, discussed the impact *in loco parentis* had on education, and presented a model for future schools and universities to employ. They claimed that the paternalistic nature of U.S. higher education, stemming from the concept of *in loco* parentis, had its beginnings in early English common law (Bickel & Lake, 1999).

In loco parentis was defined as a legal tool for schools to use to discipline students (Bickel & Lake, 1999). This amounted to acting in place of a parent and generally referred to the paternalistic culture or aims of a school or academy. Based on historical documents, Bickel and Lake (1999) concluded *in loco parentis* began in English common law. They explained that the father or male head of the household had legal rights over his wife and children and those rights could be transferred to another party. For example, "If the father/husband overturned the cart while drinking and seriously injured the children, the children had no right to sue him nor did the mother (1999, p. 19)."

Kaplin (1985) in the first chapter of his text, *The Law of Higher Education,* discussed the evolution of English common law as it related to postsecondary education in the United States. He asserted that the judiciary of the late 19th and early 20th centuries took, "…refuge in the *in loco parentis* doctrine borrowed from early English common law (p. 4)." Kaplin also said that the *in loco parentis* doctrine gave a school virtually limitless authority and control over its students as the *Gott vs. Berea (1913)* case illustrated.

Gott vs. Berea (1913) provided the first significant legal entry of the *in loco parentis* doctrine into the American higher education landscape (Kaplin, 1985; Bickel &

Lake, 1999). In *Gott vs. Berea*, the Kentucky Court of Appeals decided that a school had the right to act as parents might for the overall welfare of its students. Kaplin (1985) quoted text from the ruling (Gott vs. Berea College, 156 Ky. 376, 161 S.W. 204, 206, 1913), which stated that schools could make any rule or regulation for the welfare of students similar to the rules a parent might make for their own child. "There were three indelible features of the *Gott/Hunt in loco parentis* model (Bickel & Lake, p. 23)."

Bickel and Lake (1999) wrote that *in loco parentis* provided a school with the legal ability, "…to discipline, control, and regulate (p. 23)" much like a parent might with their own child. That conclusion was interpreted to mean that the power was in fact paternal in nature and contractual. "In its inception, *in loco parentis* was not about university duties towards students but about university rights and powers over students (p. 23)." Hence, student handbooks, university charters, bursar and registrar policies, and many other features of university governance gravitated to this doctrine until the *Dixon* case of the 1960s.

Dixon vs. Alabama (1961) has been credited for the legal demise of *in loco parentis* as a model for higher education (Lucas, 1970; Bickel & Lake, 1999; Nuss, 2003). In *Dixon*, the issue of due process for a student facing expulsion from a postsecondary administration came into play. Lucas (1970) wrote that *Dixon*, "…overturned privilege theory, rejected the idea that a student could be required to agree to possible expulsion without a hearing, and spelled out some of the basic procedures required in a fair hearing (p. 60)." Bickel and Lake (1999) echoed that opinion and the significance of the *Dixon* case. They wrote, "…college was a student/university relationship primarily, not primarily the delegation of family relationship prerogatives (p.

39)." More recently, Nuss (2003) also echoed those perspectives when she wrote, "In the late 1950s and early 1960s, questions about the civil liberties of colleges students were raised, and the long-standing doctrine of *in loco parentis* was challenged and eventually abolished (p. 74)."

Bickel and Lake (1999) contended that after *Dixon* (1961), U.S. higher education transgressed through a 'Bystander' era during the 1970s and 80s. They described a time when, "colleges had no legal duties to students and hence were not responsible for harm (1999, p. 49)." They also wrote that American higher education had traveled through a 'Duty' era, one where the university has some liability for its students. They explained that the 'Duty' era was when, "Courts today enforce business-like responsibilities and rights while preserving some uniqueness in college affairs (p. 105)." The two authors concluded by saying colleges and universities in the 21st century should gravitate towards a role of 'Facilitator'. "Fundamentally, a facilitator university continues to search for the right balance between student responsibility and university responsibility—and the appropriate amount of shared responsibility (p.201)."

And yet the dilemma *in loco* presents still remains. While *Dixon* (1961) might have changed the impact the *in loco parentis* doctrine had on college and university law after the 60s, the question of its ultimate demise remains. Forbes (2001) wrote, "Many of us have been struggling to reconcile the expectations of our students' parents that we will protect their children from all harm with our own desire to encourage their children to take the risks that may accompany the full exploration of all that colleges and universities have to offer (p.12)." Henderson and Henderson echoed that view charging, "Unfortunately, it is well known that although students demand release from parent rules,

their parents, and the community, college administrators want those rules maintained (1974, p. 75)." Woodard and Komives (2003) may have best summarized the state of the *in loco parentis* doctrine at the start of the 21st century when they wrote, "The doctrine of *in loco parentis* was the guiding philosophy of early student affairs professionals; although it is no longer legally viable, it is still visible in the ethic of care that permeates the field (p. 656-657)."

In summary, the historical context of the English student-centered model influencing American higher education, which included the early colonists' need for a paternalistic setting, coupled with the infusion of the doctrine of *in loco parentis,* provides evidence that American higher education had a culture of paternalism. And while *in loco parentis* may have found its demise legally, the effects on educators still are visible, as Komives and Woodard (2003) suggested. It would be foolish to assume, however, that the parental expectation of care that began with the early colonists out of the influence of the English model of education also retreated with the *in loco parentis* doctrine. Indeed, the parental expectation of care for students by postsecondary institutions likely remains intact from the time of the early colonists. At the heart of this expectation is a developmental need of the parent as the next section illustrates.

Critical Psychosocial Evidence

In 1959, Erik Erikson a Freudian ego-psychologist was the first to suggest stages of development past adolescence. In his article, "*Identity and the life cycle*" he said there were eight stages of psychosocial development, and not five as his mentor Freud had

originally suggested. Most importantly he identified three stages of adulthood—implying that psychosocial development did not end after the teenage years.

The second major theme in this review chapter, which provided evidence for an assumption of care by parents for their students attending postsecondary institutions, comes from this body of work. Erikson's (1959) eight stages of psychosocial development serve as evidence that adults have a developmental need to care for their adult child beyond the end of the high school years and well into the collegiate years.

This section will present a summary of Erik Erikson's (1959) eight stages and showcase its relevance to this study. Next, this section will identify more contemporary authors who have echoed the same psychosocial theme—that parents have a developmental need to continue caring for their college bound child (Newman & Newman, 1992; Austin, 1993; Mullendore & Hatch, 2000; Forbes, 2001). This section ends with a look at secondary sources written for parents about the start to their students' collegiate journey, which again suggests that parents have a need to care for their students even after the start of the collegiate journey (Coburn & Treeger, 1988; Newman & Newman, 1992; Savage, 2003).

Erik Erikson and Adult Development

Erik Erikson's (1959) eight stages of psychosocial development were considered indicative of the life stage grouping of psychosocial theorists (Evans, 2003). Psychosocial theory is helpful to use when addressing developmental issues across a person's life as Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) suggested, "The family of psychosocial theories includes theories that view individual development essentially as a process that

involves the accomplishment of a series of 'developmental tasks' (p.19)." Evans (2003) echoed that comment saying that psychosocial theory helps explain how people can have differing life challenges and approach life from multiple perspectives. She explained that psychosocial theory can be broken into three major groups: life stage, life events, and life course.

The life stage perspective was, "…that individuals become more individuated and complex as they progress through life, with later developmental tasks building on earlier tasks in a predictable patter (Evans, 2003, p. 184)." Another of Evan's psychosocial groups was that of the 'life event' perspective. It addressed, "…the timing, duration, spacing and ordering of life events in the course of human development (p. 184)." The third and final group of psychosocial theories was the life course or sometimes referred to as the socio-cultural perspective which, "…focus on the social roles that individuals assume during their lives and the timing of life events (p. 184)."

Erikson's (1959) work as a life stage psychosocial theorist has been considered the foundation for most other psychosocial theory (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Evans, 2003). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) said that Erikson, "…theorizes eight stages or periods in psychosocial development when biological and psychological changes interact with socio-cultural demands to present a 'crisis' that is characteristic of a given stage (p. 19)." Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito (1998) supported this view of Erikson's work pointing out that Erikson had, "…described psychosocial development as a series of development tasks or stages confronted by adults when their biology and psychology converge (p. 10)…."

Rodgers (1989) categorized Erikson's (1959) stage-crises as: (1) basic trust vs. mistrust (birth to 2 years of age); (2) autonomy versus shame and doubt (ages three to six); (3) initiative versus guilt (ages six to ten); (4) industry versus inferiority (ages ten to fourteen); (5) identity versus identity confusion (ages fourteen to twenty); (6) intimacy versus isolation (ages twenty to forty); (7) generativity versus stagnation (ages forty to sixty-five); and (8) integrity versus despair (ages sixty-five and older). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) built on Rodger's work saying that Erikson's stage five, also known as adolescence (Erikson, 1959), was the, "...dominant developmental task for people of traditional college age (although not necessarily students) (p. 20)."

Parents of traditional-age college students, on the other hand, are likely in stage seven or 'Middle Adulthood' (Erikson, 1959; Rodgers, 1989). Erikson suggested that between the ages of 40-65, individuals must find a way to satisfy and support the next generation without falling into a state of self-centeredness. He identified the psychosocial crisis in that stage as a conflict between generativity and self-absorption, and in that stage the major focus of life was parenting (Erikson, 1980). It is also important to note that Erikson had concluded that children affected the growth and development of parents, and coined this interaction of the generations, mutuality (1959). Erikson's work can be interpreted to mean that the view of the college journey is a developmental process for both student and parent, based on the implementation of the concept of mutuality within Erikson's eight stages of development.

Contemporary Points of View

Other authors claimed that the start of the college years is a significant time for psychosocial change in a parent's life (Newman & Newman, 1992; Austin, 1993; Mullendore & Hatch, 2000; Forbes, 2001). Citing Erikson's (1959) work those authors supported the contention that persons in 'middle adulthood' still were developing psychosocially and had a developmental need to impart wisdom and experiences to younger generations.

Newman and Newman (1992) posited that as college students sought to establish autonomy from parents there likely was an adverse reaction. They addressed issues such as identity formation, sexuality, values development, career exploration, social relationships, etc., explaining the tension created by the change in locus of control and guidance, fostered by the child's affected parents wanting to shield a child from unpleasant experiences but those inclinations were tempered by a realization it was necessary to encourage independence. The competing drives were analogous to an approach-avoidance conflict for parents. Concurrently the new college student also experienced competing drives. One was to assert independence. The other was to avoid disappointment for parents. With both parties engaged in approach-avoidance conflicts, but with different rewards and punishments, the conundrum usually became exacerbated. Ameliorating such situations presumably could be done by addressing parental needs during the transition with the expectation of synergy impacting both parties.

While speaking directly to parents about their child's identity development, it was pointed out that their concept of identity was at least under review, if not evolving, at the start to their student's collegiate journey (Newman & Newman, 1992). The authors

suggested that for an individual to gain independence from the parental fold, the parenting relationship had to change from a parent care-taker to one where it was more consultative and mentoring. The concept of the student affecting the parent and the parent affecting the student during the collegiate journey of the student was cited as evidence of Erikson's (1959) concept of mutuality.

Austin (1993) provided another example of the psychosocial changes parents undergo at the time of their student's start to the collegiate journey. She wrote, "A healthy student-parent relationship is positively linked to overall college adjustment, including academic achievement and affective health; and these issues are all clearly demonstrated factors in student retention (Austin, 1993, p. 99)." Austin emphasized that healthy student-parent relationships were an important factor for higher education to consider, especially in light of overall student retention and ultimately a student's successful completion of the academic journey. In terms of parents growth and development, Austin wrote, "For the parents, evidence of successful separation is their ability to develop an adult-to-adult relationship with their young adult and feel comfortable with the change in their role of 'parent' (p. 99)." Her definition of the separation process was predicated on experience culled from many summer orientation programs, sessions at orientation programs devoted to parents, and through analysis of results from a parent questionnaire aimed at assisting them during orientation sessions. The questionnaire, entitled the College Parent Questionnaire (CPQ), was developed by Austin and Sousa (1985) and is covered later in this chapter.

The view of the college journey as a developmental process for both student and parent was addressed more recently by Mullendore and Hatch (2000). They reviewed a

number of different growth and developmental aspects important in the development of young adults. In light of the apparent dilemma parents faced at the start of their student's collegiate journey, they suggested the separation was not where parents let go, but rather was a process whereby parents redefined their parental relationship with the child (Mullendore & Hatch, 2000). These changes included developmental changes for the parent as well as the student, and further reinforced the work by Newman and Newman (1992).

In chapter one, Forbes was cited as saying, "Until the last decade, theories of college student development have assumed that student autonomy is established during the early college years, but newer research suggests that the separation from parents occurs closer to the end of the college years and also varies with a student's gender, race, and culture (2001, p.14)." Forbes argued that earlier assumptions of college students becoming 'adults' at the beginning of the college years were incorrect and needed revision. She further claimed that there are positive developmental consequences to continued closeness between parents and students during the college years. "Students who remain more attached to their parents throughout the college years appear to accrue benefits in academic, vocational, affective, and social domains (p. 14)." Also Forbes said that too much or too little parent involvement could have disastrous effects on the development of college students. To support such claims, Forbes referenced the work of Arnett (2000), who suggested a more contemporary concept to identify the traditional-age college student. Arnett posited the concept of 'emerging adulthood'; the demands on youth in heavily industrialized nations as well as extended educational pathways were leading students to need additional time to make choices and choose a direction in life.

Thus it was important for the separation between parent and child to be more of a weaning process, often extending over several years. It was not a precipitous event; to conclude this section on the application of psychosocial theory as it pertains to this study, it is worthwhile to consider some sources written for parents about the start to their students' collegiate journey, with recognition that parents have a need to care for their students even after the start of their student's collegiate journey (Coburn & Treeger, 1988; Newman & Newman, 1992; Savage, 2003).

Self-Help Literature for College Parents

As of August 2005, college bookstores were filled with numerous texts and volumes claiming to assist college parents with the transitional process. Almost Grown: Launching Your Child from High School to College (Pasick, 1998), When Your Kid Goes to College; A Parent's Survival Guide (Barkin, 1999), Don't Tell Me What to Do, Just Send Money: The Essential Parenting Guide to the College Years (Johnson and Schelhas-Miller, 2000), or Empty Nest ... Full Heart: The Journey from Home to College (Van Steenhouse, 2002) are a few of the texts available to parents looking for help and guidance. These guides cover issues of finance, emotions, trends, homesickness, and a host of other topics presumably pertinent for survival of the parent and student. All addressed how parents can cope with the loss of their son or daughter and still support their offspring. Of the available material three publications stood out in terms of their sagacious information on parental psychosocial development.

Coburn and Treeger (1988) authored Letting Go, one of the earliest guides to help parents during the collegiate process. Those authors segmented their material into two

parts: the college experience and their parent's guide. In the college experience, they discussed the developmental experience students typically encounter and how college life has changed since parents were on a college campus. Issues such as academic stress, alcohol, social stress, and finances are major topics discussed. In the parent's guide section is a chronological breakdown of what to expect from move-out to move-in, the sophomore year, and beyond.

Coburn and Treeger (1988) pointed out the need for parental emotional support and that lends credence to the assertion of this study that parents are in a developmental process at this time. The authors wrote that by the time students were seniors in college, "…most students have stopped turning to their parents for their primary emotional support, and turn first to their friends and lovers (p. 277)." They suggested that the period of college is, for the parent, a time where financial support remains a constant, but the affective, the emotional support that has been a mainstay in the relationship since birth, faced a dramatic transition that had serious consequences in the life of a parent. Usually parents realize the upcoming transition, but regrettably colleges and universities have little information on its potential significance. The point of friction is when an institution provides the caring and affective support needed to transition their offspring into young adults without due collaboration with the parental entity.

When Kids Go to College, authored by Newman and Newman (1992), illustrated a number of helpful topics for parents and the changing relationship they have as their student begins college. The authors discussed developmental theory, focusing on how the parent-child relationship changes. They painted a picture of tension found in the changing parent-child relationship that was important for this study. They wrote about

the ongoing paradox, "One of the challenges for us as parents is to help our children build autonomy while we build confidence in their judgment (Newman & Newman, 1992, p. 12)." They also presented information on how a parent could help the student move towards that autonomous state by incorporating carefully orchestrated tactics during the high school years; present questions that require consideration of multiple perspectives and varying consequences. Erikson's (1959) concept of 'mutuality' is again present in Newman and Newman's advice for parents—again suggesting a developmental link for parents at the start of their student's collegiate journey.

In 2003, Marjorie Savage wrote, You're on Your Own: But I am Here if You Need Me. She tackled many of the issues presented by the other authors, but Savage distinguished her message, in chapter twelve, by illuminating the concept of parents acting as mentors for their student's life beyond the college campus. The point was that the parenting function was not terminated, but changed to one of a consultative figure. The author contended that a parent remained a nurturer and a teacher of their young, but that a young person had transitioned to adulthood necessitating that the method of teaching and caring needed to become more of a consultative or mentoring function. This same theme was noted in Erikson's (1959) 'middle adulthood' stage, where he said those in that stage concerned themselves with the passing of wisdom and experiences to the younger generation.

Two key concepts from Erikson's (1959) work regarding 'middle adulthood' are worthwhile to review. First, his concept of 'generativity' established that parents of college-aged students were likely to search for ways to impart knowledge and experience to their younger generation. Second, students benefited and were likely to make positive

gains in their growth and development based on a strong student-parent relationship. The same could be said for parents. This second point is directly related to Erickson's (1959) concept of 'mutuality'. The assumptions of parents 'letting go' at the start of the college years have given way to the belief that their college-bound off-spring progress through a developmental phase, and both parties continue to interact, but in many respects it is like an inverse relationship. Parents' need to be involved by their degree of influence dissipates as the child's autonomy and independence increase. Inherent to the model operating effectively is that parents, more so than the students, need knowledge and guidance on how to best transition through that developmental period for both students and parents.

Behavior Changes of Students and Parents

"Today's parents are going to unprecedented lengths to avoid their worst fear—that harm will befall their child, and they are largely succeeding (Forbes, 2001, p. 11)." This section presents a third theme to bolster the foundation for this study's research questions and hypotheses. It will be presented that the students and parents of tomorrow differ behaviorally than previous generations. First, based on socio-cultural influences such as technology, the college students of tomorrow are more connected with other people, peers, and their parents. Second, these students' parents not only are more connected, but they are more involved in the lives of their children and especially are concerned with their child's safety. Both of these shifts (involvement and connection) in students and parents provide evidence of a developmental need for parents to care and to remain connected with their student beyond the start of the college years.

A Generation More Connected

The first behavioral change with the new generation of Millennial students is they want to be wireless and yet connected at all times. Millennials' comfort with technology drives this behavioral change, and they have been continually described as a tech-savvy generation (Tapscott, 1998; Howe & Strauss, 2003). As covered earlier in Chapter One, Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward (2006) suggested that with communications such as cell phones, email or more recent technologies such as instant messaging, blogging, or Facebook—students are never 'far away' from parents or other friends. These technologies are driving a behavioral change in the culture of United States college students and their families. To understand the extent of behavioral change due to this influence requires a selected review of the socio-cultural landscape as it relates to technology.

Technology as a Socio-Cultural Influence

The examples of current events impacting today's world, higher education, and its stakeholders (student and parents) have been numerous. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the ongoing unrest throughout the middle-east, and the creation of the European Union exemplify how global events have affected aspects of life in the United States. Life has been affected for Americans whether through the loss of life in war, the impact of terrorism and safety concerns, and the demand globally for oil, which in turn creates higher prices, in the U.S. In his text, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Friedman (1999) noted that socio-political events, particularly on a global scale, increasingly influence

American culture locally and nationally. He cited examples in the middle-east such as the injection of McDonald's franchises into various Muslim countries, instances where United States' policy supported dictatorships rather than true democratic governments and the ability for transnational business to operate seemingly beyond national boundaries and to do so almost instantaneously.

The underlying thesis in Friedman's (1999) book is the concept of globalization, a world-wide integration of economic, cultural, social and political systems. Narula (2003) pointed out that globalization was wedded to technology. As more information becomes available to people across the globe, thanks in large part to the Internet and satellite TV, the more likely events can be felt half a world away. Globalization, he argued, promoted the expansion and use of technology, thus creating interdependence between the two. For example, as makers of computer-based technologies have grown, their need to sell technologies to new countries in new markets improves revenue, thus fueling the implementation of new technologies across the globe. Also the issue of outsourcing demonstrates how economies benefit from and depend upon each other, as witnessed in how the telecommunications sector often out-sources support services from the U.S. mainland to southeast Asia.

This interdependence can be seen as multinational corporations continue to be able to communicate in live video conferences in board rooms across different continents, as election results for provinces in India are readily available to any Internet user, or as worldwide news networks illustrate atrocities seconds after they occur to satellite TV consumers. Indeed, it is easy to see the interdependent relationship of technology—

pushing information at break neck speeds to people across the globe—and globalization at work as Narula (2003) suggested.

Higher education in the United States and its consumers are not devoid of the influence of globalization. Consider a few examples: study abroad programs allow students to immerse themselves in new cultures, researchers have access to increasingly more and more information, and technology allows learning to occur free from restrictions of time and location. Globalization has set the stage for networking and diversity exposure on levels previously not imagined. Other examples of how globalization impacts learning are the introduction of distance education by for-profit schools such as the University of Phoenix (Katz, 1999) and sequela from terrorist actions on new restrictions for student visas (Hindrawan, 2003).

Evidence that technology is a leading socio-cultural factor in addition to globalization, impacting students, faculty, administrators, and parents in the higher education marketplace is compelling. Consider the advent of such items as the personal computer, fuel cell technology, personal digital assistants (PDAs), the Internet, satellite communications, nano-technologies at the atomic level or the explosive growth of wireless technologies in society. These technologies are providing new methods of communication, research, commerce, and learning. Gumport and Chun (1999) asserted, "The hope is that technology will be the key to more affordable, accessible, and effective teaching and learning (p. 387)." Whether it has been the protection of student information in the databases colleges and universities keep, the Internet-driven, for-profit institution now competing in the higher education market, or the ongoing coordination of visa information via large networked-databases, it has been established that for the higher

education producer of the 21st century technology has implanted itself into the higher education marketplace.

Millennials have been noted as a generation of college students armed with the Internet, cable television, and wireless technology. Oblinger (2003) wrote, "Not surprisingly, technology is assumed to be a natural part of the environment. The younger the age group, the higher the percentage that use the Internet for school, work, and leisure (p. 38)." In 1994, approximately 3% of public schools had instructional classrooms with Internet capability. As of fall 2000, the percentage of public schools across the United States employing the use of Internet-ready instructional classrooms had risen to 77% and approximately 98% of public schools in the nation had a connection to the Internet. (Source available at http://nces.ed.gov)

Oblinger later cited a report from September 2001 involving twelve to seventeen year olds who use the web (Lenhart, Simon, & Graziano, 2003), "…investigators found that 94 percent use the Internet for school research and that 78 percent believe the Internet helps them with schoolwork (p. 39)." The problem that surfaces as a result of Millennial's tech-savvy skill might be best summarized by Oblinger who said, "Perhaps because of the contract between their comfort with technology and the technology comfort of teachers, many students find the use of technology in schools to be disappointing (Oblinger, p. 39)."

Oblinger (2003) expanded further on that apparent disappointment, "The aging infrastructure and the lecture tradition of colleges and universities may not meet the expectations of students raised on the Internet and interactive games (p. 44)." Indeed, this generation has had an extremely different experience with technology throughout

their elementary and secondary school lives. They are coming to campus to learn and the question remains if colleges and universities have adapted and are ready.

Hence the pressure on colleges and universities exerted by the expectation for technology is daunting. Infrastructure costs, university-wide software licenses, virus protection, legal requirements associated with the management of data, information technology staff costs, and digital media production, acquisition, and storage are some of the real costs associated with the hope technology brings. When writing about the need for a scalable network on Creighton University's campus, Young (2004) stated, "Because the rate of technological change is increasing and network capacity is essential to enhanced learning, teaching, and campus communication, a flexible network design that allows for virtually unlimited growth in a simple, cost-effective manner is key to Creighton's future (p. 34)." Earlier, Bates (1999) wrote, "…there is a heavy price to be paid to maximize the educational benefits of technology for teaching, a price some may feel strikes at the very soul of the academy (p. 35)." The expectation to provide the best available technology might be staggering when financial issues are juxtaposed against revenue streams. But failure to be proactive might heighten Bates' admonition. No institution wants to be deemed of secondary quality.

A closer look reveals that technology has not only begun to impact the producers and consumers of higher education, but the product itself. Consider again what Young (2004) wrote and note the inherent assumption in his text, "…network capacity is essential to enhanced learning, teaching (p. 34)..." This suggested a melding of teaching and technology, and that learning itself had somehow changed. Bates (1999) suggested, "Thus, the use of technology for teaching is not just a technical issue. It raises

fundamental questions about target groups, methods of teaching, priorities for funding, and above all the overall goals and purpose of a university or college (p. 34)."

Perhaps the technological pressure placed on postsecondary schools can best be summarized by the old cliché that consumers, here assumed to be the more involved Millennial parents and their students, expect the latest and greatest. That expectation, as well as the cost of the technology itself, is impacting educational institutions at an unrelenting pace (Duderstadt, 1999).

A final perspective on today's higher education marketplace and technology comes from outside the ivory walls. Bates' (1999) assessment of learning and technology was eerily similar to predictions John Naisbitt made in his 1982 provocative text, *Megatrends.* In that text, Naisbitt suggested that corporate America look at the core impact of technology and customer-orientation. It is from Naisbitt's text that the phrase "high tech/high touch" was introduced. His phrase meant that companies cannot be driven by technology alone, rather that companies of the future will be driven by solid technologies that gear themselves to be consumer-oriented. His prediction seems to have traction in the higher education marketplace and his call to be more customer-oriented is similar to what Young and Stick (2003) predicted.

Young and Stick (2003) wrote that colleges and universities needed to be ready for a new student and a new stakeholder. They suggested that while technology had increased the pace of life, educators needed to renew their one-on-one contact with students while also engaging a new stakeholder, the parents.

In summary, the explosive growth and use of technologies such as phones, email, and instant messaging by students enables students to be in instant contact with parents

(Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2006). This technological growth has led to a daily behavioral change among parents and students. This technological and socio-cultural change provides the first part of the argument that Millennials and their parents are 'behaving' differently when compared to earlier generations.

A More Involved Parent

A second behavioral change being seen on campuses is that of increased parental involvement in the lives of their students (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Forbes, 2001; Fay, 2003; Lowery, 2004). As noted previously, Braskamp, Trautvetter, and Ward defined 'helicopter' parents as, "…always hovering over campus ready and willing on a moment's notice to become involved in the affairs of their son or daughter (2006, p. 6)." Fay (2003) wrote, "Many of today's parents are obsessed with the desire to create a perfect image for their kids (p. 1)." Fay charged, "It's the Jet-Powered Turbo-Attack Helicopter Model epidemic. It rears its ugly head in all communities, but is especially excessive and out of control in more affluent communities (p.1)…" Fay was referring to the ever-increasing parent watchdog or hovering helicopter and their ability to care for (or interfere) with their child's education. As Fay (2003) suggested, parents want more than to be informed of the educational process, they want a stage where, "…their kids never have to face struggle, inconvenience, discomfort, or disappointment (p. 1)." To understand the relationship between Millennials and their parents, a further examination of Millennials and their parents is required.

The Largest Generation Ever: Millennials

Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000) wrote, "Parents' visions of college life and memories of their own collegiate experiences—however unrealistic in today's world—shape students' expectations of college (p. 32)." Indeed, students deserve higher education's full attention, for as Altbach (1993) suggested, "Students are central to the academic enterprise. Along with professors, they are at the core of the educational equation (p. 203)." This new generation of students, coined by the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) as Millennials (Howe & Strauss, 2000), have been extremely dependent on their parents, especially when it comes to financial support (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Sax, Astin, Korn, and Mahoney (1997) supported this claim, reporting that 76% of freshman students receive monetary support from their parents to attend institutions of higher education.

And much has been written and prophesized about this new group of students (Howe & Strauss, 1992; 1998; 2000; Tapscott, 1998; Zoba, 1999). They have been called tech-savvy (Tapscott, 1998), living in an environment telling them "nothing matters" (Zoba, 1999), and they represent a generation bigger than the baby boomers (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Howe and Strauss (2000) pointed out, "Millennials have never known pro sports arenas that were not named for companies or happy meals that did not have movie toys or schools that did not have soft drink logos and candy ads (p. 281)." As a very diverse (ethnically) generation they are intent on achieving a race-blind society; they are assigned much more homework than any generation in the past; they have the most educated parents for a generation of students; and defying conventional wisdom, they are active politically, promoting causes via the Internet and media connections

(Howe & Strauss, 2000). And as a generation they continue to have life-changing events thrown their way. Besides the influences of globalization and technology, they have witnessed two wars, another Shuttle disaster, and a recession—all in a post-September 11th landscape.

Perhaps most distressing about this group has been the constant cry heard from many college counselors that students are coming in with more mental and physical problems than ever before. That cry was largely anecdotal in prior years, but new information on a national level helped to confirm this fact with regard to tomorrow's student. Bartlett (2002) reported on the results from the Your First College Year survey, a follow up to the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey. Bartlett mentioned that several of the findings were asking college educators to seriously consider the health and well being of students. When comparing answers to student perceptions before their first year of college and towards the end of the first year, there were significant drops in the ratings of emotional and physical health. Bartlett (2002) said students reported feeling depressed, constantly overwhelmed by all they had to do, and in poorer emotional health with significantly higher levels of stress by the end of their first year of college. However, it also was reported that students changed their worship habits, suggesting that students attended religious services less than before college, even though they also indicated that the need to bring faith into their lives as more important than before they started college.

Considering those reported traits of Millennials, it is important not to forget these Millennials are more connected to friends, family, and peers than any generation

previously, but they have parents who are more involved, as suggested previously in this section (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Forbes, 2001; Fay, 2003; Lowery, 2004).

This increase in parental involvement was documented by Forbes (2001), who found that student affairs practitioners reported an increase in contact, initiated by the parent. "Until the last decade, theories of college student development have assumed that student autonomy is established during the early college years, but newer research suggests that the separation from parents occurs closer to the end of the college years and also varies with a student's gender, race, and culture (Forbes, 2001, p.14)." Forbes conclusion, based on her review of current literature and investigation into parent expectations, provided evidence that, at the very least, parents want to stay attached to their child beyond the first-year of college.

Lowery (2004) seemingly echoed that viewpoint in his article, "Student Affairs for a New Generation." He wrote, "These Millennial students are facing the same developmental issues and challenges as previous generations, but they have grown up in a world fundamentally different from that of their predecessors (p. 87)." Lowery supported this claim citing material from Howe and Strauss (1993, 2000, 2003); Newton (2000); and Strauss and Howe (1991). In his description of Millennial students, Lowery cited Howe and Strauss' (2000) seven key characteristics. The first characteristic was, "One of the personal manifestations of this specialness is the relationship that many Millennial students enjoy with their parents (p. 88)." Later in the same section of his text, Lowery warned readers that, "It is incumbent on student affairs professionals to create opportunities for parents to be involved in their students' education without removing the

role of college as a place where students develop the ability to live independently from their parents (p. 88)."

As for parents of tomorrow, the work by Keppler, Mullendore, and Carey (2005) offered insight into the future. Their work, Partnering with the *Parents of Today's College Students*, is one of the very few comprehensive textual resources available for those working in the student affairs arena. Keppler, et al. (2005) were purposeful in their language, saying that the relationship with parents must be one where student affairs practitioners view the parent stakeholder as a partner (Mullendore, Banahan, & Ramsey, 2005). In a later chapter in the text, Lowery (2005) discussed the ever-changing legal landscape and the affects law continued to have on the parent-student relationship during the college years. Lowery noted that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) have had the most impact over the past three decades on higher education and the parent-college relationship. It was said that while these acts continue to protect student information, they have been misunderstood by student affairs practitioners, resulting in a possible breakdown in communications with parents.

In the final chapter of that text, Jackson and Murphy (2005) discussed how institutions can manage parent expectations. They issued, however, an important caveat, "The current trend of increasing parental involvement in the education of students in college has become a complicated process and one that will not give way to easy resolution (p. 57)." Regrettably, the suggestions they gave did not address understanding parent attitudes, opinions or expectations (Jackson & Murphy, 2005).

In summary, the students of tomorrow are more tech-savvy and thus more connected to family and friends. They have stronger relationships with their parents and their parents are exerting more involvement in the lives of their children than any generation previously. Students are looking for ways to learn using technology and parents need college and university administrators to provide pathways towards continued parental involvement throughout their students' collegiate years.

A Lack of Information on Parents and their Expectations

This section details the fourth and final theme providing for the foundation for this study. It details current literature regarding parents and their expectations, and concludes by summarizing that more study is needed. "Although a fair amount of research exists on the impact of parenting on college students, the literature contains virtually no information about what parents expect from the college experience (Forbes, 2001, p. 15)." This same conclusion, that considerable research needs to be done in the arena of parents, their opinions, attitudes, and expectations of the college experience, also was expressed by Habben (1997), and Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000).

Parent Literature: What We Know About Parents

A careful reading of available student affairs/higher education related peer-reviewed journals, disclosed limited material on 'parents' and their 'expectations'—with most of those addressing the state of *in loco parentis*. Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000) reported on the unpublished work of Habben (1997), who claimed

there was a lack of research on parents and parental hopes for their student. This is also further echoed by Forbes (2001), as reported previously in this chapter. Table 2.1 provides a summary of work on the study of parents of college-bound students and their expectations, as of August 1, 2006.

Table 2.1: Parent Literature Findings

Resource	# of articles containing the words "parent" in the article title	# of those articles related to "college parent expectations"
Journal of College Student Development (JCSD) (1992-present)*	20	0
Journal of College Orientation and Transition (The National Orientation Director Association's (NODA) Journal)*	0	0
Journal of Higher Education (1984-present)*	4	0
Journal of College Admission (1992-present)*	7	0
New Directions for Student Services*	15	0
NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators)*	5	1

* - The following resources were reviewed as of August 1, 2006.

The Journal of College Student Development (JCSD) produced 20 articles directly mentioning parents in the title since 1992. Five articles specifically dealt with parental attachment (Donaldson & Kenny, 1992; Bradford & Lyddon 1993; Taub, 1997; Wintre & Sugar, 2000; Schwartz & Buboltz, 2004).

Several articles mentioned the role of parents and families: Heyer and Nelson (1993) mentioned parents in respect to marital status along with addressing a student's identity development and emotional autonomy; Dennis, Phinney, and Chuateco (2005) spoke of the combined influence of motivation, parental support, and peer support among

ethnic minorities as it related to their success in college; Ceja (2006) who detailed the role of parents and families in the college choice process of Chicana students; and Hahs-Vaughn (2004) completed a longitudinal study over several years demonstrating the impact between a parent's level of education on their college offspring. It was also interesting to find three articles detailing parents and substance abuse: Garbarino and Strange (1993) focused on alcohol use by parents and adjustment to college by students, Christensen (1995) reported on parental alcohol use and its effects on family relationships, self-esteem, and repression in offspring attending postsecondary education, and Sessa (2005) illustrated the influence of parenting on substance abuse during the transition to college.

Also tangential to the issue of the current study was work by: Janosik (2001) who wrote about parents, students, and faculty when dealing with disciplinary concerns; Lentz (1992) who focused on parents as an important factor impacting career choices; Bartholomae, Hickman, and McKenry (2000) detailing the influence of parenting styles and presumed impact on academic adjustment and achievement at college; Boyd, Van Brunt, Magoon, Hunt, and Hunt (1997) discussing parents as referral agents to an institution; Janosik (2004) who detailed parent views on the Clery Act and campus safety; and McLeod & Vonk (1992) presented information on a support group for students who had children while attending graduate school. However, it was found that none of the 20 articles in the Journal of College Student Development expressly dealt with college parent expectations.

A review of the Journal of College Orientation and Transition, a journal sponsored by the National Orientation Directors' Association (NODA), revealed that

since its inception in 1993 there have been no articles directly mentioning ‘parent’ in the title of an article. That finding was of particular concern due to the fact the NODA Journal is one of the leading sources to help inform student affairs practitioners developing orientation programs for students and their parents.

The Journal of Higher Education, one of the oldest higher education resources to date and widely considered a comprehensive resource, had only four articles with the word parent(s) in an article title dating back to 1984; and there were no articles focusing on college students’ parent expectations. In that same outlet (Journal of Higher Education) Olson and Rosenfeld (1984) wrote about parents and the process of gaining access to student financial aid, Hossler and Vesper (1993) explored their findings on parental savings for college education, and Perna and Titus (2005) examined racial differences in the relationship between parental involvement and college choice. And last, Litten and Hall (1989) reported evidence they found on how high school students and their parents viewed quality in colleges. The latter authors urged higher education to begin thinking of the external consumer, “The management of colleges and universities will have to become actively engaged with the dialectic created by internal and external perspectives on quality in higher education (p. 321).” They suggested that effective marketing for institutions would entail helping consumers to understand aspects of the educational process that the producers often took for granted.

In the Journal of College Admission were seven article titles containing the keyword ‘parent’. Cochran and Cochran (1997) provided a list of 14 suggestions from parents to help admissions officers operate open houses for high school students; Wesley and Bennett (1998) evaluated the prepaid tuition program scene from the perspective of

administrator and parent; Glass (2004) provided marketing information for college counselors via the viewpoint of the college parent; and Johnston and Shanley (2001) discussed what parents said about the college counselor assisting their offspring. Those four articles dealt more with the process of college investigation and selection without speaking to expectations on the college years.

The two articles discovered in the Journal of College Admission were worth noting and provided an interesting backdrop for this discussion. Smith (2001) found that African-American parents from low socio economic status at a Los Angeles public high school felt disconnected from the process of deciding on colleges, and that it would be prudent for other relevant personnel to develop strategies to assist selected sub-groups of parents in their journey. Smith's work was important because it focused on parents of color and non-majority backgrounds. It emphasized that the term 'parent' was multidimensional and should be viewed as merely a general descriptor. While all parents were individuals, it was conceivable that some similarities existed among them and that institutional representatives should seek to address needs, similarities, and differences.

The final source mentioned in the Journal of College Admission was written by Sachs (2000) and republished in 2006. Sachs described the growing role of the parent and said the evolution of the parent in the college process had evolved from the Dark Ages of the 60s and 70s to a Renaissance during the 80s and 90s, to the Modern Day era. Sachs indicated that higher education was in an era of responding to parents as part of the provision of orientation and ongoing support systems, and to continue such efforts effectively necessitated establishing a research base.

"From the changing dynamics of families emerges the growing phenomenon of parental involvement in the college student's experience. Although institutions may resist, the parents of today's college students clearly expect to exercise that prerogative (Scott & Daniel, 2001, p. 83)." A review of this series entitled, New Directions for Student Services, dating from January 1996 to August 2006, revealed 15 additional articles matching the search parameter for the word 'parent'. Weeks (1985) reviewed the limitations and allowable communications school administrators may have with parents, Sells (2002) introduced the parent factor into the discussion of campus safety and security, and Weeks (2001) discussed policies in regards to FERPA and how to maintain and grow strong parental relationships in light of FERPA.

Kreppel (1985) was the first to address the parent factor in residence hall administration services and later, Conneely, Good, and Perryman (2001) discussed the need for housing professionals to work with students and parents in creating community saying, "Housing staff must show respect for students and their parents by building a sense of trust with them. The process should be one of engagement and collaboration rather than separation (p. 61)." Those authors expressed the importance of educators cultivating trust, respect, and working to define the relationship with parents in terms of an ongoing and evolving partnership that assumed a further commitment. Lange and Stone (2001) asserting that the role and involvement of the parent in admissions and financial aid had increased with the competition for students, rising costs of education, and greater opportunities for postsecondary study. It was stated parents and students from low to middle class socioeconomic status faced a confusing landscape and that colleges should position themselves to help those students and their parents.

Moll (1985) reported that college counselors needed to be aware of the role of parents in the college selection process, Perigo (1985) wrote about the need for parental orientation programs to be focused on assisting parents with letting go, and Scott and Daniel (2001) emphasized why parents are integral to higher education. However, it was Coburn and Woodward (2001) who claimed that the need parents had for information at the start of their child's college journey had changed. "Most institutions offer programs for parents or families that are far more substantive than the punch-and-cookies receptions of generations past (p. 37)." And Golden (2001) asserted that it was not only orientation professionals that needed to adjust their methodology, but also institutional presidents. Golden pointed out that a president of an institution must try to make a connection with parents, thus enhancing the likelihood of establishing a working partnership between the parent and the college.

Additionally, four other articles in the New Directions for Student Services were found with the keyword 'parent' in the author title. Jacoby (1983) suggested that parents of commuter students were an untapped resource, Cohen and Halsey (1985) suggested ways postsecondary institutions could reorganize themselves to be ready to work with parents, Lopez (1991) documented the impact of parental divorce on students at college, and Austin (2005) reported on the perspectives of parents from the American Indian experience. All articles found in the New Directions for Student Services did not address college parent expectations.

Upon a review of the past thirty-five volumes of the NASPA Journal dating back to 1970, only five (5) articles were found to have the word 'parents' in their title, and just one included investigating parent expectations. The article by Moore (1973) focused on

the amount of information parents usually had about the aid process and was entitled "Student Financial Aid: How much do Parents know?" Gregory and Ballou (1986) dealt with whether or not there continued to be a "parenting function" in higher education while, Huff and Thorpe (1997) examined the challenges facing today's students who also were single parents. Palmer, Lohman, Gehring, Carlson, and Garrett (2001) wrote "Parental Notification: A New Strategy to Reduce Alcohol Abuse on Campus." Notably none of those latter four manuscripts addressed the issue of parental expectations as it related to the care and learning functions of a postsecondary institution.

Most salient to this study's discussion of parent expectations, however, is a more recent article by Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000). They wrote "The Parent Project: What Parents Want from the College Experience". Their study presents the reader with a unique look at what parents want for their students' collegiate experience. Their work will be explored in more detail in the next section detailing landmark initiatives investigating college parents.

Additionally the Dissertations Abstract International (DAI) database (1950-2006) was consulted by the investigator for any additional information. As of August 1, 2006, the DAI had 22 matches for dissertation titles with the phrase 'in loco parentis'. Most referred to the legal, ethical, and developmental obligations educators had when standing in the place of a parent. A further review of the DAI database found 63 matches using the terms 'parent' and 'college', with only a few focusing on understanding parents or parent expectations. Many of the dissertations addressed changing family dynamics, perceptions of drug usage at college, and student or parent identity formation as a result

of the college experience. None were precisely on parental expectations of an institution with regard to the educational social, cultural, and physical well-being of their offspring.

One related study investigated parental involvement for college-bound African-American, first-generation students. Through a qualitative, active research inquiry design Hollie-Major (2003) found parents were interested in information on such broad topics from financial aid to selecting a college to succeeding in college. She interpreted those data to mean parents wanted more information about the collegiate journey (Hollie-Major, 2003).

Mohler (1990) looked at the perceptions students and parents had of the college choice process, the transitions they faced during the college choice process, and the subsequent adjustments students made to campus life. The findings allowed for claiming parents and students self-reported high levels of parental involvement in the college choice process. The data also suggested that there were varying degrees of difficulty in adjustment to campus life based on family income. Interestingly, more than 80% of student and parent participants self-reported they were comfortable with an institution dealing directly with a student on university matters (Mohler, 1990), which could mean the academic issues were of less concern than perhaps safety and other factors commonly ascribed to the umbrella of *in loco parentis*.

The same DAI database had one (1) match for dissertation titles with the words ‘parent’, ‘college’, and ‘expectations’. It was a study by Barber (1994) on the expectations parents and high schools students had of the transition to and first semester at college. That study also investigated family cohesion before and after the first

semester at college. The data allowed her to claim that students and parents reported a stronger bond after a first semester in college.

To support that claim Barber (1994) used the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales developed by Olson, Portner, and Bell (1982) to assess adaptability and cohesion from the perspective of the student and parent. Scores from both groups (students and parents) showed a positive relationship. Barber said that the findings meant that a stronger bond was perceived by both parents and students.

In summary, Turrentine, et al, (2000) mentioned that parents, "…are a major influence as high school students select a college (p. 31)." They referenced the work of Dubble (1995); Galotti and Mark (1994); Litten and Hall (1989); and McGinty (1992) to corroborate the positive influence parents had on the consumer end of selecting an institution. Whether it is the traditional mother and father, grandparent(s), single parent, or guardian, parents have generally been a primary factor in a student's life up to the point of entering college. Such parents, who have been integrally connected to a student's educational journey, have an emotional stake in what their child is being taught and how their child is being cared for by colleges and universities. "Parents are an important constituency for colleges (Turrentine, et al, 2000, p. 31)." Howe and Strauss (2003) rephrased that connection saying that parents and students embarking on the college selection process were "co-purchasing" (p. 69).

On many of today's college campuses, educators have identified the need to dialogue with parents during orientation sessions, and augmenting their new student orientation sessions to include sessions strictly for parents. The communicative process between educators and parents is vital, however, Vail (2001) warned that while teaching

parents often is the first step toward helping students, the trick is to engage parents in a manner that is respectful and meaningful. Encouraging parents to support and challenge their children, while encouraging them to let go is tantamount to offering to be in *loco parentis*, but without the negative connotations implied during Colonial America. This dilemma is further complicated by a dearth of information educators and administrators have about parental expectations when their children go to college.

Landmark Initiatives Investigating College Parents

During this literature review process, three initiatives from the arena of student personnel work were uncovered that appeared to have directly asked parents what they wanted from the college experience or how they (parents) expected themselves and their students to grow and transition. The first was Austin's and Sousa's (1987) College Parent Questionnaire (CPQ). The second was by Turrentine, et al (2000) reporting what parents wanted from the college experience. The third was by Barber (1994), which focused on comparing the perceptions of parents and students prior to leaving for college and again at the end of the first semester. Barber's work, summarized previously in this chapter, was not reported in any student affairs literature outside of the Dissertations Abstract International.

Austin and Sousa (1987) sought to understand parents at the start of the college process, and are regarded as the first to develop a tool for collecting relevant information from college parents. Their questionnaire asked parents to rate themselves on items such as, "Although he/she hates to admit it, I think my son/daughter is still pretty dependent upon me" or "I expect to be in frequent contact with my son/daughter" with responses

ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This tool was generally used with parents during orientation sessions as a vehicle to create dialogue amongst parents and university administrators.

The CPQ (Austin & Sousa, 1987) provided information to facilitate meaningful discussions with groups of parents about the ensuing developmental change in their lives. What the CPQ fails to do, however, is project what is important that a college or university provide or to define what a parent expects from an institution. Another concern is the CPQ is dated and does not cover topics related to technology found in American culture today, nor does it address a parent's ethnic diversity.

Austin (1993) later reported that a number of themes emerged from her use of the CPQ at her home institution and that there was, "a similarity in response patterns for first-time parents and parents who have not been to college (p. 101)." She further wrote that there was, "very little difference in response patterns between parents of daughters and parents of sons" and they had, "a desire to retain control in, or over, their students' lives (p. 101)." Additionally, she also reported that parents who perceived their students' academic or social abilities as below average were more protective as parents.

More recently, Turrentine, et al, (2000) reported on a two-year long, qualitative study including 1,382 parents, who were surveyed using interactive websites and kiosks. The authors were interested in learning the parents' hopes and fears for their college-bound children. In years one and two of the study, two separate institutions in the southeast were used, both with predominantly white student bodies.

The study allowed for claiming that the top interests of parents for their students' college career included quality education, job preparation, maturity/independence,

fun/enjoyment, graduation, friendships/networks, and academic success (Turrentine, et al, 2000). They noted that several key items were in the lower tier of interest by parents, notably, developing faith, preparing for citizenship, and experiencing diversity. The investigators concluded, "The heavy emphasis placed on job preparation among these parents mirrors the career orientation of students at many institutions, including those in this study (p. 39)."

In summary the work by Austin and Sousa (1987) and Turrentine, et al, (2000) were landmark initiatives in student affairs research and literature because they addressed the issue of parental expectations of colleges and universities. Both initiatives looked within and outside of a classroom. Additionally, Austin (1993) reported there was little difference in the responses of first-time parents when compared to those parents who previously had guided a student into college.

Literature Review, Conclusion

In conclusion, Chapter Two presented evidence that care is the core of a parent's expectations for a College or University. This chapter illustrated that: (a) historical documents regarding the establishment of higher education in North America pointed to the view that institutions of higher education initially were to be paternal, (b) parents had a developmental need to remain in a caring stance with their emerging adult child, (c) there are observable behavior changes in tomorrow's college student and their parents when compared to previous generations, and (d) considerable study is needed on the parent partner and their expectations. As a result of this literature review, three conclusions seem worthy of note.

First, the dilemma before North American higher education of whether to act in place of the parent continues to be a salient discussion for administrators and educators alike. If institutions of higher education purposefully choose to act alone when determining what is best for students and their learning, then the logical argument follows that their actions are proof those same schools are choosing to act in place of the parent. Busman (1999) said, "In short, policy makers, as well as students, parents, and the private sector, are demanding changes in the social contract between higher education and its constituencies (p. 142)." In today's marketplace the academic environment is beset by demands for accountability and responsibility from all stakeholders invested in the educational enterprise. Thus, Bickel and Lake's (1999) idea of a 'facilitator university' appears on the surface to be a model needing additional discussion and perhaps worthy of implementation as an alternative to *in loco parentis*.

Second, intergenerational effects of college students impacting the development and growth of their parents much like their parents impact their growth and development—'mutuality' as Erikson (1959) coined it—is key for educators to note. If college parents have a developmental need to ensure the next generation's growth, knowledge acquisition, and development; then colleges and university faculty and administrators must find intentional pathways to partner with parents towards those aims. Failure to not recognize this developmental need of parents to care for their young—even beyond the start of their collegiate journey—seems eerily similar to accepting *in loco parentis* as a model from which to operate. And if higher education is to reject *in loco parentis* and gravitate to a new model of 'shared responsibility' as Bickel and Lake

(1999) encouraged, then higher education must devote more research to the developmental needs of adults with children attending college.

Finally, it is understandable, why Austin and Sousa (1985), Barber (1994), and Turrentine, et al, (2000) attempted to further the information base on what parents hope and want from the collegiate journey for their children. The conclusion drawn from the literature reviewed is that not enough study on parents has been conducted, especially in light of the new students coming to campus. Failure to not study parent expectations is especially dangerous in light of the mounting evidence that students and parents of tomorrow are different from generations past.

The information in this chapter illustrated that students were more connected via multiple technologies and that multiple scholars suggested that parents were more involved in their student's lives. Fay (2003) suggested parents wished to create a perfect image for their children, and knowing that fact means it would be foolish for higher education to proceed without discovery into those same parents' expectations.

The next chapter presents a methodology for understanding the parental stakeholder. The investigator presents a process and product designed to discover the expectations parents have of colleges and universities. In the design of the survey tool employed, the investigator addressed the parental assumption of care for students by colleges and universities. The design takes note of lessons learned from Austin and Sousa's (1987) work as well as Turrentine, et al, (2000) as it focuses both on academic and non-academic life.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research examined the expectations of parents with first-year students accepted for the Fall 2005 class by Creighton University. The *Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC)* survey was developed, piloted, and validated to determine parent expectations regarding a university's ability to teach and to care for students. Participants were asked to rank the relative importance of items related to the teaching and caring functions of a university as well as provide answers to selected demographic items detailed later in this chapter.

The first part of this chapter restates the research questions and hypotheses, and explains the relevance of knowing such information. The second provides information on the PECTAC and the processes employed in the development of the PECTAC, with a focus on instrument validity. The final part of this chapter details how the study was administered; securing informants, collecting data, and the process for analysis.

Restatement of Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question One:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent? H1-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent.

Research Question Two:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent? H2-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

Research Question Three:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent? H3-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent.

Research Question Four:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent? H4-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

Research Question Five:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student? H5-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student.

Development of the PECTAC

Chapter two laid a foundation supporting three major themes related to parents of traditional-aged college students of today: a) the beginning of the college journey signals a separation process that is developmentally important for parents, (b) the student and parent of tomorrow are different from decades past, and (c) student affairs offices and higher education in general have just begun to uncover the nature of the relationship between higher education and the parent partner. The *Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC)* was constructed to investigate parental expectations regarding the importance parents placed on a University's ability to teach and care for students through various resources, programs, and services.

When developing the early version of the PECTAC instrument, the investigator was influenced by the questions and benchmarks set by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Bridges & Kuhn, 2004). The items on the NSSE were grouped into five sub-sections, three of which spoke to teaching functions of a university and two that dealt with the communicative and supportive functions of a university. The PECTAC was constructed with the goal of further understanding the parent partner; specifically the importance parents placed on the teaching and caring functions of a University (Appendix A). The PECTAC's eighty-six items were broken down into three distinct segments.

The first segment, Section 1, included twelve demographic items. Items included: gender of the parent, marital status, gender of the student, ethnicity of the parent, was English the parent's primary language, education level of the parent, number of children

in the family, prior experience as a college parent, school or college their student was entering, number of computers in the home, and type of home internet access.

As the PECTAC (Appendix A) was presented in an on-line format, the demographic items were easily completed using clickable, check-boxes. Included in the demographic items was one additional question asking parents to gauge how involved they were with their student's college decision. Participants were asked to rate their level of involvement on a four-point Likert scale with the options: very involved, somewhat involved, a little involved, and not involved at all. A four-point Likert scale was used instead of a five-point scale with a neutral option because the investigator assumed that a parent either had some level of involvement in the college choice or was not involved at all. Thus, the need for a fifth, neutral choice was deemed unimportant.

For the second and third segments of the PECTAC (Appendix A), participants indicated the importance they placed on each item using a five-point, Likert-type scale with the options: very important, important, neutral, somewhat unimportant, and unimportant. Participants also were provided a final, not-applicable option with each item. These choices were easily indicated using an online format using clickable check-boxes for each item. Each sub-section also was followed by a question asking participants to identify the two most important items in that group.

The second segment of the PECTAC, Section 2, presented forty items relating to the teaching functions of a University. The first sub-section within the teaching items was developed recognizing that technological resources have profoundly impacted teaching and are a key provision in the learning process. Items within this section were authored with this cultural change in mind. In this sub-section, fourteen items asked

parents about the technological resources they expected their student to be provided. In the second sub-section, regarding teaching, ten items asked parents about the importance they placed on active and team learning. In the final teaching sub-section, thirteen items asked participants to rate the importance they placed on out-of-class learning opportunities.

The third and final segment of the PECTAC, Section 3, offered thirty-four items relating to the caring functions of a University. Nine items in the first caring sub-section, sought the importance parents placed on administrative and faculty care of students. The next sub-section regarding caring presented participants with eleven items that sought the importance parents placed on a caring university community. The final caring sub-section included eleven items for participants to indicate the importance they placed on various ways a university could be a caring partner with parents.

Instrument Validity

An instrument can be highly reliable and still not be valid; however, reliability is a prerequisite for a valid survey. Suskie (1996) claimed a valid instrument measured that which it was constructed to measure and assumptions taken from that instrument logically were valid. Since there were no statistical tests available to determine tool validity, the investigator involved an eleven-member expert panel. The persons included in the review were considered experts who differentially worked with students, parents, technology, teaching, learning, and assessment. The panel members and their expertise as panel members are listed below.

- The Director of Cardoner at Creighton/Psychology Department Faculty Member at Creighton University (The Director of Cardoner has considerable expertise in research design and assessment. The Director also has extensive experience with instruction in the area of psychology.)
- The Director of Assessment Services, at StudentVoice.com (StudentVoice.com has been one of the leading, for-profit assessment companies available to higher education and student affairs in particular. The Director of Assessment Services has been involved in numerous projects and initiatives across the nation and has presented at numerous regional and national conferences on the assessment of teaching, learning, student attitudes and opinions.)
- The Director of the Academic Development and Technology Center (ADATC)/Pharmacy Department Faculty Member at Creighton University (The Director of the ADATC at Creighton has led Creighton as one of the leading experts in articulating the relationship between technology and learning.)
- The Assistant Vice President of Student Services for Student Life at Creighton University (The Assistant Vice President has handled the ongoing facilitation of the Creighton University Parents Council and has extensive experience working with students.)
- The Assistant Vice President of Information Technology for E-Learning at Creighton University (The Assistant Vice President has been involved in e-learning activities and training with faculty for the past eight years.)

- The Associate Vice President of Student Services for Student Learning at Creighton University (The Associate Vice President has been a leading expert in student learning environments and living-learning program design.)
- The Associate Vice President of Student Services for Residence Life/Food Services at Creighton University (The Associate Vice President had more than thirty-plus-years experience in student development work and was considered a leading expert on campus with regards to students and student behavior.)
- The Associate Vice President of Student Services for Assessment, Budget, and Research/Director of Institutional Research at Creighton University (The Associate Vice President served on the Executive Board for the University of California at Los Angeles' Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and was the leading assessment and research authority at Creighton.)
- The Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Teaching, Learning and Assessment at Creighton University (The Associate Vice President has been considered a expert with the instruction and further development of faculty with regards to teaching and assessment of learning.)
- The Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Enrollment Management at Creighton University (The Associate Vice President has been considered an expert with regards to student college choice, student retention, and parental involvement in the college choice process.)
- The Vice President of Information Technology at Creighton University (The Vice President of the Division of Information Technology has been a leading

innovator and advocate for student learning and technology.)

Additionally, all persons on the investigator's Doctoral Supervisory Committee were given the revised instrument after the expert panel review and Committee members were solicited for input on how to further improve the PECTAC. Their feedback and approval for the design phase of the PECTAC is addressed later in this chapter. The process of an expert panel review coupled with feedback from the investigator's Doctoral Committee established a process that addressed both content and the construct validity of the PECTAC. Correlations computed in this study further confirmed the construct validity of the PECTAC as is detailed in chapter four.

Expert Panel Review

The eleven member panel was provided a copy of the PECTAC survey, a feedback form, and the research questions for the study. The feedback form allowed for comments on the instrument items with regard to clarity and ease of completion. The panel also was asked to provide feedback on the relation of the items to the research questions and mention any "problems" they encountered with the survey tool. The process of asking for and incorporating expert opinion assisted in assessing the construct validity of the PECTAC while also helping to improve the clarity of instructions and item wording.

Panel members were contacted in February of 2005 by phone and then sent, via email, the PECTAC materials. Panel members were asked to provide feedback on the three sections of the PECTAC: the demographic items in section one, the teaching items

in section two, and the caring items in section three. Panel members filled out a simple feedback form and mailed or emailed their comments to the investigator. Each panel member then was called by the investigator to clarify comments and suggestions made. The investigator believed the feedback offered by the panel members to be thorough, concise, and helpful to the construction of the PECTAC.

After reviewing each panel member's feedback and discussing each member's feedback with that panel member individually, it was concluded that the items in the PECTAC did indeed relate back to the research questions posed in the study. Panelist comments followed two themes: clarity/ease of use and research design. In terms of clarity/ease of use, the following changes were made to the PECTAC as a result of the feedback from the panel: to use the term computer instead of PC throughout the survey, to provide additional options on the parent gender question, to change all references from 'they' to he/she when referring to a parent's student, and to use the term 'variety' instead of various in reference to questions about out of class opportunities.

Regarding research design, two points were raised by the panel members. The first was a concern about a possible ceiling effect occurring (on the second half of the PECTAC). Panelists pointed out that every parent wants their son/daughter to be cared for and supported. For example, one panelist mentioned in their feedback that they would always want a university or college to find additional programs, services, or tutors to help assist his children with their transition to college and the demands inherent on any collegiate campus, both academically and socially. Another panelist confirmed that perspective, suggesting that as a parent she would ideally be interested in universities and colleges providing weekly or bi-monthly advising opportunities with her student to help

guide her student academically. To accommodate for this ceiling effect it was suggested the investigator amend the PECTAC and ask parents to rank one or two items, within each sub-section, as most important for that group to help counter the concern.

Second, there were reservations about the stem language in each of the sub-sections. The original draft of the PECTAC asked a participant to note their expectations as it related to items in the survey. It was recommended to use the term 'importance' in the stem of each sub-sections' instructions rather than the term 'expect'. The purpose was to more clearly relate the item back to the study's research questions. Originally each stem on the second and third sections of the PECTAC, dealing with the teaching and caring functions of a university respectively, read as follows:

- As a parent, do you expect the University provide your student with…
- As a parent, do you expect that at college your student will…
- As a parent, do you expect that your student should…
- As a parent, do you expect that upon arriving at college your student finds…
- As a parent, do you expect the University…

The concern by the panelists regarding the use of the term 'expect' was noted and modifications were made to the PECTAC instrument. The PECTAC instructions on the second and third sections were amended to read:

- As a parent, how important is it to you that the University provide your student with…
- As a parent, how important is it to you that at college your student will…
- As a parent, how important is it to you that your student should…

- As a parent, how important is it to you that upon arriving at college your student finds…
- As a parent, how important is it to you that the University…

After the expert panel review, the investigator took the revised PECTAC to a meeting with the investigator's Doctoral Supervisory Committee. The committee provided three additional issues needing reconciliation. First, they questioned the use of a parent's gender or the gender of a student as a variable in the study. Members of the Doctoral Committee stated that they did not believe that gender would be a likely predictor in the study. They mentioned to the investigator that a parent—whether male or female—would likely want the best for their student, regardless of the gender of the student.

Second, the Committee said the survey was too narrow in scope and needed more student behavior-type items, such as: alcohol, drugs, parental notification, and other behavior-related items. They stated that today's college campus was full of alcohol-related crises, student deaths related to drugs, and mental health issues—to name but a few—and that the PECTAC should be amended to reflect this reality of today's college campus.

Third, the committee said the expert panel, while a good feedback step in the design of the PECTAC, could not support the construct validity of the instrument. They suggested that more information and feedback was needed specifically from parents of college students.

The Doctoral Committee asked the investigator to reconcile these three concerns by use of a Delphi-type process. It was suggested that two pilot studies be conducted with an additional follow-up focus group of participants from the pilot studies. For the pilot studies, the supervisory committee recommended that participants be asked to rank items on the PECTAC as ‘good to ask’, ‘ok, to ask’, or ‘do not ask’ in order to help the investigator refine items in sections two (teaching functions of a University) and three (caring functions of a University) of the PECTAC. The Committee also requested the investigator to provide a section at the end of the PECTAC for participants to add comments or suggest questions/items for the survey with each of the two pilot studies.

Finally, the Committee requested the investigator to facilitate a focus group of parents between the first and second pilot studies, supply those participants with results from the first pilot study, and seek additional feedback on the PECTAC’s design. The Committee charged the investigator with the task of inquiring from the focus group about the use of parent and student gender as a variable in this study.

Parent Pilot Studies and Focus Group

As mentioned in the last section, a Delphi-type process was completed by the investigator involving two pilot studies and a focus group of parents who participated in the first pilot study. The pilot studies were conducted using Creighton University’s WebSurveyor tool, a web-enabled survey software package. Each pilot study and the focus group involved current parents of Creighton students, either chosen from the Creighton University Parents Council or at-large from all current Creighton parents.

All Parents Council participants received an email from Ms. Tanya Winegard, Assistant Vice President for Student Life and advisor to the Parents Council, to inform them they would be asked to voluntarily assist in the pilot studies and the focus group before initial contact was made by the investigator. The pilot studies were done after the investigator was certified by the Human Subjects Research training provided through Creighton University's Institutional Review Board office (Appendix C). The investigator also sought and obtained IRB approval from both Creighton University (Appendix D) and the University of Nebraska - Lincoln (Appendix E).

The first pilot study was completed by 31 participants of the Creighton University Parents Council. Participants were asked to rank items on the PECTAC as 'good to ask', 'ok, to ask', or 'do not ask'. Comments led to the inclusion of several new items for the survey as well as the deletion of some items. Those parents suggested new items in three specific categories: student behavior, parental notification, and options for additional training/learning opportunities for their students. They also suggested deleting items that involved specific technologies such as streaming audio/video, Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), and instant messaging. Those items were ranked as 'do not ask' by the parents, which was interpreted by the investigator to mean that they should not be presented in future versions of the PECTAC.

Upon summarizing the information from the first pilot study, the investigator held a focus group on April 16, 2005 with 28 of the 31 participants from the first pilot study. The focus group was conducted during the Parent Council's annual spring meeting. The group met for approximately forty-five minutes on Creighton's campus and the participants were provided results from the initial round of the pilot study. The

investigator summarized the descriptive findings and then illustrated lists of items suggested to be added and to be deleted. The investigator then asked participants: their opinions on the issue of using gender as a variable in the study, their opinions on the PECTAC in relation to the research questions posed in this study, and what further suggestions they had for the survey instrument itself.

The focus group participants began by mentioning how pleased they were that the University was interested in studying their expectations of the institution. They agreed the PECTAC was comprehensive and seemed to ask about all aspects of campus life. Surprisingly, all parents claimed that it was important to look at the gender of parents and not of the students. That fact was justification for its inclusion in the final version of the instrument.

The second pilot study was completed by 10 of the 31 participants from the initial group of parents. An additional seven parents also completed the second round pilot study. The additional seven parent participants had been suggested by two members of the investigator's expert panel because of a concern that more faculty needed to be involved in the PECTAC design process. The seven additional parents were faculty members at Creighton University. Participants of the second pilot study were asked to complete the survey and again asked to rank items as 'good to ask', 'ok, to ask', or 'do not ask'. As was done in the first pilot study, this process helped further refine the PECTAC. Comments received from the second pilot study were interpreted to mean the parents were pleased with the survey's design and interested in knowing the full study's results. One item was changed as a result of the second pilot study. It dealt with the importance of leaving college with more information technology skills, and was amended

to read, ‘Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise.’

Faculty Focus Group

Upon completion of the second pilot study, the investigator received a phone call from a Faculty member at Creighton who also happened to be one of the seven additional pilot study participants. Her recommendation was that if the investigator planned to provide a report back to the Creighton community on the PECTAC’s findings, that it would be wise to provide the same small group of faculty members who participated in the second pilot study an opportunity to provide input and feedback on the PECTAC in person—specifically those items relating to teaching and learning. Upon receiving this recommendation, the investigator conferred with his Dissertation Advisor regarding the idea of creating a Faculty Focus Group on the PECTAC. The idea was approved and the group met on Creighton’s campus on May 16, 2005.

The seven faculty members met with the investigator for approximately 90 minutes. Each participant was provided with a copy of the revised PECTAC survey as well as the proposed research questions. They were asked three questions: their opinion on the issue of using gender as a variable, their opinion on the PECTAC in relation to the research questions, and suggestions for further strengthening the survey. They reported the PECTAC to be well-constructed and there was interest in the scope and direction of the research questions. The comments and recommendations received during the focus group meeting are delineated into four themes below.

Student and Parent Gender

The group agreed it was important to consider gender of a parent, but not a student. Several of the faculty members explained that whether it was their son or their daughter they would still want the best from a school whether in regards to teaching or caring. One faculty member suggested that they fully expected there would be no relevance to further investigating the gender of a student except in the case of one item dealing with campus safety and security. This feedback, coupled with the input from the parent focus group, led the investigator to delete two research questions using gender of the student as a predictor variable.

However, based upon individual experiences the participants suggested that they expected or wanted different things for their offspring from a college or university than did their spouse. They reflected, as a group, that they believed it was not indicative of their role as faculty members, but rather that there were real differences in the expectations a male and female parent brought to the college decision process. This input supported the investigator's decision to leave parent gender as a variable on two of the research questions.

Concerns Regarding Parent Orientation

Those seven faculty participants mentioned, on several occasions, that the PECTAC items related back to the research questions and they were pleased someone was asking parents of Creighton students about their expectations of the postsecondary experience. Two additional comments continued to surface: whether orientation sessions for parents were constructed correctly; and whether parents truly understood FERPA

(Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) and the limit to which faculty were allowed to share academic information with a parent. To the first of those two comments, several of the faculty lamented they repeatedly were asked to sit on panels during recruitment sessions in the spring for the admissions office and again during the summer for college orientation sessions. They shared that they often wondered if parents are receiving the information they need to help their son or daughter. As a group they shared with the investigator their hope that the results of this study might be a feedback loop to those who design recruitment and orientation programs.

The other concern noted was an apparent lack of parental understanding regarding FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act). The seven participants vividly related stories of parents not understanding the change in the relationship between teacher and parent from high school to college. One faculty member related a story with a father who thought the university would set up parent-teacher conferences during the student's first semester at the school. Again, the group noted that if any line items spoke to this disconnect, that the findings be shared with those who communicate with parents and coordinate parent orientation sessions in order to make this more clear to parents.

Existing Item Amendments

One of the first suggestions they made for the teaching functions segment of the PECTAC survey was that the initial sub-section, within the teaching group of items, needed to be titled as technological resources in support of learning, and sequentially organized to reflect how a student (and parent) might experience them. Items pertaining

to registering for classes and paying tuition via the web subsequently were re-positioned ahead of items such as access to computer labs.

The participants also removed selected modifiers from some items to obviate misleading a respondent or unnecessarily loading an items' importance. The first change suggested included removing the term 'quality' from two items relating to the student health center and the counseling center, and to remove the term 'more' from an item relating to a student knowing a faculty member on a personal level. The last change suggested was to add the term 'illegally' to the item relating to notifying the parent if the student was drinking. This was important to the faculty group to add in the event that an incoming student was of legal drinking age.

Proposed New Items

The final group of suggestions came in the form of proposed new items. The first was in the learning section of the PECTAC, in the sub-section entitled 'technological resources provided in the support of learning'. It was believed important to have an item added about the ease of paying tuition and fees via the web, as well as having an item regarding email access to the academic advisor. The faculty mentioned that based on other technological-related items within the PECTAC that those two items were necessary add-ons, because they considered them normal services a parent might expect, based on their own life experience as a parent.

The second related to services the university provided students within the teaching and caring functions of an institution. It was stated that there was a need to assess parent expectations on the amount of information provided to their student upon

entry to Creighton. They suggested the following items be included: have access to services and resources in the greater city area, have access to career counseling and placement services, and provide me (the parent) with my student's major and degree programs information via a website.

The last item suggested was related to the mission and character of the university used as the research site for this study. The investigator was urged to include an item asking parents to determine the relative importance of their son or daughter being instructed by a Jesuit priest. The group believed it was of particular importance considering Creighton University is a religious university, one which often touts that it will shape and guide a parent's offspring in a Catholic context. These items were all added to the PECTAC, as suggested by the faculty participants.

Research Study Administration, Introduction

The concluding section of this chapter details the survey population and administration of the tool, as well as the data analysis rationale and statistical procedures used. Before initiating research proper human subjects certification was secured through Creighton University's Institutional Review Board (Appendix B), and the study was approved by Creighton University's Institutional Review Board (Appendix D) and by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's (UNL) Institutional Review Board (Appendix C).

Survey Population and Administration

The population identified for the administration of the PECTAC included all parents with students accepted into Creighton University's Fall 2005 Freshman class as

of May 19, 2005. Creighton University's Office of Admissions closed the incoming, freshman class as of May 1st. The investigator requested that the Office of Admissions send a data file that included the following information: student last Name, student first name, address, city, state, zip code, student email address, parent email, mother's first name, mother's last name, father's first name, and father's last name. The investigator further requested the data file be constructed approximately 10-15 business days past the May 1st deadline to allow for any additional student registrations, changes in status, etc. For the purposes of this study, non-probability sampling was used. It was the intent to receive responses from a majority of parents with offspring likely to attend Creighton in the Fall of 2005. Thus, the population frame for this study included all parents of prospective students accepted at Creighton University as of May 19, 2005.

On May 19, 2005, the Office of Admissions at Creighton University reported 996 students were deposited—indicating their intent to enroll in Creighton's Fall 2005 first-year class. Of those 996 students, approximately 99% reported a current email address for themselves and 35.4% reported at least one or more email addresses for their parent(s). According to the data received from the Office of Admissions, the total number of parents available to participate in the study was 1,867.

Parent participants in the survey population who had given Creighton University an email address were emailed a letter on May 26, 2005 inviting their participation. All other parent participants were contacted via a mailed letter (Appendix F). Approximately 76% of the participants ultimately were contacted via email versus the mailed invitation letter.

Participants were given information specific to Institutional Review Board requirements at Creighton University and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The parents also were asked to go to a specific website to complete the survey. The survey was closed after 26 days (June 20, 2005). In all communications and reminders to potential participants, the investigator provided the option to contact the investigator to receive a paper copy of the survey. One such request was received (June 4, 2005) and it was mailed the following day. It was not returned by the June 30, 2005 deadline set for a paper copy submission.

As required by the Institutional Review Boards at Creighton University and University of Nebraska-Lincoln, all contact and consent information was included on the web-based survey or via any paper copies sent. Participants were sent one mailing reminder and two email reminders in addition to the initial requests to participate in the survey. The mailing reminder and email reminders went out to all participants even if they had already participated in the survey, because there was no tracking of participants.

Data Analysis Rationale

"It is frequently said that science is empirical. That is, scientific investigation is based on making observations (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000, p. 5)." Data analysis, therefore, is part of the scientific process that enables an investigator to make certain observations and infer certain conclusions and then allow for an investigator to ask new, additional questions. This process, one of posing a question, researching it, drawing inferences statistically, arriving at answers, and developing new areas for study is at the heart of the spirit of scientific exploration. The study's intent was to explore the

similarities and differences in expectations of parents based on the gender of the parent and the parent's status as a first-time college parent. For the first four research questions two variables—gender of the parent and status as a first-time college parent—were used as predictor variables on the outcome variables of teaching and caring.

Statistical Procedures

A statistical consultant with the University of Nebraska Lincoln's NEAR Center recommended that a factor analysis would be appropriate as a data reduction method. The investigator used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) so that two variables could be expressed as one factor. In this study, gender of the parent and first experience as a college parent were combined when looking into differences on the caring and teaching scales.

Upon completing a PCA, a 2X2 MANOVA was used to answer research questions one and two about teaching functions of a university, and questions three and four about caring functions. Gravetter and Wallnau (2000) defined analysis of variance (ANOVA) as, "…a hypothesis-testing procedure that is used to evaluate mean differences between two or more treatments (or populations) (p. 397)." The MANOVA procedure was useful for this study as four of the research hypotheses compared two distinct groups. For the fifth and final research question, a dependent samples t-test was used to reject the null hypothesis, and is reported in chapter four.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter begins with a summary of the survey administration, demographic findings, and the findings for each of the sub-sections' most important items. It then details the Principal Component Analysis and reliability analysis for each of the sub-scales for the teaching and caring variables, including correlations computed for each sub-section variable. The chapter concludes with a description of the results pertaining to each of the five research questions.

Survey Administration Summary

The PECTAC was available to participants for completion via the web for 26 days, from Thursday, May 26, 2005 until Monday, June 20, 2005. One paper copy was requested and the respondent was given a window of 25 days for completion. Of the 1867 possible participants, 476 completed the survey for a return rate of 25.49%. Using a population N of 1867, a sample n of 476, and at a 95% confidence level, the sampling error rate was calculated to be +/- 3.9% for the findings in this study.

Demographic Item Findings

Participants who completed the PECTAC responded to 12 demographic items. Generally, respondents reported themselves as Caucasian, married, owning two or more computers, English as their native language, and having been 'very involved' in their student's college choice. A majority (79.4%) reported they had broadband computer

access using DSL or Cable connections, 85.5% reported having at least an earned Bachelors Degree or a two-year Associate Degree, and 60.7% reported having three or more children.

Table 4.1 illustrates Parent Gender. Of the 476 respondents to the survey, 466 replied to the Parent Gender item. Of those 466, 61.9% (n=294) reported themselves as 'Female', while 38.1% (n=181) reported themselves as 'Male'. One respondent did not indicate a choice between the two gender options presented in the PECTAC. The researcher concluded that the respondent either mistakenly forgot to indicate their gender on the web survey before continuing to the next step or chose not to participate on that item. The researcher further concluded that the respondent may have chosen not to participate based on the limited options available in response to the parent gender item as there were not options such as 'transgender' or 'other'. That respondent subsequently was removed from further analysis in this study due to the fact that gender was a variable in all five research questions.

Table 4.1: PECTAC Parent Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	294	61.8	61.9	61.9
	Male	181	38.0	38.1	100.0
	Total	475	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		476	100.0		

The next demographic item on the PECTAC dealt with Parent Marital Status. Table 4.2 shows the results of that item. Of all respondents answering the Parent Marital Status item, 91.8% (n=434) reported themselves as 'Married'; 6.1% (n=29) reported

themselves as ‘Divorced’; .8% (n=4) reported themselves as ‘Divorced and Single Parent’; .6% (n=3) reported themselves as ‘Widowed’; and .4% (n=2) reported themselves as ‘Single Parent’. The range of options for the parent marital status item were presented for respondents due to feedback received from the initial panel review phase of PECTAC development. Several panel members had suggested to the researcher that a limited yes/no, two-option set for the parent marital status might offend participants and thus it had been recommended to provide additional options for respondents to clarify their status.

Table 4.2 also shows that three respondents did not report their marital status. The researcher concluded that the respondents may not have answered for the following reasons: they mistakenly went to the next item, they were uncomfortable with the selections, an appropriate option had not been provided, or they chose not to divulge their marital status.

Table 4.2: PECTAC Parent Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	434	91.2	91.8	91.8
	Divorced	29	6.1	6.1	97.9
	Single Parent	2	.4	.4	98.3
	Widowed	3	.6	.6	98.9
	Married and Divorced	1	.2	.2	99.2
	Divorced and Single Parent	4	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	473	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.3 illustrates parents reporting on their incoming students' gender. As the table reveals, 51.9% (n=245) said that their student was 'Female'. Four parents chose not to report on their student's gender or mistakenly forgot to record one of the options provided for that item.

Table 4.3: PECTAC Student Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	245	51.5	51.9	51.9
	Male	227	47.7	48.1	100.0
	Total	472	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.8		
Total		476	100.0		

In terms of parent ethnicity, Table 4.4 shows the results obtained. Of the parents participating in this study, 87.7% (n=413) reported their ethnicity was 'Caucasian'. This relatively ethnically homogeneous group did include five participants (1.1%) who reported themselves as 'African-American/Black', four (.8%) as 'Pacific Islander', two (.4%) as 'Puerto Rican', three (.6%) as 'Other Latino', and an additional 34 participants (7.2%) self-reported as 'Other/Mixed Ethnicity'. Three respondents did not indicate an ethnicity and the researcher concluded they mistakenly missed the item and proceeded to the next step in the survey, did not find an appropriate option, or were uncomfortable with the options provided and chose not to indicate a response.

Table 4.4: PECTAC Parent Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African American/Black	5	1.1	1.1	1.1
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	.4	.4	1.5
	Caucasian	413	86.8	87.7	89.2
	Mexican American/Chicano	8	1.7	1.7	90.9
	Pacific Islander	4	.8	.8	91.7
	Puerto Rican	2	.4	.4	92.1
	Other Latino	3	.6	.6	92.8
	Other/Mixed Ethnicity	34	7.1	7.2	100.0
	Total	471	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.1		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.5 illustrates responses indicating whether English was a parent's first language. Parent respondents overwhelming indicated that English was their first language as 96.8% (n=456) reported 'Yes' to that item. Five respondents made no response to this item and the researcher concluded that participants either mistakenly did not answer that item or were not comfortable divulging such information.

Table 4.5: PECTAC Parent First Language as English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	15	3.2	3.2	3.2
	Yes	456	95.8	96.8	100.0
	Total	471	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.1		
Total		476	100.0		

In terms of completed education, Table 4.6 shows that 14.5% (n=68) of the parent participants self-reported the highest level of education was a high school diploma. Of those continuing their education beyond high school: 11.3% (n=53) reported earning an

‘Associates or other two-year Degree’; 40.3% (n=189) reported earning a ‘Bachelor’s’ Degree; 22.2% (n=104) reported earning a ‘Master’s’ degree; and 11.7% (n=55) reported earning a ‘PhD or terminal Degree’. Seven parent participants did not make a response on their highest level of education completed. The researcher determined that this could have been due to respondent error, with the item’s response options, or discomfort disclosing their educational level.

Table 4.6: PECTAC Parent Highest Level of Education Completed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school	68	14.3	14.5	14.5
	Bachelor’s	189	39.7	40.3	54.8
	Master’s	104	21.8	22.2	77.0
	PhD or terminal degree	55	11.6	11.7	88.7
	Associates or other two-year degree	53	11.1	11.3	100.0
	Total	469	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	7	1.5		
Total		476	100.0		

As mentioned previously at the beginning of the demographic findings section, 60.7% (n=284) reported having three or more children. Table 4.7 illustrates the number of children reported by parent participants. Only 5.8% (n=27) of the participants in the study indicated having ‘1 child’, but 43 respondents (9.2%) reported having ‘5 or more children’. Of all those participating in the PECTAC survey, seven participants did not indicate any answer in relation to number of children. The researcher concluded that respondents either mistakenly forgot to record an answer, perhaps were not legal parents, or were not comfortable providing a response.

Table 4.7: PECTAC Parent Number of Children

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 child	27	5.7	5.8	5.8
	2 children	157	33.0	33.5	39.3
	3 children	162	34.0	34.6	73.9
	4 children	79	16.6	16.9	90.8
	5 or more children	43	9.0	9.2	100.0
	Total	468	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.7		
Total		476	100.0		

Two of the research questions required information on a parent participant's status as a First-time College Parent. As Table 4.8 shows, 50.7% (n=237) reported their student attending Creighton in the Fall of 2005 was their first experience as a college parent. Almost half of the respondents, 49.3% (n=230), responded they had previously been a parent of a college student. An additional nine respondents did not record an answer to this item. The researcher concluded that respondents either did not understand the item or mistakenly forgot to indicate their answer before continuing with the survey.

Table 4.8: PECTAC First-time College Parent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	230	48.3	49.3	49.3
	Yes	237	49.8	50.7	100.0
	Total	467	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.9		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.9 illustrates the college/school choices of students entering Creighton in the Fall of 2005, as understood by parent participants. 'Arts and Sciences' was indicated most often with 74.7% (n=349); 14.8% (n=69) responded that their student would enter 'Business'; 6.6% (n=31) indicated 'Nursing'; and 3.9% (n=18) indicated 'Don't

Know/Unsure'. Another nine respondents either chose not to answer, mistakenly did not record an answer, or thought another option needed to be made available and thus did not record an answer.

Table 4.9: PECTAC College/School Student is Entering

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Arts and Sciences	349	73.3	74.7	74.7
	Business	69	14.5	14.8	89.5
	Nursing	31	6.5	6.6	96.1
	Don't Know/Unsure	18	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	467	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.9		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.10 on the next page shows the 466 valid responses to the item regarding parental involvement in the college selection process. It was calculated that 92.9% (n=433) of the parent participants were 'Very Involved' (57.7% or 269) or 'Somewhat Involved' (35.2% or 164) in their student's college selection process. Four parents (.9%) reported 'Not involved at all' and 29 (6.2%) reported having been 'A little involved'. An additional ten parents did not indicate their level of involvement with their student's college selection process and the researcher determined that respondents either erred by not responding or chose not to indicate a response.

Table 4.10: PECTAC Parent Involvement in College Selection Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not involved at all	4	.8	.9	.9
	A little involved	29	6.1	6.2	7.1
	Somewhat involved	164	34.5	35.2	42.3
	Very Involved	269	56.5	57.7	100.0
	Total	466	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.1		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.11 illustrates the number of household computers and of those responding 100.0% (n=466) indicated having at least '1 computer' in their household, while 36.6% (n=174) respondents reported '3 or more Computers'. Ten respondents did not give an answer. The researcher determined that the lack of an option indicating no household computers or respondent error produced the missing results.

Table 4.11: PECTAC Number of Household Computers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Computer	131	27.5	28.1	28.1
	2 Computers	161	33.8	34.5	62.7
	3 or more Computers	174	36.6	37.3	100.0
	Total	466	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.1		
Total		476	100.0		

Table 4.12 shows the type of internet access found at a parent's place of residence. Three hundred and seventy (79.4%) of parent participants reported 'DSL/Cable' as their type of internet access, which indicated that a majority of the respondents had access to a high-speed Internet connection. An additional 85 respondents (18.2%) reported having 'Dial up' access, four respondents (.9%) reported 'Other', and an additional seven participants (1.5%) reported 'None'. Ten respondents

did not complete this item and it was concluded that respondents either mistakenly forgot to answer this item or chose not to answer.

Table 4.12: PECTAC Type of Internet Access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	7	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Dial up	85	17.9	18.2	19.7
	DSL / Cable	370	77.7	79.4	99.1
	Other	4	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	466	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.1		
Total		476	100.0		

In summary, the first twelve items of the PECTAC provided the researcher with demographic information on the respondents. The researcher concluded that the respondents were a very homogeneous group considering variables such as ethnicity, marital status, education, and computer access. The researcher also concluded that the observed homogeneity subjectively was congruent with past incoming Freshman classes at Creighton University.

Sub-Section Most Important Items, Findings

In addition to the 12 demographic items, the PECTAC had 74 items asking parents to record the importance they placed on the teaching and caring functions of a university. Six of these additional 74 items asked participants to rank the two most important in each of the sub-sections for teaching and caring as the researcher intended to learn what was most important to parents. However, on these items there were two important aspects to note: a participant was not ‘required’ to complete these six items

and a participant could have identified only one item—and not two items—as most important. The frequency of items selected as most important for each of the PECTAC sub-sections are presented in Tables 4.13 through 4.18.

For the first teaching sub-section: Technology Resources Provided in Support of Learning, Table 4.13 illustrates the items in that sub-section selected by parents as most important. For example, the item 'High-speed Internet access in her/his residence hall room' (n=142) was narrowly selected over 'Email access to her/his faculty instructor' as the most important item of 'Technology Resources' by parent respondents. Meanwhile, the item 'Access to textbooks required and ordering via a website' (n=9) was the least indicated item. All items within the 'Technology Resources' sub-section received at least one vote from a parent participant indicating it as most important.

Table 4.13: Items by Importance for 'Technology Resources'

Item	Frequency
High-speed Internet access in her/his residence hall room	142
Email access to her/his faculty instructor	141
Email access to her/his academic advisor	97
Web access to register/drop/add courses and view tuition and fees	75
Wireless Internet access throughout campus	74
Specific academic advising information via a website for my student	54
Access to computer labs	52
A University-provided portable computer	51
Web access to view tuition and fees and financial aid information	44
Training on the University library's digital resources	44
General academic advising information via a website	41
Academic content delivered via a course website	40
Access to a University-provided email account	37
Access to textbooks required and ordering via a website	9
Total Respondents	452

Table 4.14 presents the findings for the teaching sub-section: Active & Team Learning. Of the 437 parent respondents, the item 'Be given consistent feedback on

written work (research papers, journals, etc.)' (n=272) and 'Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise' (n=200) were the highest in frequency. Perhaps surprisingly, only 7 parents indicated that the item 'Learn via an online course' was most important. All items within the 'Active & Team Learning' sub-section received at least one vote from a parent participant indicating it as most important.

Table 4.14: Items by Importance for 'Active & Team Learning'

Item	Frequency
Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)	272
Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise	200
Discuss and critique ideas from readings with other students and the instructor during course	118
Participate in community-based or service-based course projects	93
Use the Internet to research an assignment	76
Outperform the faculty instructor's expectations	54
Present in front of peers and the instructor using technological means	35
Complete assignments via a course website	13
Learn via an online course	7
Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging	3
Total Respondents	437

For the last teaching sub-section 'Out of Class Learning Opportunities', Table 4.15 illustrates the resulting frequency of each item. Of the four most important items in this sub-section: 'Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested' (n=190) and 'Access to student tutoring and academic support' (n=116) were directly related to academic support while 'Be provided with opportunities for internships' (n=173) and 'Have access to career counseling and placement services' (n=148) dealt with institutional expectations to assist in a student's post-graduation employment needs.

Interesting to note, only 10 parents noted the item 'Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture' as most important in this sub-section. All items within the 'Out of Class Learning Opportunities' sub-section received at least one vote from a parent participant indicating it as most important.

Table 4.15: Items by Importance for 'Out of Class Learning Opportunities'

Item	Frequency
Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested	190
Be provided with opportunities for internships	173
Have access to career counseling and placement services	148
Access to student tutoring and academic support	116
Be provided with opportunities for service and volunteerism	56
Be provided with information on developing good morals	46
Be provided with training on how to be more responsible	46
Use technology to complete a practicum or internship	23
Have opportunities to socialize in group activities	22
Have opportunities to join a variety of clubs and organizations	22
Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture	10
Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed	5
Have access to services and resources in the greater city area	5
Total Respondents	431

For the first caring sub-section: 'A Caring Faculty', Table 4.16 illustrates the frequency of each of the items. As indicated in Table 4.16, the item 'Have regular contact with her/his academic advisor' (n=175) was the most important item for parents. Other items reported as very important to parents listed in descending order were; 'Be treated fairly by the course instructor(s) (n=154); 'Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant' (n=139); and 'Develop plans for a major with her/his academic advisor' (n=137). It is also important to note that the items 'Be known by her/his course instructor(s)' (n=70) and 'Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member' (n=67) also were noted as important by parents. All items within the 'A

Caring Faculty' sub-section received at least one vote from a parent participant indicating it as most important.

Table 4.16: Items by Importance for 'A Caring Faculty'

Item	Frequency
Have regular contact with her/his academic advisor	175
Be treated fairly by the course instructor(s)	154
Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant	139
Develop plans for a major with her/his academic advisor	137
Be known by her/his course instructor(s)	70
Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member	67
Have access to her/his course instructor(s) outside of class	61
Receive information on additional tutoring from her/his course instructor	34
Be provided the opportunity to give feedback on her/his course instructor(s)	13
Total Respondents	426

Table 4.17 illustrates the frequency of items selected as most important by parents in the caring sub-section entitled 'A Caring University Community'. Interesting to note based on the setting of this survey, the item 'Courses where she/he is instructed by a Jesuit priest' (n=36) received relatively little interest from parents as the most important items in the sub-section. As for the most important items in this sub-section, two items stood out: 'Opportunities to explore her/his leadership potential' (n=131) and 'Opportunities to grow in her/his faith life' (n=118). The item 'Programs welcoming your student to campus life' did not receive any votes as the most important item while all other items in the sub-section received at least one vote.

Table 4.17: Items by Importance for 'A Caring University Community'

Item	Frequency
Opportunities to explore her/his leadership potential	131
Opportunities to grow in her/his faith life	118
Programs orienting her/him to collegiate life	115
A University community that appreciates the uniqueness of each student	108
Support and challenge like a parent might give	100
Opportunities to welcome each student during their first semester	86
Health care at the student health center	58
Courses where she/he is instructed by a Jesuit priest	36
A friend in her/his RA (Resident Advisor), if living on campus	29
Care at the student counseling center	18
Programs welcoming your student to campus life	0
Total Respondents	423

The final caring sub-section of the PECTAC was entitled 'Being in Partnership with Parents' and each item within the sub-section received at least one vote from a parent participant indicating it as most important. Results of this sub-section are shown in Table 4.18. The item 'Provide a safe and secure campus' (n=306) was clearly an overwhelmingly important item to parents. Also of note were two academic items highly regarded by parents: 'Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis' (n=173) and 'Provide my student additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested' (n=149). Similarly, two behavioral items were least regarded by parents: 'Notify me if my student is drinking illegally' (n=10) and 'Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing' (n=10).

Table 4.18: Items by Importance for 'Being in Partnership with Parents'

Item	Frequency
Provide a safe and secure campus	306
Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis	173
Provide my student additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested	149
Have my calls returned by members of the faculty or administration within 24hrs	46
Orient me as to how I will be involved in my student's education	34
Provide me with my student's major and degree progress information via a website	32
Notify me if my student is using illegal substances	28
Discipline my student fairly if she/he breaks University policies and procedures	26
Provide my student unlimited visits at the student counseling center, if needed	21
Notify me if my student is drinking illegally	10
Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing	10
Total Respondents	418

In summary, this section presented items within each sub-section that participants indicated were the most important. However, these questions were removed from further analyses by the investigator for two reasons. First, the investigator determined they were not statistically useful in answering the research questions posed in this study. Second, the researcher interpreted the results of Cronbach's alpha on each of the sub-sections to mean that each group of items reliably measured the same underlying concept, as is illustrated later in this chapter. Thus, ranking the two most important items in a sub-section was no longer useful for this research and the six items were stricken from further analysis.

Principal Component Analysis

As mentioned in the prior section of this chapter, six items were removed from further analysis for the purposes of answering the research questions posed in this study.

Of the remaining 68 items; 37 teaching items were assigned labels of T1 up to T37 for ease of describing them within the teaching section. Similarly, the 31 caring items were assigned labels of C1 up to C31. Listwise deletion was performed to filter the data so that Principal Component Analysis could be used. Through the use of Listwise deletion it was found that several responses were missing within the teaching sub-sections. Parents who had missing scores in the teaching items were excluded from the Principal Components Analyses on the teaching and caring sections (N=364), as it was assumed those missing scores occurred randomly.

Principal Component Analysis was used as an extraction method with the remaining items within the teaching and caring sections. The three components within the teaching section were technology resources, out of class learning opportunities, and active and team learning. The three components of teaching accounted for 37.452% of the variability; 22.449% by technology resources, 8.625% by out of class learning opportunities, and 6.378% by active and team learning. A factor analysis was used to accomplish the goal to derive a parsimonious and interpretable solution given the set of items. The three components within the teaching section were identified after items were analyzed to determine if they double-loaded, loaded on the wrong factor, or did not meet a minimum criterion for pattern and structure loading of .4. Using that structure, seven items were dropped from further analysis. Items remaining met this structure and were grouped by the three factors: items T1-T10 and T12-T14 made up the first factor of Technology Resources; factor two was comprised of items T25-28, T31-T34, T36, and T37 which was labeled as out of class learning opportunities; and the final factor, active and team learning, was made up of items T15-T20 and T22.

In the same way, Principal Component Analysis again was used with the caring section. It was determined that the three components within the caring items accounted for 45.308% of the variability; 28.782% by caring university community, 9.239% by being in partnership with parents, and 7.287% by caring faculty. Using the same structure as was used with the teaching items, five items were dropped. Those items remaining were grouped by three factors: items C10-C19 were called caring university community; items C21, C22, C25, C26, C28, C29, and C31 made up being in partnership with parents; and items C1-C9 comprised the last factor, a caring faculty.

Appendix F illustrates the specific PECTAC items that were dropped as a result of factor analysis.

PECTAC Reliability

In chapter three the investigator explained how pilot studies and a Delphi-type approach was followed to validate the instrument. Because of that approach and due to the fact that the PECTAC was a non-standardized survey designed for this research study, it was necessary to determine its reliability. To do so, within each teaching sub-section (technology resources, active and team learning, and out of class learning), Cronbach coefficients were computed as shown in Table 4.19. Sample sizes varied due to the number of valid responses from sub-section to sub-section. The sample sizes for the remaining items in each sub-section not excluded previously by factor analysis were: technology resources (n=445), active and team learning (n=433), and out of class learning (n=375). Cronbach coefficients calculated using responses are shown behind

each factor: technology resources (.836); active and team learning (.721); and out of class learning (.762).

Table 4.19: PECTAC Teaching Sub-Section Reliability

Teaching sub-sections		
Technology Resources	Active and Team Learning	Out of Class Learning
.836 (*) n=445	.721 (*) n=433	.762 (*) n=375

* - Cronbach's coefficient alphas greater than 0.7 are considered reliable.

Similarly with the caring sub-sections (caring faculty, caring university community, and being in partnership with parents), Cronbach coefficients were computed as Table 4.20 shows. Sample sizes varied due to the number of valid responses from sub-section to sub-section. The sample sizes for the remaining items in each sub-section not excluded previously by factor analysis were: caring faculty (n=425), caring university community (n=409), and partnership with parents (n=411). Cronbach alpha values calculated were: caring faculty (.808); caring university community (.832); and being in partnership with parents (.842).

Table 4.20: PECTAC Caring Sub-Section Reliability

Caring sub-sections		
Caring Faculty	Caring University Community	Partnership with Parents
.808 (*) n=425	.832 (*) n=409	.842 (*) n=411

* - Cronbach's coefficient alphas greater than 0.7 are considered reliable.

Cronbach's coefficients above 0.7 are considered acceptable for most social science studies (Nunnally, 1978). Correlation tests result in values between 1.00 and .00 with any value above .78 representing strong correlation. The investigator interpreted

those results to mean that the PECTAC's sub-sections reliably measured that which they were constructed to measure. For example, the teaching sub-section of technology resources had a Cronbach's coefficient of .836. The coefficient was greater than .7 which Nunnally (1978) suggested as acceptable for a social science study. Hence, the investigator concluded that items within the technology resources sub-section reliably measured the component entitled technology resources.

It also is important to mention that a total reliability score was computed for the teaching and caring sections, as illustrated by Table 4.21. Using the remaining items not excluded by factor analysis, the reliability for the total teaching items was .872, while the reliability for the total caring items was .897. These results mean that the items within each major section (teaching and caring) reliably measured the component or factor they were constructed to measure. That was important when addressing the last question posed in this research study.

Table 4.21: Reliability of Teaching and Caring Items

Reliability Score by PECTAC Section	
Teaching Items	Caring Items
.872	.897

Variable Correlations

Correlations for variables (technology resources, active and team learning, and out of class learning) within the teaching section are presented in Table 4.22. Correlations between variables were statistically significant at or beyond the 0.01 level using a two-tailed test. A two-tailed test was used as the hypotheses in this study were

non-directional and thus necessitated excluding a one-tail test where a certain directional effect is assumed or predicted.

Table 4.22: PECTAC Teaching Variables Correlations

		Technology Resources	Active and Team Learning	Out of Class Learning Experiences
Technology Resources	Pearson Correlation	1	.372 (**)	.414 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	445	368	423
Active and Team Learning	Pearson Correlation	.372 (**)	1	.415 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	368	375	371
Out of Class Learning	Pearson Correlation	.414 (**)	.415 (**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	423	371	433

** - Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Pearson Correlations were significant for each of the teaching variables at the .01 level (2-tailed) as indicated in Table 4.22. For example, the Pearson Correlation for technology resources and out of class learning was calculated to be .414 (n=423) at the .01 level (2-tailed). The high correlations for teaching variables were interpreted to mean that higher scores in the technology resources sub-section were associated with higher scores in the out-of-class learning sub-section. Likewise, lower scores in the technology resources sub-section were associated with lower scores in the out-of-class learning sub-section.

Correlations for variables within the caring section are presented in Tables 4.23. Pearson Correlations were significant for each of the caring variables at the .01 level (2-tailed) as indicated in Table 4.23. For instance, the Pearson Correlation for caring faculty

and caring university community was calculated to be .512 (n=407) at the .01 level (2-tailed). This was interpreted to mean that higher scores in the caring faculty sub-section were associated with higher scores in the caring university community sub-section. Likewise, lower scores in the caring faculty sub-section were associated with lower scores in the caring university community sub-section.

Table 4.23: PECTAC Caring Variables Correlations

		Caring Faculty	Caring University Community	Being in Partnership with Parents
Caring Faculty	Pearson Correlation	1	.512 (**)	.453 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	425	407	409
Caring University Community	Pearson Correlation	.512 (**)	1	.425 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	407	409	395
Being in partnership with Parents	Pearson Correlation	.453 (**)	.425 (**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	409	395	411

** - Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Findings for Research Questions 1 and 2

To begin to answer research questions 1 and 2, initial descriptive statistics were computed for the teaching items section as shown in Table 4.24. The means, standard deviations and sample size per group are presented along for each sub-section's groupings determined by parent gender (Pgender) and first-experience as a college parent (Firstexp). For instance, the mean 'technology resources' score for female parents who were a first-time college parent was 58.7453 (n=106). A further visual inspection of the teaching item descriptive statistics revealed the possibility that women and men may have

scored teaching items differently. The variance in scores between parents with prior experience as a college parent versus those having their first experience suggested that the scores were essentially the same. A 2X2 MANOVA was calculated to confirm these possibilities and to answer research questions 1 and 2.

Table 4.24: PECTAC Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Items

	Pgender	Firstexp	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Technology Resources	Female	no	58.6754	4.65917	114
		yes	58.7453	5.61132	106
		Total	58.7091	5.12821	220
	Male	no	55.9722	4.76481	72
		yes	58.1389	5.58243	72
		Total	57.0556	5.28460	144
	Total	no	57.6290	4.86988	186
		yes	58.5000	5.59181	178
		Total	58.0549	5.24625	364
Active & Team Learning	Female	no	43.0702	4.36137	114
		yes	43.8396	4.06878	106
		Total	43.4409	4.23091	220
	Male	no	41.5833	4.21516	72
		yes	42.9444	4.43700	72
		Total	42.2639	4.36609	144
	Total	no	42.4946	4.35486	186
		yes	43.4775	4.23225	178
		Total	42.9753	4.31755	364
Out of Class Learning Experiences	Female	no	25.6140	3.55366	114
		yes	26.3585	3.94773	106
		Total	25.9727	3.75860	220
	Male	no	25.4444	4.01367	72
		yes	25.9722	4.18909	72
		Total	25.7083	4.09652	144
	Total	no	25.5484	3.72868	186
		yes	26.2022	4.03986	178
		Total	25.8681	3.89238	364

Pgender = parent gender
Firstexp = first experience as a college parent

A Principal Components Analysis (PCA) followed by a 2X2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to determine whether to reject or accept the first two research hypotheses. The MANOVA procedure was useful because the hypotheses

dealt with four groups: women with experience as a college parent, men with experience as a college parent, women without experience as a college parent, and men without experience as a college parent. One of the main assumptions of MANOVA is that the covariance's and population variances among the dependent variables are the same across all levels of the factors. In this case the investigator tested this assumption with the dependent variables by employing the use of the F test statistic. If the computed p-value is non-significant than the major assumption of MANOVA is met and interpretation can proceed; it was computed to be .242, which was greater than .05 and thus non-significant. This calculation allowed the investigator to be confident when interpreting the results from the 2x2 MANOVA.

Table 4.25 illustrates the findings after calculating a 2X2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for teaching items. Specifically of interest was the calculated value for Wilks' Lambda, using parent gender (Pgender) and status, as a first-time college parent (Firstexp). Wilks' Lambda is a commonly used and widely accepted multivariate test. Other multivariate tests are also illustrated such as Pillai's Trace, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root. Table 4.25 presents the effect, statistical test, test value calculated, F value, Hypothesis degrees of freedom, Error degrees of freedom, Level of significance, and Partial Eta Squared.

Table 4.25: PECTAC Multivariate Tests on Teaching Items[b]

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.994	19309.302[a]	3.000	358.000	.000	.994
	Wilks' Lambda	.006	19309.302[a]	3.000	358.000	.000	.994
	Hotelling's Trace	161.810	19309.302[a]	3.000	358.000	.000	.994
	Roy's Largest Root	161.810	19309.302[a]	3.000	358.000	.000	.994
Pgender	Pillai's Trace	.036	4.460[a]	3.000	358.000	.004	.036
	Wilks' Lambda	.964	4.460[a]	3.000	358.000	.004	.036
	Hotelling's Trace	.037	4.460[a]	3.000	358.000	.004	.036
	Roy's Largest Root	.037	4.460[a]	3.000	358.000	.004	.036
Firstexp	Pillai's Trace	.019	2.340[a]	3.000	358.000	.073	.019
	Wilks' Lambda	.981	2.340[a]	3.000	358.000	.073	.019
	Hotelling's Trace	.020	2.340[a]	3.000	358.000	.073	.019
	Roy's Largest Root	.020	2.340[a]	3.000	358.000	.073	.019
pgender * firstexp	Pillai's Trace	.015	1.773[a]	3.000	358.000	.152	.015
	Wilks' Lambda	.985	1.773[a]	3.000	358.000	.152	.015
	Hotelling's Trace	.015	1.773[a]	3.000	358.000	.152	.015
	Roy's Largest Root	.015	1.773[a]	3.000	358.000	.152	.015

a – exact statistic
b – Design: Intercept+pgender+firstexp+pgender * firstexp
Pgender = parent gender
Firstexp = first experience as a college parent

Research Question One:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent? H1-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent.

To answer this first research hypothesis regarding teaching items and parent gender, a Wilks' Lambda was calculated at a value of .964, with F (3, 358) = 4.46, p = .004. The multivariate effect size of .036 (Pillai's Trace) indicated that only 3.6% of multivariate variance of the variables was related to or associated with the gender of the parent. Wilks' Lambda was determined to be significant based on its p=.004. That was interpreted to mean that the null hypothesis (H1-A_0) should be rejected and the

alternative hypothesis accepted. The investigator concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent. Thus, the first research question was accepted.

Research Question Two:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent?

H2-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

To answer the second research hypothesis regarding teaching items and status as a first-time college parent, a Wilks' Lambda was calculated at a value of .981, with a $F(3, 358) = 2.34$, $p = .073$. The multivariate effect size of .019 (Pillai's Trace) indicated that only 1.9% of multivariate variance of the variables was related to or associated with status as a first-time college parent. Wilks' Lambda was determined to be non-significant based on its $p=.073$. This was interpreted to mean that the null hypothesis (H2-A_0) should not be rejected. Based on the status as a first-time college parent, the investigator concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student as a consequence of their experience(s) as a parent of a college student.

Findings for Research Questions 3 and 4

To begin to answer research questions 3 and 4, initial descriptive statistics were computed for the caring items section as shown in Table 4.26 on the next page. The means, standard deviations and sample size per group are presented along for each sub-section's groupings determined by parent gender (Pgender) and first-experience as a college parent (Firstexp). For example, the mean 'caring faculty' score for male parents who were not first-time college parents was 40.8831 (n=77). Reviewing the descriptive statistics for caring items revealed the possibility that women and men may have scored caring items differently. The variance in scores between parents with prior experience as a college parent versus those having their first experience was interpreted to mean that scores on their caring items' essentially were the same. A 2X2 MANOVA was calculated to confirm those possibilities and to answer research questions 3 and 4.

Table 4.26: PECTAC Descriptive Statistics for Caring Items

	Pgender	Firstexp	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Caring Faculty	Female	no	42.2167	2.95678	120
		yes	42.3000	2.71813	120
		Total	42.2583	2.83433	240
	Male	no	40.8831	3.46020	77
		yes	40.9474	3.54737	76
		Total	40.9150	3.49237	153
	Total	no	41.6954	3.22120	197
		yes	41.7755	3.12814	196
		Total	41.7354	3.17133	393
Caring University Community	Female	no	44.2000	4.38216	120
		yes	44.1833	4.34632	120
		Total	44.1917	4.35515	240
	Male	no	41.2078	4.70257	77
		yes	42.5000	4.75675	76
		Total	41.8497	4.75833	153
	Total	no	43.0305	4.73039	197
		yes	43.5306	4.57239	196
		Total	43.2799	4.65307	393
Being in Partnership with Parents	Female	no	31.3000	3.57536	120
		yes	32.0417	3.74255	120
		Total	31.6708	3.67110	240
	Male	no	31.0000	3.57256	77
		yes	31.3553	3.60261	76
		Total	31.1765	3.58013	153
	Total	no	31.1827	3.56816	197
		yes	31.7755	3.69485	196
		Total	31.4784	3.63938	393

Pgender = parent gender
Firstexp = first experience as a college parent

The investigator again used the F test statistic to test the main assumption of a MANOVA; that population variances and co-variances among the dependent variables were the same across all levels of the factors. Additionally, if the computed p-value was non-significant than the major assumption of MANOVA was met and interpretation could proceed; It was calculated to be .461, which was greater than .05 and thus non-significant. That calculation allowed the investigator to be confident when interpreting the results from the 2x2 MANOVA.

Table 4.27 illustrates the findings after calculating a 2X2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for caring items. Specifically of interest was the calculated value for Wilks' Lambda using parent gender (Pgender) and status as a first-time college parent (Firstexp). Wilks' Lambda commonly is used and a widely accepted multivariate test. Other multivariate tests are also illustrated such as Pillai's Trace, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root. Table 4.27 presents the effect, statistical test, test value calculated, F value, Hypothesis degrees of freedom, Error degrees of freedom, Level of significance, and Partial Eta Squared.

Table 4.27: PECTAC Mutlivariate Tests on Caring Items[b]

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.995	3965.279[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.995
	Wilks' Lambda	.005	3965.279[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.995
	Hotelling's Trace	185.777	3965.279[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.995
	Roy's Largest Root	185.777	3965.279[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.995
Pgender	Pillai's Trace	.074	10.335[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.074
	Wilks' Lambda	.926	10.335[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.074
	Hotelling's Trace	.080	10.335[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.074
	Roy's Largest Root	.080	10.335[a]	3.000	387.000	.000	.074
Firstexp	Pillai's Trace	.009	1.190[a]	3.000	387.000	.313	.009
	Wilks' Lambda	.991	1.190[a]	3.000	387.000	.313	.009
	Hotelling's Trace	.009	1.190[a]	3.000	387.000	.313	.009
	Roy's Largest Root	.009	1.190[a]	3.000	387.000	.313	.009
pgender * firstexp	Pillai's Trace	.009	1.229[a]	3.000	387.000	.299	.009
	Wilks' Lambda	.991	1.229[a]	3.000	387.000	.299	.009
	Hotelling's Trace	.010	1.229[a]	3.000	387.000	.299	.009
	Roy's Largest Root	.010	1.229[a]	3.000	387.000	.299	.009

a – exact statistic
b – Design: Intercept+pgender+firstexp+pgender * firstexp
Pgender = parent gender
Firstexp = first experience as a college parent

Research Question Three:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent? H3-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of the parent.

Wilks' Lambda was calculated at a value of .926, with a $F(3, 387) = 10.335$, $p < .001$ and the multivariate effect size of .074 indicated that 7.4% of multivariate variance of the variables was related to or associated with the gender of the parent. Wilks' Lambda was determined to be significant based on its $p < .001$. This was interpreted to mean that the null hypothesis (H3-A_0) had to be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. The investigator concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on the gender of a parent.

Research Question Four:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent? H4-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent is a First-time College Parent.

When computing the Wilks' Lambda for the first experience as a college parent, a value of .991, with a $F(3, 387) = 1.190$, $p = .313$ and a 0.9% multivariate variance of the variables was found related to first experience as a college parent. The Wilks' Lambda

was determined to be non-significant based on its p=.313. The investigator interpreted that finding to mean that the null hypothesis (H4-A_0) should not be rejected. The investigator concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in the importance parents placed on a University's ability to care for their student based on whether a parent was a First-time College Parent.

Findings for Research Question 5

Research Question Five:

Is there a significant difference in the importance parents placed on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents placed on a University's ability to teach their student? H5-A_0: There is no statistically significant difference in the importance parents place on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents place on a University's ability to teach their student.

A dependent sample t-test was used for ease of interpreting whether parents placed more importance on teaching items versus caring items. To complete a dependent sample t-test, an assumption about the correlation of the teaching and caring sub-sections needed to be met. As was presented earlier in this chapter in Table 4.21, the reliability for the total items in the teaching and caring sections were .872 and .897, respectively. Those reliability scores were interpreted by the investigator as indicating a positive relationship existed among the sub-scales in the teaching and caring sections and thus the investigator could proceed with a dependent samples t-test.

To answer the fifth research question, the researcher decided that a total score for caring items and teaching items was needed. The researcher was able to develop a total

score for the caring sub-section as it was assumed that the items within the caring sub-section moderately correlated with each other and thus tapped the same construct. The same conclusion was arrived at for the teaching sub-section.

As Table 4.28 shows, a total score for the teaching sub-section and caring sub-section was calculated by totaling up all the scores within a sub-section and then dividing by the number of items. When dividing by the number of items on the scale (26 items for the caring sub-section and 30 items for the teaching sub-section) the resulting total score could be placed on a scale of 1 to 5 and then compared, without concern, for scaling differences. The caring sub-section items (n=343) were found to have a Mean score of 4.4775 (SD=.36586) while teaching section items (n=343) were found to have a Mean score of 4.2305 (SD=.35397).

Table 4.28: Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Pair	Teaching (total score/30)	4.2305	343	.35397	.01911
1	Caring (total/26)	4.4775	343	.36586	.01975

To accept or reject the null hypothesis for research question five, the researcher performed a dependent samples t-test as Table 4.29 illustrates. A t-statistic of -16.454 (df = 342) was computed at the $p<.001$ level, two-tailed (Lower = -.27647, Upper = -.21743). The t-statistic fell in the upper region of the two-tailed distribution and thus was determined to be significant.

Table 4.29: Paired Differences

		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Teach (total score/30) – Care (total/26)	-.24695	.27796	.01501	-.27647	-.21743	-16.454	342	.000

This was interpreted to mean that the null hypothesis (H5-A_0) should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. The investigator concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the importance parents placed on a University's ability to care for their student versus the importance parents placed on a University's ability to teach their student.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

The initial section of this chapter revisits the most important items within each PECTAC sub-section. The second section of this chapter summarizes three important themes woven throughout this study. The third section presents recommendations for future practice and research regarding higher education and the parental stakeholder. The chapter concludes with a proposed model of parental engagement for higher education.

PECTAC Sub-Sections Revisited

As Chapter Four presented, the PECTAC asked parents to rank two items as most important in each of the teaching and caring sub-sections. This was intended to help the researcher understand what is most important to parents.

Table 5.1 illustrates the two most important items within each of the teaching sub-sections. Under the sub-section 'Technology Resources' parents regarded high-speed Internet access (n=142) and immediate email access to instructors (n=141) as the most critical items. Along the theme of technology, parents also placed a high-level of importance on the item 'Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise' (n=200) in the 'Active & Team Learning' sub-section. However, the most important item by far in that sub-section was the expectation from parents that written work by their student be given consistent feedback (n=272). The final teaching sub-section 'Out of Class Learning Opportunities' revealed that parents placed the most importance on receiving academic advising or mentoring information (n=190) along with opportunities for internships (n=173).

Table 5.1: Key Items in PECTAC Teaching Sub-Sections

	Item	Frequency
Technology Resources	High-speed Internet access in her/his residence hall room	142
	Email access to her/his faculty instructor	141
Active & Team Learning	Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)	272
	Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise	200
Out of Class Learning Opportunities	Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested	190
	Be provided with opportunities for internships	173

Likewise for the caring section of the PECTAC, Table 5.2 illustrates the two most important items within each sub-section. Parents reported that having regular contact with the academic advisor (n=175) and being treated fairly by instructors (n=154) were the most important items in the 'A Caring Faculty' sub-section. Meanwhile in the 'A Caring University Community' sub-section, parents placed the most importance on two items that dealt with opportunities for individual growth in leadership (n=131) and faith (n=118). The final caring sub-section addressed items where the institution is in partnership with parents. Overwhelmingly, parents placed great importance on the issue of safety and security. However, it was also interesting to note that parents placed much importance on an institution's ability to regularly notify a parent on the academic success of their daughter or son.

Table 5.2: Key Items in PECTAC Caring Sub-Sections

	Item	Frequency
A Caring Faculty	Have regular contact with her/his academic advisor	175
	Be treated fairly by the course instructor(s)	154
A Caring University Community	Opportunities to explore her/his leadership potential	131
	Opportunities to grow in her/his faith life	118
Being in Partnership with Parents	Provide a safe and secure campus	306
	Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis	173

In short the findings reported in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 were revealing and have implications for postsecondary institutions in several aspects such as informing parents about campus safety and technological resources, planning orientation programs, and building realistic expectations of faculty-student relationships. These aspects are further discussed in the recommendations for practice and research later in this chapter.

Three Significant Themes

Forbes (2001) wrote, "Many of us have been struggling to reconcile the expectations of our students' parents that we will protect their children from all harm with our own desire to encourage their children to take the risks that may accompany the full exploration of all that colleges and universities have to offer (p.12)." The tension Forbes referred to has become a major issue for student affairs practice. Student affairs professionals and faculty who try to balance increased parental involvement, confidentiality, professional integrity, and student growth into adulthood find themselves in an increasingly complex environment.

The importance of this study was highlighted when juxtaposed against those competing factors. First, it intended to uncover the importance parents placed on the

services and product of higher education; categorized as the teaching and caring functions of a University or College. The goal of this investigation included a secondary objective to provide higher education with a tool for colleges and universities to use in their efforts to understand the parent partner. Second, it was anticipated that the findings would add to the literature and inform professional personnel working with parents of college-bound students to view rising parental involvement as an opportunity to be grasped. The third and final objective was to make pragmatic suggestions for practice and future research.

Three themes emerged during the analysis. First was the conclusion that parents of college-bound students were highly involved in their students' selection process. Second, was the conclusion that female parents gave more importance to the caring and teaching scales of the PECTAC as shown in Chapter Four. Last, it was determined that parents placed greater importance on a postsecondary institution's caring functions for their matriculating student instead of the teaching functions. Possibly the latter was an implicit acknowledgement, but when contrasted to the caring function it came up wanting.

Parental Involvement

Howe and Strauss (2001, 2003) said parental relationships with the upcoming Millennial students were different than prior generations because of being more involved in their student's lives. Forbes (2001) echoed that claim by pointing out that her colleagues, throughout higher education, reported substantially more parental involvement in college students' lives. Other authors also reported an increase in

parental involvement in college students' lives (Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Turrentine, et al, 2000). This study reinforced those claims.

As reported in the last chapter, 92.9% (n=433) of parents reported they were somewhat or very involved in their student's college selection process. This high level of involvement by parents in the college selection process has been coined as one of "co-purchasing" by Howe and Strauss (2003). This study's findings, coupled with the claims of other authors, should encourage student affairs professionals, faculty, administrators, and institutional presidents that parent 'co-purchasers' need to be recognized and their participation embraced.

Female versus Male Parents

As reported in chapter four, a 2X2 MANOVA was conducted on both teaching and caring items. The first and third research questions claimed that there was no statistical difference with regards to gender in the scores on the teaching and caring items. Wilks' Lambda was calculated for both teaching and caring items using parent gender as a predictor variable and was found to be .964 (multivariate effect size=.036) for teaching and .926 (multivariate effect size=.074) for caring. Those results allowed the researcher to reject the null hypothesis in research questions one and three, which used parent gender as a predictor variable. Thus, the researcher concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the importance placed on the teaching and the caring functions of a College or University according to parent gender.

This result bears special notice based on the faculty focus group feedback received by the researcher. As first mentioned in Chapter Three, the researcher was

given input by the faculty focus group to discard student gender as a variable, but keep parent gender as a variable. Their input led to retaining parent gender as a variable for this study. The findings regarding parent gender were interpreted to mean that the importance given by each gender is different and thus institutional administrators and faculty should be cautious when preparing information that they believe speaks to both groups. Practicality dictates economizing but reality is different; distinct messages would be best for each gender while ensuring there is no ambiguity in content.

While Chapter Four indicated that parents placed more importance on the caring functions versus those teaching functions, further investigation on the differences between gender seemed relevant. To further investigate this difference between genders; the investigator calculated standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients for the teaching and caring sections. As Table 5.3 illustrates, the standard canonical discriminant function coefficients for the teaching sub-sections were .804, .595, and -.445 for ‘technology resources’, ‘active and team learning’, and ‘out of class learning opportunities’, respectively.

Table 5.3: Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Teaching

	Teaching Function (1)
Technology Resources	.804
Active and Team Learning	.595
Out of Class Learning Opportunities	-.445

The positive coefficients for two of the three teaching function sub-sections were interpreted to be the primary factors influencing the difference in scores between female and male parents. The negative coefficient for ‘Out of class learning opportunities’,

however, did not contribute nearly as much to the difference between males and females as its negative coefficient score (-.445) suggested. This meant that the teaching sub-section 'out of class learning opportunities' did not account for much separation between female and male scores.

Table 5.4 shows the standard canonical discriminant function coefficients for the three caring sub-sections: 'caring faculty' (.504), 'caring university community' (.781), and 'being in partnership with parents' (-.324). The two positive coefficient scores for the caring sub-sections: 'caring university community' followed by 'caring faculty' influenced the difference in scores between female and male scores. The third caring sub-section, 'being in partnership with parents' (-.324) did not influence the difference in scores between female and male parents. The implication here is that when parents were asked about faculty, staff or university administrators' ability to care, females and males answered items in these sections differently.

Table 5.4: Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Caring

	Caring Function (1)
Caring Faculty	.504
Caring University Community	.781
Being in Partnership with Parents	-.324

In summary and as illustrated in Chapter Four, the use of Wilk's Lambda allowed the researcher to conclude there was a statistically significant difference between female and male scores. Additionally, the computation of standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients for the teaching and caring sub-sections allowed the researcher to discover which sub-sections were responsible for the differences in scores between

female and male parents. This allowed the researcher to claim that females placed statistically greater importance on the two teaching sub-sections: ‘technology resources’ and ‘active and team learning’. Also, females placed statistically greater importance on the caring sub-sections of: ‘caring university community’ and ‘caring faculty’.

The difference in parent scores and the importance they placed on the items within each sub-section of the teaching and caring functions by the researcher has traction for higher education and student affairs professionals in particular. Suffice it to say that colleges and universities would be recommended to tailor their information regarding a ‘caring faculty’ or ‘caring university community’ towards their female parents. Meanwhile information on ‘being in partnership with parents’ can most likely be presented consistently between male and females. However, two additional findings were important to note.

The first finding involves technology and female parents. Presenting information to parents on student computer purchasing programs, learning opportunities employing the use of technology, and technological resources available to students should be made knowing such information likely is of greater importance to female parents. This finding is important to consider when juxtaposed with possible gender stereotypes surrounding technology and females.

The second finding focuses on female scores in the caring section. Of the caring sub-sections, a ‘caring university community’ drove the difference in scores between male and female parents within the caring section with a large, positive coefficient score (.781). The researcher interpreted this to mean that female parents, in particular, placed great importance on learning those caring functions by other institutional personnel.

For example, consider a typical recruitment weekend or orientation session for parents where schools showcase academic advisors and perhaps college deans. This study's results indicate that it might be more important, especially to female parents, to showcase other institutional personnel who help guide and care for students during their transition to collegiate life. This point seems to be of paramount importance when parents, those 'co-purchasers' as Howe and Strauss (2001) coined, are assisting in the college selection process. Intentionally creating parent handbooks, recruitment weekends, or orientation sessions that enable a female parent to more fully understand the caring functions of the university community could be a key tactic for recruitment.

Caring Functions versus Teaching Functions

In this study, the researcher calculated a dependent samples t-test to determine what, if any, statistically significant difference existed among the sample participants between the teaching and caring functions of a University or College. As reported in chapter four, the t-test was interpreted to mean that parents placed more importance on the caring functions of a University versus the teaching functions.

As reported previously, Honigman (2003) suggested that U.S. higher education was influenced not only by the English, student-centered model of education, but also by the German, research-centered model of education. The results from this study were interpreted to mean parents expected higher education to present a closer association with the English, student-centered model of education. Realizing that parents have more interest in a student-centered model that emphasizes educating beyond the classroom, of nurturing, and of providing a wide-range of support is important. Convention is for

recruitment activities to emphasize creative scholarship and research activities, but conceivably it would be more productive to extol issues under the caring function.

The researcher's experience as a student affairs professional leads to a belief that a disproportionate amount of time and/or space is spent on discussing the teaching functions of a university versus the caring functions as found in: admission viewbooks, recruitment events, campus tours, phone calls, websites, and orientation sessions. Indeed, this study's findings allow for stating that if a session for potential parents is too heavy on the academic side of a university, it could be a serious recruitment error. Likewise if a website or brochure for parents does not have enough content about the caring and supportive functions, it could result in a recruitment error.

Recommendations for Practice

Consider for a moment, the anecdotal message some schools use during parent orientation sessions. Somewhere during their orientation sessions for parents, administrators suggest that in college there are no more parent-teacher conferences, after school detention periods, or calls home about a student missing class—all drawing laughs from parents. The implied message to parents is that it is time to let go. Presentations usually explain to parents FERPA and other legal issues as examples of how colleges and universities are restricted from being in connection to parents. The unfortunate result of such messages is that regulations and case law serve as reasons, or excuses, for the lack of a connection with (or understanding of) parents rather than as guides to help shape practice towards partnering with parents.

From a certain standpoint, colleges and universities tell parents they need to let go, that they (colleges and universities) cannot communicate with parents, and the conclusion is to hope a student has a positive academic experience. When such information is juxtaposed with the findings from this study a critical gap seems evident. Parents value the caring functions of a college or university, and report having high levels of involvement with the college selection process (Howe & Strauss, 2003; Forbes, 2001; Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Turrentine, et al, 2000).

Colleges and Universities must seek to find ways to help students take on their own challenges and assist them in taking advantage of all that a campus can provide (Forbes, 2001). However, to meet such a developmental goal with students, the student affairs practitioner must take into account the role of parental involvement. Therefore, the following recommendations for practice are presented with the goal being to narrow this apparent gap between parents and institutions of higher education.

Recommendation for Practice I: Retool Orientation Programs for Parents

As mentioned previously in this chapter, parents reported a high level of involvement in their student's college choice. Knowing that parents have a higher level of involvement and are serving as consultants in the selection process, then a keen eye must be kept on the information and structure of sessions that an institution provides to a parent of a college-bound student. While many schools have added sessions for parents, including information on housing, financial aid, academics, and health issues, it may be wise to consider additional content for this important stakeholder. In particular, information for parents orientating them to campus should begin before the parent arrives

on campus. Providing information on an orientation website for parents or linking the orientation website to a parents-only website is advisable as it allows for a sharing of information before a parent comes to campus. Such a site could include articles on parenting college students, frequently asked questions, testimonials from past parents, and a list of resources on a campus and available to parents.

The first suggestion towards retooling orientation sessions for parents comes from the findings in this study. While many services and resources of a University are important to parents, those findings presented previously in this chapter in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 offer insight into how student affairs professionals may wish to tweak their current orientation offerings. Consider the following findings and resulting questions:

- Parents reported that they placed the most important on the item 'Provide a safe and secure campus' (n=306). Clearly in this study, this item was overwhelmingly important as reported by parents. Thus, does the institution's orientation program have a heavy emphasis on providing information on the safety and security provided on campus?
- Parents reported that they placed importance on their student being given consistent feedback on their written work (n=272), having regular contact with her/his academic advisor (n=175), and treated fairly by her/his instructor(s) (n=154). Additionally they placed importance on receiving academic advising or mentoring (n=190) and opportunities for internships (n=173). These items were interpreted by the researcher to mean that institutions must educate parents about the process by which students will be taught and how learning will occur. For instance, does the institution's

orientation program have a session aimed at educating parents through the eyes of a faculty member who can speak to previous examples of working with students over the course of four years? Such a session could highlight a faculty member's relationship with a student advisee during their collegiate journey.

- Parents reported that they placed importance on their student leaving college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise (n=200). Does the institution have a session, whether facilitated by IT staff or faculty, addressing the role of technology in a student's learning process throughout their years at the institution?
- Parents reported that they placed importance on the item 'Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis' (n=173). This was interpreted by the researcher to mean that parents may need continued education and information regarding the institution's ability to meet this need. Does the institution have a session for parents during orientation presenting federal/state restrictions on communication whether it regards a student's academic success or health?

Indeed it is also important to note that all of these questions assume that the institution is simultaneously offering education and information on the Internet similar in scope and content to that which is offered during orientation. The obvious issue at play here is that not all parents will be able to attend orientation sessions due to the demands of family, work, and other commitments in the life of a parent. However, the assumption

here is important to note. Does the institution fall victim to providing critical information about services, resources, and limitations to only those parents who attend orientation sessions and not to those parents unable to come to campus?

The second suggestion focuses on educating parents to their new parent role with their student. The foundation for this suggestion comes from the culling of relevant psychosocial evidence presented in Chapter Two and involves a parent's developmental journey. Higher education and student affairs administrators in particular, must not overlook the developmental transition parents are experiencing as their student begins their collegiate journey. Student affairs practice has long held the conviction they are committed to the intentional placement of resources, services, and programs aimed at meeting students' developmental needs. This same assumption must be applied to parents.

Student affairs administrators must intentionally create parent orientation sessions that include informative and dialogical modules asking parents to examine how they are feeling, how they are thinking, and ultimately how their lives are changing. Such a session might be designed as part didactic and small group discussion. The session could begin with an overview of the psychosocial issues at play for parents—specifically addressing the developmental hurdles and crises they are facing as a result of this change for their student. Such information could be presented by a student affairs practitioner or a faculty member with a background in psychosocial research. The latter part of the session could involve small and large group sharing, providing a context for parents to discover similarities and differences in what they are thinking and feeling as compared to other parents facing the same developmental crisis in their life. Questions could range

from how parents see their level of involvement changing whether with their student, with University personnel, or with faculty. Regardless of the specific session design, failure to not recognize the developmental processes at play in a parent's life will decrease the likelihood that a university is seen as a 'partner' to parents.

Recommendation for Practice II: Appoint a Parent Leader/Liaison for Campus

Colleges and Universities should recognize that this generation of college students and their parents want new approaches towards achieving a partnership. Administrators should appoint a representative of the university, if not an entire office, as the definitive resource and contact point for parents. This parent leader/liaison for campus should be someone who works collaboratively with both recruitment and retention staff, but does not necessarily have to be a part of the enrollment management division. In fact some parents might feel more comfortable with a staff member who may not be seen as attempting to sell them something. It is also preferable, although not necessary, to have someone who has parented older children. Parents will likely more readily accept challenge and support from someone whom they know who has the same shared experience—in this case—parenting. The ability of this person to listen, to seek understanding, but to also relate to the dilemmas and concerns of parents is key for institutions in the future.

Campuses need to make this parent leader/liaison resource widely available during recruitment and orientation processes. This leader/liaison could serve many functions: whether serving as a sounding board during recruitment, assisting with a difficult academic decision, mediating parent concerns in an 'ombudsman for parents'

type role, or simply supporting parents as they react to their student's successes and failures. It would also be prudent to intentionally continue to market this resource to parents once their student has begun classes and fully entered into campus life. Mailings, both electronic and hard-copy, are one way such a leader/liaison could connect with parents. This also could include the development of an all-inclusive website just for parents with direct links and information about the parent leader/liaison for the university.

Recommendation for Practice III: Develop a Plan for Communicating with Parents

At many institutions, the communication flow with parents slows down (if not ends all together) at the start of their student's collegiate journey. Once classes begin for their student, communication to parents involves billing statements, invitations to family/parent weekends, and graduation information (four years later). The assumption here is that educators at colleges and universities may be incorrectly assuming that parents are turning their sons and daughters free to grow up and make their own decisions with little to no involvement from parents.

However, when considering that parents are reporting high levels of involvement in their student's college selection process, it seems likely they may also want to be involved in their student's journey at college. Regulations such as FERPA may act less as a guide, therefore, and more as an obstacle to circumvent. Parents may still wish for their son or daughter to have some freedoms to grow into adulthood, but it may be plausible to assume that parents now also want to be informed and kept abreast of their student's progress—especially in terms of their academic success. Consider again some

of the items parents placed importance on: their student having regular contact with her/his academic advisor (n=175), parents being notified on a regular basis about their student's academic success (n=173), their student developing plans for a major with an academic advisor (n=137), or that their student will be known by her/his course instructor(s) (n=70) or be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member (n=67). These results were interpreted by the investigator to mean that parents were expecting that a certain level of communication of care—perhaps even on a personal level—existed from the parent perspective.

Coupling this higher level of involvement in the selection process with the findings that parents place more importance on the caring functions a University provides, it is suggested that University administrators intentionally set forth a communications plan for their parent constituents that includes tactics for being in touch with parents throughout the collegiate experience of their student. Such a plan is modeled later in this chapter.

In summary, Colleges and Universities failing to adapt their staffing, services, and programs to the needs of college parents will not be seen as partners to parents. This failure will be easily recognizable. True 'parent partner institutions' will be characterized as understanding of the need for a direct University contact for concerns, recognizing the developmental need of parents to reflect on their own journey, and realizing that communication with parents must not end as their student's collegiate journey begins. The lack of these types of sessions, resources, and services will be clear and distinguishable bell-weathers for institutions that do not take college student parents seriously. Colleges and Universities have a choice to change their practices and become

true ‘parent partner institutions’ or accept the fate that parents will be less likely to work with a school to help partner in the education of students. This lack of a partnership with parents could be detrimental if indeed parents continue to keep in close contact throughout the collegiate years setting up a dynamic where the student and parent are in conflict with faculty and staff.

Recommendations for Future Research

Higher education must devote more study to the parents of college students. As a major stakeholder in higher education, parents’ wants, hopes, desires, and dreams are important considerations for colleges and universities. When considering that in this study 92.9% (n=433) of parents reported being ‘Very Involved’ or ‘Somewhat Involved’ in their student’s college decision, the message to higher education seemingly is clear: schools must take extra efforts to understand the parental stakeholder as the relationship has changed (Howe & Strauss, 2001; Scott & Daniel, 2001).

Future Research Recommendation I:

Replication of this research should take place. Consideration should allow for parent participation from campuses that are public, private non-religious, of varying sizes, and in other geographical areas of the United States. This would be important to increase the discussion on how well higher education understands the expectations parents have as well as to further investigate whether parents place more importance on the caring functions versus the teaching functions at other institutions.

The PECTAC also needs to be subjected to more research. Does the PECTAC reflect all the complexities at institutions of higher education? Are there additional items needing to be added or refined for the survey tool? Would additional parent focus groups at institutions unlike Creighton University yield additional clarity for the ongoing development of the PECTAC? Or, are there correlations between a parent's expectations and a student's ability to full matriculate?

Future Research Recommendation II:

Investigation should be made into the expectations parents have of a college or university throughout their student's collegiate journey. The PECTAC asked parents about their expectations of a college or university at the start of their son or daughter's collegiate journey. While the PECTAC provides a solid foundation from which to begin understanding the expectations parents have, a natural question arises about the end of the first-year, second-year, and so on.

In particular, investigation could be made on understanding whether parents continue to place more importance on the caring functions of a university versus the teaching functions during the later years of college. Do parents ever begin to place more importance on the teaching and academic functions of a university during a student's four years? Subsequently, do Colleges and Universities need to tailor their message to parents as students move into different phases of their college education? Or to take it an additional step further, would it be of value to look at parent expectations years after their student matriculates to further assess whether a school met or exceeded a parent's expectations?

Future Research Recommendation III:

As suggested previously, parents are more involved in their student's lives. Understanding what has fueled this increased involvement would aid in the process of partnering with parents—answering their questions and meeting their needs before they recognize either. In Chapter Two, the researcher explored the student and parent of tomorrow and noted that rising costs in higher education and the pace of technological growth are but two factors affecting higher education. Is the emerging phenomenon of increased parental involvement the by-product of increasing college cost, technology, or both? The implication is that if the pace of technology and the rising cost of higher education indeed fuel increased parental involvement together or unilaterally, then educators likely must brace for a very different future in dealing with parents.

Parents will demand more as the pressure mounts on the financial end of providing a college education for their son or daughter. Their developmental need to provide an education and assist their children into adulthood still will be present, but will come under heavy stress as the rapid cost of higher education continues. Furthermore, technology will continue to bring parent and student closer together, regardless of physical locality, suggesting parental involvement in student lives beyond current levels.

Conclusion: A Parental Involvement Model for Higher Education

Reconsider what Scott and Daniel (2001) said, "From the changing dynamics of families emerges the growing phenomenon of parental involvement in the college student's experience. Although institutions may resist, the parents of today's college students clearly expect to exercise that prerogative (p. 83)."

The PECTAC was designed to gauge the expectations of parents at the start of their student's collegiate career. But as Scott and Daniel (2001), Forbes (2001), and Howe and Strauss (2003) have suggested, the parents of today's college students are exercising a greater level of involvement in their students lives. Thus, engaging parents past the start of their student's collegiate journey through the use of a coordinated, intentional communications plan is strongly recommended. This model is presented as a guide for higher education and student affairs officers in particular, to shape communication/involvement with parent partners and is based on parent expectations at the start of the collegiate journey.

Model 5.1 demonstrates this concept and takes it several steps beyond the findings presented in this study—a model of engaging the parent partner throughout the collegiate journey. The Parent Involvement Model is structurally built into four quadrants with each representing one of the four years at a traditional four-year institution. The vertical, left-side axis represents parental need on caring functions of the university from high involvement to low involvement. Likewise the horizontal, bottom axis represents parental need on teaching functions of the university. This horizontal axis is represented from low need to high need. The model depicts a progression with lessening of involvement with parents over the four years a student is in school, as others have suggested (Forbes, 2001). It also depicts that the need for parental information or communication on the caring functions of a school subsides during the collegiate years as a student is able to make adjustments to collegiate life.

Model 5.1: Parental Involvement

PARENTAL NEEDS RELATED TO CARING	High Involvement	**FRESHMAN YEAR** Parents should receive monthly communication from the University detailing events on campus, transitional issues their student may be experiencing, and articles on ways to help guide students or seek help. The Academic Advisor should also make contact with the parent to underscore that they are excited to meet and get to know their son or daughter.	**SOPHOMORE YEAR** Parents should receive 1-2 updates a semester about how their student may still be adjusting to college and learning how to be on their own. Information on stress, alcohol, relationships, and social opportunities may still be needed. At the sophomore year parents also may need more information on major, career, and what their student is learning. This year is characterized by a high need for care and a high need for information on how their student is learning, progressing towards their degree, etc.
	Lower Involvement	**SENIOR YEAR** Parents still need an update each semester, but no longer need information on how a school will care for their student—rather they should receive information on how the University will help their son or daughter find a job, transition to a career, or graduate/professional school.	**JUNIOR YEAR** Parents should receive a major academic update once each semester. Information regarding internships, graduate school, and suggestions for helping students learn about career paths related to their major.
		Low Need	High Need
		PARENTAL NEEDS RELATED TO TEACHING	

Consider again Erik Erikson's (1959) work. In his model he spoke of crises that each person goes through and struggles with to come to a new place of growth and learning. A person's success or failure with these crises determines their ability to move to a new stage. This philosophy can be applied to the children of parents as well. For example, as parents realize that their student has attained new milestones such as making friends at college, involving themselves in student leadership/activity functions, and successfully completing college courses; the model assumes a lessening of the need among parents for the caring functions a university provides. The assumption here is that the need for caring for their child dissipates as a parent perceives that their child has begun to move into adulthood.

It also is critical to point out that this model presents a serious challenge for educators in the second-year. In this model, the parent of a second-year student is characterized as someone still needing the institution to provide a high level of care and yet provide a high level of academic information such as: advising opportunities, major exploration, internship possibilities, career opportunities, post-graduate volunteer opportunities, or graduate/professional school possibilities.

The Parent Involvement Model is meant to be a guide for higher education, and student services personnel in particular, as they reconsider their work with parents. Recalling again that Jackson and Murphy (2005) wrote, "College and university leaders must also understand that today's parents want to play an important role in the continuing developmental and educational process of students enrolled in their institutions (p.54)." At the heart of this model then is a change in the basic assumption that communication with parents is only 'an important thing to do at freshman orientation sessions'. Rather it suggests a new way to engage parents over the course of a student's collegiate journey—it assumes that communication should never stop, but rather be expected and planned for in a more developmentally intentional manner.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The researcher developed, piloted, and validated a survey instrument entitled the *Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring* (PECTAC) for this exploratory study. The goal of this study was to gather specific data regarding parental expectations of new, first-year students admitted to Creighton University. The need for this study was heartened by the earlier work of Habben (1997), Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, & Ward-Roof (2000), Forbes (2001), and the underlying premise of a parental expectation of care was documented through historical insights by Henderson and Henderson (1974), Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), Bickel & Lake (1999), and Honigman (2003).

The population for this study included 1876 possible respondents, and 476 completed the PECTAC. Findings from the twelve demographic items led the researcher to make several broad generalizations about the population: they were largely Caucasian, married, owning two or more computers, English was their native language, and most were 'very involved' in their student's college choice. In addition to these demographic findings, 80 items asked parents to record the importance they placed on the teaching and caring functions of a university. The primary objective of the study was to determine if the underlying premise for postsecondary institutions to care for students was predominant. Chapter Five offered several important themes worth noting and are repeated below.

Concluding Themes

1. Jackson and Murphy (2005) warned, "The current trend of increasing parental involvement in the education of students in college has become a complicated process and one that will not give way to easy resolution (p.57)." Others have also supported this increasing parental involvement (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Coburn & Woodward, 2001; Forbes, 2001; Scott & Daniel, 2001). Indeed this study confirmed that parents self-reported high levels of involvement in their student's college selection process.
2. The researcher found that parents placed greater importance on the caring functions when contrasted with the teaching functions that a college or university offers.
3. The findings allowed the researcher to further conclude that female parents placed greater importance on caring and teaching items.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G., Lomotey, K., and Kyle, S. R. (1999). Race in higher education: The continuing crisis. In Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., & Gumport, P. (Eds.) American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 448-466.

Altbach, P. G., Gumport, P. J., & Johnstone, D. B. (2001). In defense of American higher education. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Arnett, J. J."Emerging Adulthood:A Theory of Development from the Late Teens Through the Twenties." *American Psychologist*, 2000, *55*, 469–480.

Austin, D. M. & Sousa, G. M. (1987). The college parent questionnaire. Waltham, MA: Bentley College.

Austin, R. D. (2005). Perspectives of American Indian nation parents and leaders. *New Directions for Student Services*, Issue 109, 41-48.

Ballou, R., & Gregory, D. (1986). In loco parentis reinventis: Is there still a parenting function in higher education? Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 24, 28-31.

Barber, A.E. (1994). The transition from high school to college: a family systems study of expectations and outcomes for student and parent. Dissertations Abstract International.

Bartholomae, S., Hickman, G. P., & McKenry, P. C. (2000). Influence of parenting styles on the adjustment and academic achievement of traditional college freshmen. Journal of College Student Development. 41(1), page numbers.

Barkin, C. (1999). When your kid goes to college; a parent's survival guide. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers.

Bartlett, T. (2002). Freshmen pay, mentally and physically, as they adjust to life in college. The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 1, A35.

Bers, T. H. & Galowich, P. M. (2002). Using survey and focus group research to learn about parents' roles in the Community College Choice Process. Community College Review. 29(4), 67-82.

Bickel, R. D. and Lake, P. F. (1999). The rights and responsibilities of the modern university: who assumes the risks of college life? Durham: Carolina Academic Press.

Boyd, V.S., Van Brunt, J. E., Magoon, T. M., Hunt, S. M., & Hunt, P. F. (1997). Parents as referral agents for their first-year college students: A Retention intervention. Journal of College Student Development. 38(1), page numbers.

Bradford, E. & Lyddon, W. J. (1993). Current parental attachment-its relation to perceived psychological distress and relationship satisfaction in college-students. Journal of College Student Development, 34(4), 256-260.

Bridges, B. K., & Kuh, G. D. (2004). The National Survey of Student Engagement: A new indicator for

postsecondary accountability. In Kazis, R., Vargas, J., and Hoffman, N. (Eds.), *Double the numbers: Increasing postsecondary credentials for underrepresented youth.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Bryant, M. (2004). *The portable dissertation advisor*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Ceja, M. (2006). Understanding the role of parents and siblings as information sources in the college choice process of Chicana students. Journal of College Student Development, 47(1), 87-104.

Coburn, K. L. & Woodward, B. (2001). More than punch and cookies: a new look at parent orientation programs. New Directions for Student Services. 94 (Summer), 27-38.

Cochran, C. E. & Cochran, A. M. (1997). Parental advice for admission officers. Journal of College Admission. 154 (Winter), 2-3.

Cohen, R. D. & Halsey, M. M. (1985). Organizing the institution for parent affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 32, 93-104.

Coles, R. (1989). The call of stories. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Conneely, J. E., Good, C., & Perryman, K. (2001). Balancing the role of parents in the residential community. New Directions for Student Services. 94 (Summer), 51-61.

Dennis, J. M., Phinney, J. S., & Chuateco, L. I. (2005). The role of motivation, parental support, and peer support in the academic success of ethnic minority first-generation college students. Journal of College Student Development, 46 (3) 223-236.

Digest of Education Statistics, 2002. (June 2003). National Center for Education Statistics. [On-line], Available: http://nces.ed.gov/.

Donaldson, G. A. & Kenny, M. E. (1992). The relationship of parental attachment and psychological separation to the adjustment of first-year college women. Journal of College Student Development. 33(5), page numbers.

Dubble, S. (1995). Linking the family and the school: The importance of parental choice in admissions. *NAMTA-Journal, 20* (2), 21–26.

Duderstadt, J. J. (1999). Can colleges and universities survive in the information age? In Katz, R. N. (Ed.), Dancing with the Devil. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1-26.

Erikson, E. H. (1946). Ego development and historical change. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 2, p. 359-396.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society.* New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1956). The problem of ego identity. Journal of America Psychoanalytic Association, 4, p. 56-121.

Erikson, E.H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle.* Psychological Issues, 1, 1-171.

Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle.* New York: Norton.

Fay, J. (2003). The evolution of the helicopter parent. Love and Logic Journal. 18(4), 1-3.

Forbes, K. J. (2001). Students and their parents: Where do campuses fit in? About Campus, 6, 11-17.

Friedman, T. L. (1999). The lexus and the olive tree. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Garbarino, C. & Strange, C. (1993). College adjustment and family environments of students reporting parental alcohol-problems. Journal of College Student Development, 34(4), 261-266.

Glass, R. (2004). Marketing your institution effectively: A parent's perspective. Journal of College Admission. (183) (Spring) p. 2-4.

Glenny, L. A. (1993). Higher education coordination: Australia and the United States. In Levine, A. (Ed.) Higher Learning in America: 1980-2000. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 131-148.

Golden, D. C. (2001). The president's role in partnering with parents. New Directions for Student Services. 94 (Summer), 73-81.

Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L. B. (2000). Statistics for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Grossi, E. L., & Edwards, T. D. (1997). Student misconduct: Historical trends in legislative and judicial decision-making in American universities. *Journal of College and University Law, 23*(4), 829–852.

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

Gumport, P. J. & Chun, M. (1999). Technology and higher education. In Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., and Gumport, P. (Eds.) American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 370-395.

Habben, A. H. (1997). *Assessing parental aspirations for their child's college experience.* Unpublished manuscript, Azusa Pacific University, Department of College Student Affairs and Leadership Studies, Azusa, CA.

Hahs-Vaughn, D. (2004). The impact of parents' education level on college students: An analysis using the beginning post-secondary students longitudinal study 1990-92/94. Journal of College Student Development, 45(5), 483-500.

Henderson, A. D. & Henderson, J. G. (1974). Higher education in America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heyer, D. L. & Nelson, Eileen S. (1993). The relationship between parental marital status and the development of identity and emotional autonomy in college students. Journal of College Student Development. 34(6), page numbers.

Hindrawan, J. J. (2003). International student recruitment since 9/11: Part I: What is the fallout from the war on terrorism? World Education News and Reviews, March/April 2003. [Available on-line at http://www.wes.org/ewenr/03March/Feature.htm]

Honigman, R. D. (2003). Choosing a college: why the best colleges may be your worst choice. IUniverse: Lincoln, NE.

Hollie-Major, R. D. (2003). Parent involvement for college bound, first-generation african-american high school students. Dissertation Abstracts International.

Hossler, D. and Vesper, N. (1993). An exploratory study of the factors associated with parental saving for postsecondary education. Journal of Higher Education, 64(2), 140-165.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). Millennials rising: The next great generation. New York: Vintage Publishing.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2003). Millennials Go to College. Great Falls, VA: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and LifeCourse Assoc.

Huff, D. D. & Thorpe, B. (1997). Single parents on campus: A challenge for today. NASPA Journal. 34(4), Page numbers.

Jackson, M.L. & Murphy, S. (2005). Managing parent expectations: my how times have changed. In Keppler, K., Mullendore, R.H., and Carey, A. (Eds.) Partnering with the Parents of Today's College Students. Washington: NASPA, 53-59.

Jacoby, B. (1983). Parents of dependent commuters: a neglected resource. New Directions for Student Services, 24, 49-59.

Janosik, S. M. (2001). Expectations of faculty, parents, and students for due process in campus disciplinary hearings. Journal of College Student Development. 42(2), 114-121.

Janosik, S. M. (2004). Parents' views on the Clery Act and campus safety. Journal of College Student Development. 45(1), 43-56.

Johnson, H. E. & Schelhas-Miller, C. (2000). Don't tell me what to do, just send money: the essential parenting guide to the college years. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Johnson, P. & Nelson, M. D. (1998). Parental divorce, family functioning, and college student development: An intergenerational perspective. Journal of College Student Development, 39(4), 355-363.

Johnston, J. & Shanley, M. K. (2001). What america's parents say about counselors. Journal of College Admission. 170 (Winter), 18-26.

Jones, R. (2001). How parents can support learning. American School Board Journal. 188 (9). (Source available at http://www.asbj.com).

Kaplin, W. A. (1985). The law of higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Kashubeck, S. & Christensen, S. A. (1995). Parental alcohol-use, family relationships quality, self-esteem, and repression in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 36(5), 431-443.

Katz, R. N. (1999). Competitive strategies for higher education in the information age. In Katz, R. N. and Assoc. Dancing with the Devil. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 27-50.

Kenny, M. E. & Donaldson, G. A. (1992). The relationship of parental attachment and psychological separation to the adjustment of 1st-year college-women. Journal of College Student Development, 33(5), 431-438.

Kreppel, B. L. (1985). The parent factor in residence hall services. *New Directions for Student Services*, 32, 49-62.

Kuh, G.D., & Pace, C.R. (1996). College Student Expectations Questionnaire. Bloomington, IN: Center for the Study of Postsecondary Research.

Lange, D. K. & Stone, M. E. (2001). Parental involvement in admissions and financial aid. New Directions for Student Services. 94 (Summer), 15-26.

Lenhart, A., Simon, M., & Graziano, M. (2001). The internet and education: Findings of the pew internet and American life project. (Available online at http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/toc.asp?Report=71).

Lenz, J. G. (1992) Parents' voices in career choices. Journal of College Student Development. 33(2), page numbers.

Litten, L. H. & Hall, A. E. (1989). In the eyes of our beholders: Some evidence on how high-school students and their parents view quality in colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 60, No. 3. (May - Jun., 1989), pp. 302-324.

Lopez, F. G. (1991). The impact of parental divorce on college students. *New Directions for Student Services*, 54, 19-33..

Lovell, C.D. (2000). Past and future pressures and issues of higher education: state perspectives. In Losco, J. and Fife, B. L. (Eds.) Higher Education in Transition: The Challenges of the New Millennium. Westport: Bergin and Garvey, 109-132.

Lowery, J.W. (2004). Student affairs for a new generation. New Directions for Student Services. 106 (Summer), 87-99.

McLeod, M. & Vonk, B. (1992). A support group for single-parent graduate-students and their children. Journal of College Student Development, 33(2), 184-185.

Mohler, B. A. (1990). College choice and transition to campus life: parent and student perceptions. Dissertations Abstract International.

Moll, R. W. (1985). Involvement of parents in the admissions process. *New Directions for Student Services*, 32, 27-36.

Moore, D. R. (1973). Student financial aid: How much do parents know? NASPA Journal. 10(3). Page numbers.

Mullendore, R.H. & Hatch, C. (2000). *Helping your first-year college student succeed: A guide for parents*. Columbia, SC: National Orientation Directors Association and the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Narula, R. (2003). Globalization and technology: interdependence, innovation systems, and industrial policy. Cambridge: Polity Press, Inc.

National Center for Education Statistics, Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2001. (Source available at http://nces.ed.gov/)

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oblinger, D. (2003). Boomers, Gen-Xers, and Millennials: Understanding the new students. Educause. July/August, 37-47.

Olivas, M. A. (1999). The legal environment: the implementation of legal change on campus. In Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., and Gumport, P. (Eds.) American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 216-240.

Olson, D. H., Portner, J. & Bell, R. Q. (1982) *FACES II: Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales*. Minnesota: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota.

Pace, C.R. (1990). College Student Experiences Questionnaire. Bloomington, IN: Center for the Study of Postsecondary Research.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pasick, P. (1998). Almost grown: launching your child from high school to college. New York: Norton, W. W. and Company, Inc

Palmer, C. J., Lohman, G., Gehring, D. D., Carlson, S., & Garrett, O. (2001). Parental notification: A new strategy to reduce alcohol abuse on campus. NASPA Journal. 38(3), Page numbers.

Perigo, D. J. (1985). Parent orientation: programming for letting go. *New Directions for Student Services*, 32, 37-48.

Perna, L.W., & Titus, M. (2005). The relationship between parental involvement as social capital and college enrollment: An examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 485-518.

Quade, S. L. (1994). A study of affective and cognitive variables in the college choice process of students and parents. Dissertations Abstract International.

Sachs, F. D. (2000, 2006). The evolution of parent education in the college counseling process. Journal of College Admission. 169 (Fall), 4-9.

Sanford, N. (1966). Self and society: Social change and individual development. New York: Atherton Press.

Savage, M. (2003). You're on your own: But I'm here if you need me. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W.S., & Mahoney, K. M. (1997). The American freshman: National norms for fall 1997. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles.

Shellenbarger, S. (2005). Colleges ward off over-involved parents. The Wall Street Journal Online, July 29.

Schlossberg, N. K., Waters, E. B., & Goodman, J. (1995). *Counseling adults in transitions: Linking practice with theory* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.

Schwartz, J. R. & Buboltz, W. C. (2004). The relationship between attachment to parents and psychological separation in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 45(5), 566-577.

Scott, B. R. & Daniel, B. V. (2001). Why parents of undergraduates matter to higher education. New Directions for Student Services. 94 (Summer), 83-90.

Sells, D. (2002). Parents and Campus Safety. New Directions for Student Services. 99 (Fall), 25-35.

Sessa, F. M. (2005). The influence of perceived parenting on substance use during the transition to college: A comparison of male residential and commuter students. Journal of College Student Development, 46(1), 62-74.

Shinn, M. & Toohey, S.M. (2003). Community contexts of human welfare. Annual Review of Psychology. 54 (February), 427-459.

Smith, M. J. (2001). Low SES african american parents: playing the college choice game on

an unlevel field. Journal of College Admission. 171 (Spring), 16-21.

Suskie, L. A. (1996). Questionnaire survey research: What works. 2nd ed.. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.

Taub, D. J. (1997). Autonomy and parental attachment in traditional-age undergraduate women. Journal of College Student Development. 38(6), page numbers.

Turrentine, C. G., Schnure, S. L., Ostroth, D. D., & Ward-Roof, J. A. (2000). The parent project: What parents want from the college experience. NASPA Journal. 38(1), 31-43.

Vail, K. (2001). Teaching the parents. American School Board Journal. 188 (9). (Source available at http://www.asbj.com).

Van Steenhouse, A. L. (2002). Empty nest…full heart: the journey from home to college. Denver: Simpler Life Press.

Weeks, K. M. (1985). The buckley amendment and college students' parents: limitations and allowances. *New Directions for Student Services*, 32, 15-26.

Weeks, K. M. (2001). Family-friendly FERPA policies: affirming parental partnerships. *New Directions for Student Services*. 94 (Summer), 39-50.

Wesley H. & Bennett, D. T. (1998). Is this a good investment? Perspectives from a parent and college administrator on prepaid tuition programs. Journal of College Admission. 158 (Winter), 2-5.

Wintre, M. G. & Sugar, L. A. (2000). Relationships with parents, personality, and the University Transition. Journal of College Student Development. 41(2), 202-214.

Wernig, S. (December 2002). Creighton University Factbook. (Source available at http://www.creighton.edu/Factbook.)

Young, Jr., W. W. & Stick, S. L. (2003) The new generation of college students: Is higher education ready? Journal of College Orientation and Transition. 11(Fall), 27-34.

Young, B. A. (2004). Responding to tomorrow's technology. Syllabus. Vol 17, No. 11, 34-35.

Zusman, A. (1999). Issues facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In Altbach, P. G., Berdahl, R. O., & Gumport, P. (Eds.) American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 109-150.

APPENDIX A

PECTAC SURVEY

FINAL PECTAC SURVEY (May 2005)

Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC)

by Young (Copyright, 2005)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer each of the following demographic questions.

1 Your Gender
Female, Male

2 Marital Status
Married, Divorced, Single Parent, Widowed

3 Gender of your incoming student
Female, Male

4 Are you: (Mark all that apply)
n-
Amer

5 Is English your native language?
Yes, No

6 Education Level (Mark highest level completed.)
High School, Bachelors, Masters, PhD or Terminal degree

7 How many children do you have?
1, 2, 3,4, 5 or more

8 Is this your first experience as the parent of a college student?
Yes, No

9 Which school/college is your student entering?
Arts & Sciences, Business, Nursing

10 How involved were you in your student's college decision?
very, somewhat, a little involved, not involved at all

11 How many computers do you have at home?
0, 1, 2, 3 or more

12 What type of Internet access do you have at home?
None, Dial up, DSL/CABLE

For the next sections…

Answers are….Very Important (5), Important (4), Neutral (3), Somewhat Unimportant (2), Unimportant (1), N/A Don't Know

TEACHING

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the University provide your student with...

A) Collegiate Teaching: Technology Resources Provided in Support of Learning

13 General academic advising information via a website
14 Web access to register/drop/add courses and view tuition & fees
15 Web access to view tuition & fees and financial aid information
16 Specific academic advising information via a website for my student
17 Access to a University-provided email account
18 Access to textbooks required and ordering via a website
19 Access to computer labs
20 High-speed Internet access in her/his residence hall room
21 Wireless Internet access throughout campus
22 Training on the University library's digital resources
23 A University-provided portable computer

24 Email access to her/his faculty instructor
25 Academic content delivered via a course website
26 Email access to her/his academic advisor

27 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will...
B) Collegiate Teaching: Active & Team Learning

28 Discuss & critique ideas from readings with other students & the instructor during course
29 Present in front of peers and the instructor using technological means
30 Outperform the faculty instructor's expectations
31 Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging
32 Learn via an online course
33 Participate in community-based or service-based course projects
34 Use the Internet to research an assignment
35 Complete assignments via a course website
36 Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise
37 Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)

38 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will...
C) Collegiate Teaching: Out of Class Learning Opportunities

39 Be provided with training on how to be more responsible
40 Have opportunities to join a variety of clubs and organizations
41 Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested
42 Be provided with opportunities for internships
43 Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture
44 Be provided with opportunities for service & volunteerism
45 Have access to services and resources in the greater city area
46 Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed
47 Access to student tutoring and academic support
48 Have opportunities to socialize in group activities
49 Complete a practicum or internship using technology
50 Have access to career counseling and placement services
51 Be provided with information on developing good morals

52 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

CARING

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that your student should...
A) Collegiate Caring: A Caring Faculty

53 Have regular contact with her/his academic advisor
54 Develop plans for a major with her/his academic advisor
55 Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member
56 Be known by her/his course instructor(s)
57 Be treated fairly by the course instructor(s)
58 Have access to her/his course instructor(s) outside of class

59 Be provided the opportunity to give feedback on her/his course instructor(s)
60 Receive information on additional tutoring from her/his course instructor(s)
61 Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant

62 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that upon arriving at college your student finds…

B) Collegiate Caring: A Caring University Community

63 Programs welcoming your student to campus life
64 Opportunities to explore her/his leadership potential
65 A University community that appreciates the uniqueness of each student
66 Programs orienting her/him to collegiate life
67 Support and challenge like a parent might give
68 Health care at the student health center
69 Opportunities to learn how to be in community with others
70 A friend in her/his floor RA (Resident Advisor), if living on campus
71 Opportunities to grow in his/her faith life
72 Care at the student counseling center
73 Courses where he/she is instructed by a Jesuit priest

74 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the University…

C) Collegiate Caring: Being in Partnership with Parents

75 Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis
76 Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing
77 Have my calls returned by members of the faculty or administration within 24hours
78 Provide a safe and secure campus
79 Provide me with my student's major and degree progress information via a website
80 Discipline my student fairly if she/he break University policies and procedures
81 Provide my student additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested
82 Notify me if my student is using illegal substances
83 Orient me as to how I will be involved in my student's education
84 Provide my student unlimited visits at the student counseling center, if needed
85 Notify me if my student is drinking illegally

86 Out of these items, which two are the most important to you as a parent?

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECT RESEARCH EDUCATION

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

Creighton
UNIVERSITY

Research Compliance Office

Human Subject Research Education Certificate of Completion

This is to certify that the person listed below has demonstrated successful completion of the required Creighton University Human Subjects Research Education Program

Requirements for certification in the education program include:

1) Verification of receipt of the Creighton University Institutional Review Board *"Investigators' Manual for the Use of Human Subjects in Research"*
2) Attendance at a Creighton University Institutional Review Board On-Site Human Subjects Research Education Seminar
3) Completion of the CITI Web-Based Course in the Protection of Human Research Subjects

A description of each of these components can be found on the attached pages.

The Creighton University Human Subjects Research Education Program was developed to instruct research staff in the basic principles and special requirements associated with research involving human subjects.

A copy of this certificate is retained on file in the Creighton University Research Compliance Office

Name: **William Wayne Young, Jr.**

Date of Completion: **2/14/2005**

Certified by: Kathleen Diaz Taggart
Kathleen Diaz Taggart
Research Compliance Officer

Location: 1912 California Street Mail: 2500 California Plaza Omaha, Nebraska 68178
http://www.creighton.edu/researchcompliance phone: 402 280 2360 fax: 402 280 4766 hotline: 402 280 3200

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA - LINCOLN

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

UNIVERSITY OF Nebraska Lincoln

RESEARCH COMPLIANCE SERVICES
Institutional Review Board

April 19, 2005

W Wayne Young Jr
Dr Sheldon Stick
8257 Read Street
Omaha, NE 68122

IRB# 2005-03-265 EX

TITLE OF PROJECT: **Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring**

Dear Mr Young:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects This project has been approved by the Unit Review Committee from your college and sent to the IRB It is the Board's opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study Your proposal seems to be in compliance with this institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002258 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as exempt

Date of EX Review: **03/14/05**

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval: **04/19/05**

This approval is Valid Until: **04/18/06.**

1. You have received the IRB approved Cover Letter for this project Please use this letter when making copies to distribute to your participants If it is necessary to create a new informed consent form, please send us your original so that we may approve and stamp it before it is distributed to participants.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board For projects which continue beyond one year from the starting date, the IRB will request continuing review and update of the research project Your study will be due for continuing review as indicated above The investigator must also advise the Board when this study is finished or discontinued by completing the enclosed Protocol Final Report form and returning it to the Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions, please contact Shirley Horstman, IRB Administrator, at 472-9417 or email at shorstman1@unl edu

Sincerely,

Dan R Hoyt

Dan R. Hoyt, Chair
for the IRB

Shirley Horstman

Shirley Horstman
IRB Administrator

cc: Faculty Advisor

Alexander Building West / 312 N. 14th Street / P.O. Box 880408 / Lincoln, NE 68588-0408 / (402) 472-6965 / FAX (402) 472-9323

APPENDIX D

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

February 15, 2005

W. Wayne Young
School of VP for Student Services
Department of Resident's Life

Dear Dr. Young:

Thank you for submitting the proposal PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF COLLEGIATE TEACHING AND CARING (IRB #05-13645) to the Institutional Review Board office for review. This project is exempt from Federal Policy for Protection of Human Subjects as per 45CFR46.101(b) 2. Accordingly, HHS Form 310, certifying this IRB review, exemption and approval is enclosed. This IRB action is for a 12 month period.

Sincerely,

Mary Kunes-Connell, PhD

Mary Kunes-Connell, Ph.D.
Vice Chairman, Institutional Review Board

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT INVITATION LETTER

Creighton
UNIVERSITY

(CU IRB#05-13645
UNL IRB#2005-03-265 EX)

May 24, 2005

Dear New Creighton Parent:

Welcome to the Creighton Community! My name is Wayne Young, Jr. and I serve as the Associate Director of Residence Life at Creighton. I am writing to request your help with a survey studying the expectations parents have of the ensuing collegiate experience.

I am asking all parents of students admitted to Creighton's Fall 2005 freshman class to participate in my research study, the **Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC).** The results of this study will assist in fulfilling the goals of my research and help Creighton University to further design programs, services, and resources for the transitions students and parents face at the start of students' collegiate journeys. **If you agree to participate, I would ask that each parent please spend approximately 8-10 minutes to fill out their own questionnaire**. For the purposes of this study, a parent can be a mother, father, grandfather, uncle, aunt, legal guardian, or anyone who would be considered, by the student, as the parent.

Please know that all answers will be kept confidential and used for the purposes of my dissertation or for publication in professional journals and/or literature. Specific names will not be used as a result of the data obtained through this questionnaire. There are no known risks involved in participating in this research. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators, Creighton University or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

I would kindly ask that each parent please take a few minutes to fill out a questionnaire online using the website address provided below before June 13, 2005.

WEBSITE URL:

http://www.studentvoice.com/Creighton/

As a participant, you have the right to ask any questions about the survey questions, how the data will be further used, or request a paper copy of the survey. Please feel free to direct any inquiries to Mr. Wayne Young, Jr., principal investigator at 402.280.5549 (waynejr@creighton.edu) or Dr. Sheldon L. Stick, secondary investigator, at 402.472.0973 (sstick1@unl.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board, telephone 402-472-6965.

Again, welcome to the Creighton Community! Thank you in advance for assisting me with this study.

Sincerely,

W. Wayne Young, Jr.
Associate Director of Residence Life
Doctoral Student, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Cc:
File

APPENDIX F

PECTAC SURVEY AFTER FACTOR ANALYSIS

FINAL PECTAC SURVEY (May 2005)

Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC)
by Young (Copyright, 2005)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer each of the following demographic questions.

1 Your Gender
Female, Male

2 Marital Status
Married, Divorced, Single Parent, Widowed

3 Gender of your incoming student
Female, Male

4 Are you: (Mark all that apply)
American/Chicano, Pacific Islander, Puerto Rican, Other Latino, Other

5 Is English your native language?
Yes, No

6 Education Level (Mark highest level completed.)
High School, Bachelors, Masters, PhD or Terminal degree

7 How many children do you have?
1, 2, 3,4, 5 or more

8 Is this your first experience as the parent of a college student?
Yes, No

9 Which school/college is your student entering?
Arts & Sciences, Business, Nursing

10 How involved were you in your student's college decision?
very, somewhat, a little involved, not involved at all

11 How many computers do you have at home?
0, 1, 2, 3 or more

12 What type of Internet access do you have at home?
None, Dial up, DSL/CABLE

For the next sections…

Answers are….Very Important (5), Important (4), Neutral (3), Somewhat Unimportant (2), Unimportant (1), N/A Don't Know

TEACHING

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the University provide your student with...

A) Technology Resources Provided in Support of Learning

13 T1 General academic advising information via a website
14 T2 Web access to register/drop/add courses and view tuition & fees
15 T3 Web access to view tuition & fees and financial aid information
16 T4 Specific academic advising information via a website for my student
17 T5 Access to a University-provided email account
18 T6 Access to textbooks required and ordering via a website
19 T7 Access to computer labs
20 T8 High-speed Internet access in her/his residence hall room
21 T9 Wireless Internet access throughout campus
22 T10 Training on the University library's digital resources

~~23~~	~~T11~~	~~A University provided portable computer~~
24	T12	Email access to her/his faculty instructor
25	T13	Academic content delivered via a course website
26	T14	Email access to her/his academic advisor

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will...

B) Active & Team Learning

28	T15	Discuss & critique ideas from readings with other students & the instructor during course
29	T16	Present in front of peers and the instructor using technological means
30	T17	Outperform the faculty instructor's expectations
31	T18	Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging
32	T19	Learn via an online course
33	T20	Participate in community-based or service-based course projects
~~34~~	~~T21~~	~~Use the Internet to research an assignment~~
35	T22	Complete assignments via a course website
~~36~~	~~T23~~	~~Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise~~
~~37~~	~~T24~~	~~Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)~~

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will...

C) Collegiate Teaching: Out of Class Learning Opportunities

39	T25	Be provided with training on how to be more responsible
40	T26	Have opportunities to join a variety of clubs and organizations
41	T27	Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested
42	T28	Be provided with opportunities for internships
~~43~~	~~T29~~	~~Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture~~
~~44~~	~~T30~~	~~Be provided with opportunities for service & volunteerism~~
45	T31	Have access to services and resources in the greater city area
46	T32	Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed
47	T33	Access to student tutoring and academic support
48	T34	Have opportunities to socialize in group activities
~~49~~	~~T35~~	~~Complete a practicum or internship using technology~~
50	T36	Have access to career counseling and placement services
51	T37	Be provided with information on developing good morals

CARING

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that your student should...

A) A Caring Faculty

53	C1	Have regular contact with her/his academic advisor
54	C2	Develop plans for a major with her/his academic advisor
55	C3	Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member
56	C4	Be known by her/his course instructor(s)
57	C5	Be treated fairly by the course instructor(s)
58	C6	Have access to her/his course instructor(s) outside of class
59	C7	Be provided the opportunity to give feedback on her/his course instructor(s)
60	C8	Receive information on additional tutoring from her/his course instructor(s)
61	C9	Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that upon arriving at college your student finds…

B) A Caring University Community

63	C10	Programs welcoming your student to campus life
64	C11	Opportunities to explore her/his leadership potential
65	C12	A University community that appreciates the uniqueness of each student
66	C13	Programs orienting her/him to collegiate life
67	C14	Support and challenge like a parent might give
68	C15	Health care at the student health center
69	C16	Opportunities to learn how to be in community with others
70	C17	A friend in her/his floor RA (Resident Advisor), if living on campus
71	C18	Opportunities to grow in his/her faith life
72	C19	Care at the student counseling center
~~73~~	~~C20~~	~~Courses where he/she is instructed by a Jesuit priest~~

As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the University…

C) Being in Partnership with Parents

75	C21	Notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis
76	C22	Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing
~~77~~	~~C23~~	~~Have my calls returned by members of the faculty or administration within 24hours~~
~~78~~	~~C24~~	~~Provide a safe and secure campus~~
79	C25	Provide me with my student's major and degree progress information via a website
80	C26	Discipline my student fairly if she/he break University policies and procedures
~~81~~	~~C27~~	~~Provide my student additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested~~
82	C28	Notify me if my student is using illegal substances
83	C29	Orient me as to how I will be involved in my student's education
~~84~~	~~C30~~	~~Provide my student unlimited visits at the student counseling center, if needed~~
85	C31	Notify me if my student is drinking illegally

Thank you for your participation!