DISSERTATION

PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHING AND CARING AT DIFFERENT KINDS OF

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Submitted by

Tyna M. Adams

Department of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2014

Doctoral Committee:

 Advisor: George A. Morgan

 Linda Kuk
 Lisa A. Miller
 Deborah P. Valentine

ABSTRACT

PARENT EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHING AND CARING AT DIFFERENT KINDS OF

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Today's college students arrive at higher education institutions with parents who remain involved well beyond the admissions and financial aid processes. Many of these parents attended college themselves and have strong beliefs about what the college experience is like or should be. Some of these parents will not hesitate to negotiate grades with professors or intervene on behalf of their student when issues arise (Coburn, 2006; Henning, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Many of today's college students are happy with the amount of parental involvement in their college experience and welcome it (Shoup, Gonyea, & Kuh, 2009).

Today's college parent is involved in a myriad of ways with their college student's experience as well as the institution. What remains unclear is what parent expectations are of the college or university and of their involvement in their student's college experience. Understanding parent expectations may help staff and administrators better support and encourage appropriate parental involvement in the student's college experience.

This study examined parent expectations of teaching and caring at eleven different institutions, utilizing the Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC) survey created by Wayne Young (2006). The sample included a total of 3,378 participants. The intent of the study was to compare parent expectations regarding the teaching and caring functions of several kinds of institutions, which were grouped by two variables: Sponsorship (public, private non-sectarian, or private religious) and Institution Type (research/PhD or liberal arts).

One purpose of the study was to compare expectations of parents who graduated from college with those who did not graduate or attend college. Another purpose of this study was to compare parent expectations of teaching and caring results based on parent gender, parent race/ethnicity, parent education and student classification. The participants in this study were majority female, married, Caucasian, and had a college degree. At least half were first time college parents and were very involved in their student's college choice.

Parents continue to play an important role in the relationship between the student, parent, and institution. Their expectations influence how they interact with their student as well as the institution that their student attends. The results of this study suggest that parents have specific expectations of higher education. Mothers, non-college graduates, African American, and Latino parents had higher expectations of overall teaching and caring. Parents of students who attend religious institutions had higher expectations of the overall caring but not the overall teaching functions of the institution. Parents of freshmen students had higher expectations of the overall caring but not the overall teaching of the institution. In general the effect sizes were small to medium but African American parents differed from Caucasian parents with large effect sizes on both the overall caring and teaching functions of the institution.

Female parent gender, non-college graduate and non-white race/ethnicity combined to significantly predict parent expectations related to the overall teaching functions of the institution. Parent gender, education, and ethnicity as well as religious institutional sponsorship combined to significantly predict parent expectations of the overall caring functions of the institution, although the effect sizes of the multiple regressions were small.

The current study adds to the research conducted on parent expectations and may help administrators and institutions to better understand how parent expectations differ among the

various kinds of institutions. Additionally, results of this study may help administrators improve

or create services and programs to better serve parents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

did not want to. It is hard dealing with doctoral students as you have always told me, even more so when they are your own spouse. I thank you for allowing me to be added to the list of the many doctoral students you have guided on their dissertation journey but, most of all I thank you for your unending patience and love through this process and beyond.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation work to my daughters Brittany and Jennifer and my grandchildren,

Kaylen, Lexie, and Cash

Anything is possible, if only you believe.

Shafique Ahmed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Background

Parental involvement in higher education has continued to grow over the past decade (Shoup, Gonyea, & Kuh, 2009; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Today's college students arrive at higher education institutions with parents who remain involved well beyond the admissions and financial aid processes. Many of these parents attended college themselves and have strong beliefs about what the college experience is like or should be. Some of these parents will not hesitate to negotiate grades with professors or intervene on behalf of their child when issues arise (Coburn, 2006; Henning, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Many of today's college students are happy with the amount of parental involvement in their college experience and welcome it (Shoup et al., 2009).

In order to better understand these parents and their college aged students, it is important to examine the origin of this involvement. This focus on children began in the early 80s. According to Howe and Strauss (2000), those students born between 1982 and 2000 have experienced significantly more structure and supervision while growing up as compared with those born before 1982. They have spent more time on homework and structured activities and have had very little time on their own. Termed the "Baby on Board" generation, their parents have been involved in every aspect of their childhood (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

It is also important to understand that this generation of students has always had access to computers and cell phones. They talk to their parents often by text, cell phone, email, or Facebook. Often it is the student who initiates contact with the parent about issues and problems he/she is having because of a close relationship with the parent (Coburn, 2006). Other factors

that influence the involvement and expectations of parents include: the high cost of college, parenting practices, and an increased number of parents who attended college themselves (Henning, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008).

The term "Helicopter Parent" has been coined to describe the hovering parent that at any given time, is prepared to intervene on their student's behalf (Merriman, 2007). The media has capitalized on this and has helped to portray this image as negative. Most parents are well intentioned and only interested in ensuring that their student is successful.

Highly involved parents do not always have a negative impact, according to Shoup et al. (2009), who examined data from the 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement to explore the frequency of student interaction with parents while in college and the impact of parent involvement on engagement on educational outcomes. Students of very involved parents experienced higher levels of engagement and reported higher levels of satisfaction with their education, though they had a significantly lower grade point average (GPA) than those students whose parents were less involved. Parents that are very involved in their student's education pose a challenge to college administrators, but not much is known about their impact on student development or student success (Shoup et al., 2009).

As parents continue to be involved in their children's education, colleges and universities will need to collaborate with parents to help them support their student in engaged learning and student development (Coburn, 2006; Henning, 2007). The message conveyed by much of the literature on parent involvement continues to support developing partnerships with parents and involving rather than excluding them from their child's college experience (Donovan & McKelfresh, 2008; Jackson & Murphy, 2005; Ward-Roof et al., 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Weeks, 2001). Parents will be involved in their children's education whether through intentional

activities created and planned by administrators or left between parent and student (Young, 2006).

In 2006, College Parents of America began surveying parents through a web based survey tool, Survey Monkey, to identify parent concerns during the college years. The survey invitation was sent out by email to approximately 41,000 College Parents of America members and subscribers as well as the Student Advantage database. Those members and subscribers of College Parents of America and Student Advantage include parents from all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The most recent published results indicated that of the 1,727 parents who completed the survey, data indicated that finances were the greatest concerns of parents followed by health and safety and academics (College Parents of America, 2007). What remains unclear is what parent expectations are of the university and their involvement in their student's college experience. Understanding parent expectations will help staff and administrators to support and encourage appropriate parental involvement in the student's college experience.

Purpose of the Study

Today's college parents are involved in a myriad of ways with their college student's experience as well as the institution. Many of today's parents attended college themselves and have beliefs and expectations of what the college experience should be. Thus, one purpose was to compare expectations of parents who graduated from college with those who did not graduate or attend college. This study also extended the limited research on parent expectations and examines parent expectations at several different kinds of institutions. This study invited parents of currently enrolled students at six different kinds of institutions to report the importance placed on the ability of the institution to teach and care for their child. Another purpose of this survey study was to compare results from the participants based on gender, race, and student classification.

3

Research Questions

The questions explored within this study were as follows:

1. What differences exist between the kind of institution that their student attends in regards to the importance parents placed on the institution's ability to teach and care for their child?

    a. Is there a difference between public institutions, private nonsectarian institutions, and private religious institutions in regard to parent expectations?

    b. Is there a difference between research universities and liberal arts colleges in regard to parent expectations?

    c. Is there an interaction between sponsorship and institutional type (research or liberal arts) in regard to parent expectations?

2. What differences exist between the parent's racial identity in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution and parent race?

3. What differences exist between parent educational attainment in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

4. What differences exist between parent gender in regard to expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

5. What differences exist between student classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate student) in regard to parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

6. How well does the combination of parent gender, race, educational attainment, student classification, and institution type predict parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

The dependent variables in the study were as follows: Parent expectations of the teaching functions of the institution, Parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution. Independent variables cluster around several categories; institution kind, parent characteristics, and student classification.

This study was informed by Young's (2006) study of parental expectations of the teaching and caring (PECTAC) functions of an institution. Using the PECTAC, Young (2006) examined parent expectations regarding the importance that parents placed on the teaching and caring functions of Creighton University. Additionally, he examined parent gender in relation to expectations of teaching and caring. Resulting data from Young's (2006) study indicated that there were differences between the importance parents placed on the institution's ability to teach and care for their student. Parents reported that it was more important for the institution to care for their student than to teach them.

Young's (2006) study was the first comprehensive study of parent expectations. However, it was conducted at a Jesuit, Catholic institution in the Midwest with a student population of 6,100 students (Young, 2006). To build upon these findings, Young's study could be replicated at different types of institutions such as private institutions, small liberal arts institutions, and large public research institutions. Additionally, as college students transition through the university it is critical to examine differences, if any between parent expectations in regard to student classification (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, or Graduate Student).

Key Terms and Definitions

Terms that were used in this study that held significant meanings related to this study are defined below:

Caring functions of the institution- providing students with regular contact with their academic advisor, having access to instructors outside of class, receiving additional tutoring if needed, and giving the opportunity to give feedback on course instructors. Providing students with opportunities to explore their leadership potential, programs orienting students to collegiate life, health care at the student health center, care at the student counseling center, and a welcoming campus community.

Parent Expectations- assumptions or beliefs about how things should be.

Parent Involvement- parents showing interest in and acquiring knowledge about their student's college experience. Guiding and encouraging their student toward a connection with the institution (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Parent Relations Offices- A dedicated office with staff whose sole purpose is to provide support and information to parents of students.

Teaching functions of the institution - technological resources available to students on campus, active and team learning activities and out of class learning opportunities provided to students.

Limitations

Using survey research for this study may have limited the sample and excluded parents that had not registered an email with the designated parent relations office; therefore, they did not have the opportunity to participate. Additionally, it may have also excluded those parents who were not comfortable or familiar with computer surveys.

Seven of the 11 participating institutions sent out the survey invitation to parents in their parent newsletter. Not all parents may have opened the newsletter and read the invitation to participate in the study. Also, those parents who received the email invitation to participate may have not opened it. Not all institutions sent out the reminder email to parents about the survey, which probably had an impact on response rates.

Further, this study was conducted only at institutions that had a parent and family services/programs office. This study's use of parent listservs from parent relations and admission offices may have limited the study only to those parents who were involved and had certain expectations of the institution. Results may have been different if the institutions surveyed had not had a parent and or family services/programs office on their campus. Over half (54%) of the participants in the survey had students at a public institution. A more balanced sample of private and public institutions may have made the results more generalizable

Relying on parent self-reports is another limitation of this study, as there was no way to verify that parents really expected what they reported. Additionally, because only one parent may have responded to the survey, his/her responses may not have represented the expectations of both parents.

Significance of the Study

The literature reviewed indicated that parents will continue to be involved in the college experience of their student. Parents are stakeholders in their student's education and play an important role in the relationship between the student, parent, and institution. Many parents went to college themselves and have assumptions and beliefs about what the college experience is like or should be. Little research has been done exploring parent expectations of the institution from the parent perspective. No research has been identified that examines the differences in parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of different types of institutions. Understanding

parent's expectations of the teaching and caring functions of an institution and how they may differ by institution will enable institutions to create and develop better parent programs and policy. This study will explore parent expectations in general, as well as the differences, if any of parental expectations at different kinds of higher education institutions. This study will contribute to the existing parent involvement research and may provide information that will benefit all parties involved.

Researcher's Perspective

As an older non-traditional and first generation student, the idea of parent involvement in higher education was new and intriguing to me. Even as a college parent, I did not expect to be involved or engaged with the institution that my children attended in any way. My expectations of the institution were that my daughters would receive a good education; beyond that, it was up to them to figure out.

It was through my years as a professional area coordinator in housing and residence life at a large public research institution that opened my eyes to the phenomenon of parent involvement. Some parents arrived on campus with their students at move in with expectations that the institution and staff would cater to their student's every need, not just at move in but all year long. My frustration and wonder concerning why parents expected so much of us led me to question how we were currently serving this parent population. I began to think about what parents expected from us and why they might hold those expectations. Additionally, I wondered how we were addressing those expectations.

In my search of the literature on parent involvement, little research was found that examined parent expectations of the institution. There exists a plethora of research on the student's perspective of the parent's involvement and the parent-student relationship. None exists that examines parent expectations from the parent perspective and how those expectations might

differ based on the type of institution that the student attends. My experiences with parents have taught me that parents have definite expectations of the university and its staff and faculty. How those expectations came to be might be based on prior university experiences, institutional marketing, or other influences. Parent's expectations of the institution warrant exploration so that we can better understand what they expect from us. Additionally, my hope is that by learning more about parent expectations of the institution, we can build stronger relationships with parents that will benefit the institution and the success of the students we serve.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the review of the literature four themes emerged: the historical and legal relationship between parents, students, and the institution; reasons for parent involvement in higher education; impact of parent involvement in higher education; and the expectations of parent involvement in higher education. These themes established the foundation for this study.

History of Parental Involvement

Parental Involvement in K-12

Parental involvement in K-12 education can be identified as helping with homework, discussing school events or class issues, speaking with teachers by phone and attending parent-teacher conferences (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997). School involvement can be described as helping in the classroom, driving for a field trip, helping in the school office, and participating in and attending Parent-Teacher Association meetings. K-12 institutions inform and encourage parental involvement and the messages are clear; parental involvement is needed and welcomed (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 has had a tremendous effect on the education of current college aged students (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2008). Under NCLB, parental involvement is a critical component for funding of K-12 schools and standards for parental involvement are clearly stated (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2008). The U.S. Department of Education has published several documents encouraging parents to partner with their child's teacher and school to communicate and promote academic success. They suggest that parents take an active role in being involved with their child's education from the very

beginning. This involvement is encouraged because research indicates that students of supportive parents are more likely to continue, succeed, and finish high school (Kennedy, 2009).

Parental involvement during the K-12 years is associated with higher grades, in school success, higher self-esteem, and aspirations for college (Harvard Family Research Project, 2007). Additionally, Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1997) stated that there were three factors that influenced parental involvement in education: the parent's role in the child's life, the parent's sense of effectiveness in helping their child succeed, and encouragement by the institution and child for parental involvement.

In higher education, the level of parental involvement is based upon the parent-child relationship as well as the institution's encouragement and inclusion of parents in the educational process of their child (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2008). As stated by Jackson and Murphy (2005), "Parents are redefining the relationship between the institution and the student in ways that none of us understand because the behavior is so recent" (p. 54). As parents continue to intensify their involvement, we must adjust our thinking about how we work with them to establish an effective alliance (Mullendore, Banahan, & Ramsey, 2005, p. 1).

Parental Involvement in College

Examining this phenomenon from the historical perspective, early higher education institutions operated under the doctrine of *in loco parentis*. *In loco parentis* meant ' in the place of the parent', and it permitted the institution authority over students' lives (Kaplan & Lee, 1995). The higher education environment was deemed special and private and operated autonomously with little outside interference (Kaplan & Lee, 1995). The faculty and administrators were considered as having education and training far beyond the general public and were charged with the guardianship of students as well as knowledge for future generations (Kaplan & Lee, 1995).

Once enrolled, the institution became the stand- in-parent of the student and the student was still considered a child. Parents delegated rights and responsibilities for their child to the institution (Henning, 2007). Institutional regulations covered all aspects of the students' lives, with curfews, dress codes for classrooms as well as dining halls, and conduct to be followed when a male visited a female in her residence hall room or vice versa (Altschuler & Kramnick, 1999).

The decision in Dixon vs. Alabama in 1961 ended the doctrine of *in loco parentis* (Bickel & Lake, 1999; Taub, 2008). This landmark decision, as well as the lowering of the voting age to 18 years of age, was a key factor for change in higher education. Educators, administrators, and the university began accepting the view of the college student as an adult with constitutional rights and thus there was no place for the role of the parent (Bickel & Lake, 1999; Henning, 2007; Taub, 2008). It was well accepted and encouraged for parents to be involved in elementary, middle, and high school. Parental involvement in higher education, however, was not encouraged beyond parental payment for tuition or donations to the institution. The institution was no longer obligated to be involved in students' lives outside of the classroom. Students were seen as adults responsible for their own behavior and the institution acted as a bystander (Henning, 2007; Kaplan & Lee, 1995). As a bystander, the institution was not responsible for any harm befalling the student.

What was perceived as a return to *in loco parentis* began to appear in the 1980s when colleges and universities assumed the duty to protect students and visitors to campus from foreseeable harm (Bickle & Lake, 1999; Henning, 2007; Kaplan & Lee, 1995). In the lawsuits that students were bringing against colleges, they were asking that colleges act as parents and

protect them (Henning, 2007). *In loco parentis* was never seen as anything but the power of the institution to control and discipline students, not to nurture and protect (Forbes, 2001).

The recent and continuing surge of parent involvement in higher education contradicts the legal and policy developments of the 60s, 70s, and 80s. This increase in parent involvement has resulted in the development and creation of designated parent offices and services on college campuses across the nation (Spearman, 2010). Additionally, those campuses that had previously only offered one or two parent programs or services have expanded and developed new programs and services to better meet the needs of today's college parents (Savage, 2005).

Parental Involvement and FERPA

In 1974 the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), or Buckley Amendment, was legislation created to better ensure the rights of parents and students themselves. Students, over 18 years of age, were granted access to their educational records and protection of the privacy of those records by limiting disclosure without their consent (Weeks, 2001). It is this legislation that continues to define how institutions communicate with parents and ultimately challenges their relationship (Coburn, 2006; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Weeks, 2001). Most all FERPA amendments to date have been to increase information disclosure about the activities and behavior of students on college campuses. Parents and students will discover FERPA in the process of reviewing colleges. It is during this search that they will encounter the different policies and procedures regarding access and disclosure of student records (Weeks, 2001).

The defining age for adulthood is 18 years of age, though several states restrict gambling and alcohol possession until the age of 21 years (Baker, 2008). When a child reaches the age of 18 years, he/she can give consent for medical services, live apart from his/her parents, declare financial independence, and have sole access to his/her educational and health records (Baker,

2008). While the legal status of 18 year olds to 20 year olds may differ by state, FERPA protects each and every student attending a federally funded institution (Baker, 2008).

FERPA legislation sets the standard for educational records, if state and federal laws differ, then the one with greater protection for the student wins (Baker, 2008). Disclosure and access to student educational records requires specific permissions from the student. According to FERPA, the access rights of the parent terminate once the student turns eighteen or enrolls in postsecondary education (Baker, 2008; Bickel & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001).

At the college level, once a student is admitted and enrolled the parent has neither access nor disclosure rights, even if the student is financially dependent upon the parents. The student decides what and if any information is disclosed to others. All institutions that receive federal funding are obligated to follow FERPA guidelines or risk the loss of all federal funding from loans and grants (Baker, 2008; Bickel & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001).

FERPA provisions allow disclosure once permission is secured from the student. If state law does not forbid disclosure, administrators may disclose certain types of information without the student's consent, such as a health or situations of a safety emergency in which the parent needs to know the information to assist the student, in a situation involving alcohol or drugs, and a student under the age of 21 years, in which case the information may be shared with the parent unless prohibited under state law (Baker, 2008; Bickle & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001). Colleges and universities may release certain directory information such as name, address, phone number, birth-date, major field of study, membership in groups and clubs, as well as participation in sports, dates of attendance, degrees and awards granted, and the name of the most recent educational institution attended without violating FERPA regulations (Baker, 2008; Bickle &

Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001). The college is obligated to inform the student about what type of information will be disclosed and provide the student with the option to decline disclosure.

The scope of FERPA remains broad, exceptions limit a student's right to access financial aid as well as medical records held in the student health center or counseling center. All other student records are subject to FERPA access and disclosure guidelines. There are certain records that may be disclosed without consent; those pertain to other college officials that have a legitimate educational interest, or another college or university where the student seeks or is planning to enroll (Baker, 2008; Bickle & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001).

Colleges and universities may share student information with federal and state educational authorities if it is for an audit or evaluation of federally supported programs (Baker, 2008; Bickle & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001). Information may also be shared with entities that conduct studies, assessments, or accreditation. If a student believes that educational information is not accurate or is misleading they have a right to challenge the information and request that it be changed (Bickle & Lake, 1999; Weeks, 2001). If the institution does not change the information, the student may have explanatory information added to the records (Baker, 2008; Bickle & Lake 1999; Weeks, 2001).

Parents have five basic rights under FERPA: (a) confidentiality of financial information provided in relation to financial aid, (b) access to student records if a financial dependency relationship exists, (c) they may have access to health and safety information if an emergency or crisis exists, (d) obtain evidence in disciplinary actions, and (e) gain access to information concerning drug and alcohol violations. The language is very clear on the rights of parents to information (Baker, 2008; Henning, 2007; Weeks, 2001).

Colleges and universities are not always consistent or clear in the way that they share or do not share information with parents. Some institutions may provide students with an option to state or to waive that they are dependent for income tax purposes (Baker, 2008; Weeks, 2001). Other institutions may require parents to provide proof of dependent relationship by producing income tax returns listing the student as a dependent. Some institutions may not recognize this parental right and do not share information at all (Baker, 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Weeks, 2001).

College and university administrators have a wide range of discretion in interpretation and communication with parents. In most cases, parents are paying the bill for the student's education and want to know if their child is being successful. Often parents do not understand why they cannot receive direct answers to questions about grades and other classroom information, especially since they pay their child's tuition (Kepic, 2006). They want to know if their child encounters critical educational, behavioral, or medical issues (Weeks, 2001). As Cutright (2008) stated, "It is no wonder then that parents assert rights that they may or may not have when laws are conflicting and basic circumstances so different from those of the parent's college days" (p. 41).

It is important that student affairs and other campus administrators work together to assess the consistency of policies regarding parental involvement and the sharing of student information. Parents should be informed of their rights under FERPA and how the institution will handle disclosure or nondisclosure of student information. Policies should be clear and understandable for parents and their student.

Reasons for Parental Involvement in College

Parent Involvement and College Cost

The rising cost of college has turned parents into consumers looking for returns on their investment and being aggressive advocates for their student (Carney-Hall, 2008; Ward-Roof et al., 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Parents and their expectations of higher education to respond to all of their concerns, including those of protecting their student and resolving any crisis that may arise, have pushed institutions to create more opportunities for parent and family involvement (Price, 2008; Ward-Roof et al., 2008; Wartman & Savage, 2008). This is not to be mistaken for a return to in loco parentis. It may be described as more of an *in consortio cum parentibus*; in partnership with parents (Henning, 2007). Parents can be valuable collaborators in strengthening the messages schools send out regarding residence hall move out/in, health related concerns, retention, graduation, and financial responsibility (Wartman & Savage, 2008).

The discussion regarding trends in parental involvement is most often based on middle class behaviors. The type and degree of parental involvement can often be gauged by the educational level as well as the socioeconomic status of parents (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1997). Those parents who have a degree and significant economic capital are in a better position to convey the importance of a college education (Wolf, Sax, & Harper, 2009).

The recent outpouring of concern over the assessment of learning outcomes and the skills that students acquire while in college is an area of concern for parents. The mounting criticism of accountability in higher education may be part of the cause of parental monitoring of the quality of the education they are paying for (Shoup et al., 2009). They want to make certain that their student is getting the education needed to be successful beyond college. Many of these parents have beliefs and assumptions of what college is like or should be, since they have been to college

themselves. They often compare their college experience with that of their student, though the times have changed.

In a qualitative study, Bastian (2010) interviewed 17 parents of undergraduate students and found that 82% of parent participants were more involved in their child's college experience and had more contact with their child than their own parents. Participants in the study explained that their involvement was based on the fact that things are not as safe as they used to be, citing that safety of their child was a critical concern (Bastain, 2010).

Today's college parents are less confident of their student's ability to self- regulate and tend to accept the view that in loco parentis means protecting and nurturing (Forbes, 2001). Current college students feel that their parents, as well as the university, will continue to protect them as they have in the past, since they do not consider themselves ready to take on the responsibilities of adulthood (Arnett, 2001; Forbes, 2001; Henning, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Parent Involvement and Technology

Technology has changed communication today. The cell phone, email, internet, text messaging, and instant messaging are all ways available for communication. Students use all of these technologies to communicate with their parents (Coburn, 2006; Lum, 2006; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Members and subscribers (40,000) of College Parents of America and Student Advantage were invited to participate in an on line survey in 2006. Of the 839 parents who participated in the survey, 74% communicated with their student two to three times per week, with one third communicating daily. It is also interesting to note that 90% of the communication was done by cell phone and was most often initiated by the student.

The pressure to make the right decision has students turning back to those who have always been there. This being the parent in whom they trust to give them the right answers

(Coburn, 2006; Cutright, 2008; Shoup et al., 2009). Today's college student can access parental advice with the touch of a button on a cell phone or the tap of a key on a computer (Coburn, 2006). Communication can happen almost instantaneously, so the student is never without parental support and advice.

Students will consult parents most often when they are uneasy facing a particular issue or if they have not been able to resolve an issue on their own (Kennedy, 2009). Being away from home for the first time and having to make decisions, Students are left with an uncertainty of how they should proceed with problems, especially when they have tried several strategies to no avail. Many students and parents think that parental intervention is an effective way to solve a problem (Kennedy, 2009). Students and parents alike, tend to believe that institutions are more responsive to parental intervention. When parents call, things seem to get resolved or taken care of much faster and sometimes with a much better outcome for the student (Kennedy, 2009).

College and University Response to Parental Involvement

Creation of Parent Relations Offices and Parent Orientation

Response to the increase in parental involvement includes the creation and implementation of Parent Orientation sessions, Parent Associations, Parent Services Offices, and Parent Councils. Outreach to parents in the form of newsletters, emails, and the establishment of parent liaisons on some campuses is becoming the norm (Henning, 2007). Parent Services Offices, and those like it, are usually under the umbrella of student affairs and serve as the main contact for parents. They sometimes collaborate with admissions and enrollment and work seamlessly together to answer parent questions and concerns.

Parent Services and Resources

Many institutions utilize a combination of the following services as a basis for parent and family programs and services; an orientation program, a handbook, a newsletter, a website, and a

19

parent association (Saul & Honor, 2005). Parents who are included in the admissions and orientation process tend to see their involvement as an opportunity to partner with the institution. Orientation programs offer opportunities to engage and include parents and families in their student's educational process. The programs provide opportunities to assist the student, parent, family members, and staff in establishing expectations and boundaries for involvement (Ward-Roof et al., 2008).

Colleges and universities have created several resources for parents. Handbooks are one of those resources. They can provide contact information, policies and processes, deadlines and other critical facts. Newsletters are another resource that colleges and universities use to provide parents with information. Newsletters inform parents about daily activities that their student engages in, and encourage appropriate ways that parents and families can be involved and engaged in their student's college experience (Collard-Jarnot, 2009). Additionally, newsletters can include information about fundraising as well as information about events happening on campus. A website dedicated to parents and families of students helps to provide an all-inclusive information resource. Links to contact information, student organizations, financial aid, and the registrar, from one page helps parents and families navigate and gather a wealth of needed information (Collard-Jarnot, 2009). Creation of a parent council or parent and family association provides a way to gather feedback from parents and connects them to the college. This feedback will provide crucial information that can help the institution to shape their programs and services to best meet the needs and expectations of today's college parents.

Building Parent and Institution Relationships

Institutional shift to a less defensive approach when communicating with parents is important. Parents are partners in the development and support of students. The most important relationship remains between the institution and the student, but parents are seen as a beneficial

addition (Henning, 2007). Colleges and universities are beginning to create policies that are family friendly and support partnerships with parents while acknowledging the rights of the individual (Weeks, 2001). Many institutions understand that parental influence is a valued and untapped resource for impacting student behavior (Forbes, 2001). A shift in the view of parents as stakeholders in the student experience is important. This view empowers parents and families with resources so that all stakeholders can focus on student success (Ward-Roof et al., 2008).

When looking at enhancing the relationship and services provided to parents of college students, valuable information can be obtained from the parent perspective. In a qualitative study performed by Schwartz (2009), seven parents of first generation Latino females participating in the Latina Empowerment Program at a Northern Colorado University were interviewed. The results indicated that information gleaned from parents can be instrumental in the development of services to better serve them.

College students today, report that they have closer relationships with their parents and are happy with their continued involvement in their education (Coburn, 2006; Henning, 2007; Merriman, 2007; Wartman & Savage, 2008). It only makes sense then that higher education cultivates a relationship with parents that is supportive of their involvement.

Parent Involvement Impact

Parental involvement and its impact are different for each student and parent. The amount of involvement as well as the relationship between the parent and student is important. Involvement in the student's education usually begins in kindergarten and continues well in to elementary school. When looking at parent involvement in college, a substantial amount of the research is focused on the parent-student relationship from the view of the student (Sax & Wartman, 2010). Only recently has parental involvement in higher education become more clearly defined. Wartman and Savage (2008) described parent involvement in higher education,

as "parents interested and engaged in the lives of their students in college, obtaining information and resources about college and knowing when and how to provide encouragement and guidance to their student" (p. 5).

Some parents are very involved with their student's college experience. They attend orientation sessions and are active members of institutional parent organizations. They communicate with their student often via technology (cell phone, email, instant messaging) and are not above contacting professors or administrators on their student's behalf.

According to Shoup et al. (2009) and data gathered by the 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement, students communicated often with at least one of their parents during the school year and much of that communication was by some type of communication technology. A significant amount of the communication centered on academic matters and personal issues.

Harper, Sax, and Wolfe, (2012), explored the relationship between parent contact and involvement and its impact on student's academic, personal, and social development. Using data collected by the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey, parent involvement and contact were positively related to the student's academic and social development. More importantly, results indicated that parent involvement is associated with more positive outcomes than parent contact. This finding suggests that there is a difference between parent contact and the parent getting involved in the student's college experience.

Additionally, College Parents of America has begun surveying parents annually to explore the level of involvement during college, level and types of communication between parents and their college aged students, and to identify major parent concerns. According to their findings, the greatest concerns of college parents are their student's finances, followed by health and safety, academics, and career planning.

The Campus Security Act of 1999, known as the Clery Act requires institutions to prepare and publish an annual security report (Wartman & Savage, 2008). Parents often use these reports to evaluate prospective schools, as safety and security are a major concern for parents (Lowery, 2005; Spearman, 2010; Wartman & Savage, 2008). The Virginia Tech tragedy resulted in more safety notification protocols and systems including campus wide intercoms, emergency text messaging and updated surveillance camera technology (Rawe, 2007). Parents and students now expect that they will be notified in a timely manner regarding safety threats on campus.

Parent Expectations

According to Goree-Turrentine, Schnure, Ostroth, and Ward-Roof (2000), parent's expectations of the college experience include a quality education, job preparation, autonomy, fun/friendships, graduation, and academic success. These expectations form the foundation for parent involvement in the college experience. Additionally, Carney (2004) explored parent expectations of and involvement with the student and a small liberal arts college. She surveyed 198 parents of incoming freshman students at Cornell College. Results suggested that parent expectations of the institution were significantly associated with parent level of education and race. Daniel, Evans, and Scott (2001) reviewed data collected by the Cooperative Institutional Research program (CIRP) and found that the educational level of parents has risen from 1969-1999. College parents today are more educated and feel that they know more about the college experience. This has an impact on how they view the experience of their student and their expectations of the institution. Further research into parent expectations and their perspective of involvement in the college experience is needed to fully understand all of the factors that may influence it.

Institutions must begin to clearly define appropriate guidelines for parental involvement. The current ambiguity in guidelines for family involvement in higher education lends itself to confusion and chaos. This confusion and chaos results in inconsistent interactions and messages from campus to campus as well as from office to office on the same campus (Daniel et al., 2001). As Cutright (2008) stated, "It is no wonder then that parents assert rights that they may or may not have when laws are conflicting and basic circumstances so different from those of the parent's college days"(p. 41). Some parents are wise to the fact that they can call the university president's office and their problem will get resolved immediately. Other parents may call several different offices until they get the answer that they want. This is not conducive to building relationships with parents that encourage development and success of the student. It sends a message to the student as well, that parent involvement may resolve the concern or issue in a much better way.

In a study by Forbes (2001), an anonymous survey was sent out to incoming students attending Lafayette College and their parents. Lafayette College is a small liberal arts college (2,000 students) and the student body is about 90% White. Most students come from affluent families living in the Northeast. The survey asked parents about their expectations surrounding when and for what reason they might expect the college to inform them about their child's behavior. Of the 224 surveys received, most parents expected the college to contact them if their student had a major illness, was a victim of a crime, had a major mental problem, had violated a major student code of conduct policy, or was experiencing academic problems. There were only four instances that parents were less likely to expect to be informed: if their student were performing in a play or musical event, had a minor illness, a roommate conflict, or was pledging a Greek organization. Parent feedback on the survey indicated that parents are supportive of the

nurturing and protective perception of in loco parentis. Many who responded felt that there was

no excuse for the college not to inform them of certain behaviors and that it must inform them in

cases of student absences or student use of alcohol or drugs.

The results of student surveys indicated that they were significantly less likely to expect

that their parents would be notified by the college about their behavior (Forbes, 2001). Many

students felt that they were legally considered adults and therefore they were responsible for

their behavior. They indicated that they should be consulted before parents are contacted about

any situation (Forbes, 2001).

According to Young (2006), parents put more emphasis on the caring functions of the

institution rather than the teaching functions. He surveyed 475 parents of students at Creighton

University, a private, religiously affiliated institution and found that female parents had higher

expectations of the institution in the way of caring and teaching. Interestingly, status as a first

time college parent had no influence on parent expectations of teaching. A replication of

Young's study was conducted by Spearman at a large, public, research university in the South.

Approximately 1,137 parents of first-year students participated in the study and findings

supported that gender and educational background have a significant influence on parent

expectations of institutional teaching and caring.

The consumer mentality of parents and students can lead to unrealistic expectations of the

education and services that an institution provides. Families may be more focused on the safety

of their student and occupancy in the best residence hall rather than on the developmental issues

that the institution prioritizes (Daniel et al., 2001).

Both federal and state budgetary issues have caused a move away from funding higher

education. The burden is now on parents to assume more of the financial cost of sending their

student to college. The expectation that parents fund their student's education with little or no federal or institutional support can encourage unrealistic parental expectations. Additionally, when there are no clear boundaries or policies regarding parental involvement, parents assume that their involvement is a way that they can protect their investment. Even some students seem to agree that their education is being paid for by their parents and therefore, parents should be involved and allowed to have certain expectations (Forbes, 2001).

Today's consumer mind-set of 24-hr service, satisfaction guarantees, and instantaneous responses to issues and concerns has shifted into the expectations that parents and students have for higher education. These expectations have resulted in a sense of entitlement felt by students and parents (Daniel et al., 2001). Parents and students expect a certain level of service to equal the amount of tuition dollars they are paying (Kepic, 2006).

Additionally, parents sending their children to college have a basic assumption of caring, instructing, and learning (Young, 2006). There are three main points found in the literature review that support this assumption for this study as well as Young's (2006) study. First, historically institutions of higher education were intended to be paternal (Altschuler & Kramnick, 1999; Bickel & Lake, 1999; Henning, 2007; Taub, 2008). Second, there are observable behavior and expectation changes in current students and their parents when compared to previous generations (Forbes, 2001; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Scott & Daniel, 2001). Last, additional investigation is needed on parents and their expectations of the institution (Forbes, 2001; Goree-Turrentine et al., 2000).

Education is the main focus of higher education institutions and few if any do very little in the way of educating parents (Johnson, 2004). Exploring parent expectations will enable administrators and institutions to better educate parents in forming effective partnerships with the

institution (Young, 2006). Young (2006) further states that parents will be involved in their student's life during the college years, so the choice for institutions and administrators becomes whether they want that involvement to be intentional, developmentally helpful, and proactive or allow it to be intrusive and chaotic. According to Spearman (2010), institutions of higher education need an accurate assessment of what parents expect from them. Exploring parent expectations will establish a foundation of information and enable institutions to proactively create programs, support systems, and outreach opportunities that will further enhance the relationship between students, parents, and the institution (Spearman 2010).

Parent Expectations and College Choice

When choosing a college, parents and students have access to a plethora of institutional information. High school guidance counselors are sometimes the first contact a student may have regarding college opportunities. Additionally, if parents attended college, they may share information and experiences that will spark the college interest in the student. A college educated parent may value education and be familiar with the college experience but, the experience that they had no longer exists today. Gone are the days of curfews and bed checks and in their place are 24-hr visitation and card access to state of the art residence hall buildings (Daniel et al., 2001). In a consumer culture that expects a 24-hr customer service hotline for any issue arising, parents and students come to higher education with a new sense of entitlement (Daniel et al., 2001).

According to Cress and Sax (1998), freshmen who apply to three or more institutions have increased by 20% since 1967. Cress and Sax (1998) also report that more students are taking college prep classes and are reporting higher scores and better grades. Increased levels of competition in college admissions has resulted because of the value placed on college ranking reports (Daniel et al., 2001). Many parents and students begin their research in to colleges well

before graduation and are knowledgeable with the rankings and reports. Families with beliefs about the value of a college degree may look to employment rate and salary range of the most recent graduating class in reaching a decision about where to attend (Lange & Stone, 2001). Still, others may weigh the financial aid package that is offered and choose the one that is slightly more substantial (Lange & Stone, 2001).

Not all families approach college in the same way (Daniel et al., 2001). Those parents who attended college themselves may begin the conversation about college early on. Additionally, they may have begun saving for their children's college education (Hossler, Schmit, & Vesper, 1998). Parents who did not attend college have little to no information about higher education and do not engage their children in discussions about it.

College preparation begins well before a student enters high school. Hossler's (1987) college choice model consists of three different periods of time: predisposition, search, and choice. Predisposition represents the time that parents engage in conversation about college and help their students develop an interest in attending college. The search period is when parents and students are exploring their interests, wants, and needs and attempt to match them with a number of institutions that meet their criteria. During the choice stage, students rely on their peer groups, teachers, and other resources to arrive at their final college attendance choice (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).

According to Hine (1999), higher education is becoming more expensive and more necessary than ever though, a college education no longer guarantees substantial financial gain. Further, Hine (1999) states, that the median income of a college graduate is equal to the income of a high school graduate in 1970. Former Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings (2006)

indicated that two thirds of all high wage jobs created in the next 10 years will require a college degree.

Parents have good reason to be highly involved in their child's educational experience in college. Higher education is a substantial investment of money, time, and effort. Today's students have grown up with the idea that a college education is for everyone and necessary for career advancement. This idea that a college degree is a necessary component of economic success adds to the expectations of parents and students (Spearman, 2010). The rise of consumerism in higher education hand in hand with the rising costs of a college education has caused parents to expect higher education institutions to provide them with top quality customer service (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Lange & Stone, 2001; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Sells, 2002).

As the cost of a college education rises, so do the expectations of most parents (Coburn, 2006). Over the past 25 years, college tuition and fees have risen "faster than personal income, consumer prices, and health insurance" (Block, 2007). Changes in financial aid have added to the costs of higher education for students. The College Board reported that $74 billion in financial aid was available to students in fall of 2002, yet loans accounted for 58% of the aid (Fletcher, 2002). More than ever, parents and students are relying on loans to cover the costs of higher education. The view of higher education as a consumer good and parents as paying customers reinforces their desire to be connected to their student's educational experience (Connely, Good, & Perryman, 2001). As co-purchasers, parents feel that it is their right to be informed of their student's progress, disciplinary issues, achievements, and problems (Howe & Strauss, 2003; Spearman, 2010; Young, 2006).

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Approach and Rationale

According to Creswell (2009), researchers have a general view about the world and their approach to research that is shaped by the discipline as well as past and present research experience. This worldview influences the type of research that individuals gravitate toward. The post positivist worldview is represented by the traditional form of research. Those holding this worldview examine problems and issues to identify causes and resulting effects. The intent is to reduce ideas into variables and then to hypotheses and research questions that can be investigated. Thus, post positivists begin with a theory and collect data that either supports or refutes it. Key to this worldview is identifying statements that explain the problem or describe the relationships of interest (Creswell, 2009).

It is often said that science is empirical, that scientific investigation is centered on observation (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). Data analysis is part of the scientific process that makes it possible for the researcher to make observations and hypothesize about outcomes and then ask more questions. The process of asking a question, examining it, drawing inferences statistically, and arriving at answers is at the heart of scientific exploration (Young, 2006).

The survey approach is a quantitative method that provides numeric measures of behaviors, attitudes, and opinions of a population by examining a sample of that particular population. The results of the sample enable the researcher to make assertions about the population.

Survey research was chosen for this study for several reasons. Results may be able to generalize to a much broader population of college parents. Additionally, surveys can be delivered by remote location through email, mail, or phone and is a more cost effective and

convenient way to survey a large population. This study included several institutions demographically located at a distance from each other and the researcher. For the purposes of this study, the survey was transformed into a web based survey created in Survey Monkey. The availability of the survey on line provided faster and easier delivery to parents as well as a fast turnaround for data collection.

Using a web based survey made it easier to reach a much larger population of parents. Additionally, the survey delivered in this way protected participant confidentiality as no identifying information will be available to the researcher, other than institutional type. Participants were surveyed only one time for this study.

Variables and Design

The intent was to include at least eight colleges and/or universities in this study to compare parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of several kinds of institutions, which were grouped based on two variables shown in the schematic design. The goal was to have at least four public and four to six private institutions; this variable was called sponsorship and had three levels (public, private non-sectarian, and private religious). A second variable was called type of institution and had two levels (research/PhD and liberal arts). This is a 3 x 2 factorial design with three levels of sponsorship and two institutional types. Note that this means there are six specific kinds of institution: public research, private nonsectarian research, private religious research, public liberal arts, private nonsectarian liberal arts, and private religious liberal arts.

The reasoning behind comparing research and liberal arts colleges is that the largest differences in parent expectations may be found between them. The religious orientation variable

may well also lead to interesting differences in parent expectations. Once all permissions and approvals are obtained a more detailed description of the sites will be included in this section.

Participants

The institutions included in this study consisted of a convenience sample of institutions that fit the design and agreed to participate. The institutions were invited to participate based on their Carnegie Classification and sponsorship. The classifications used for this study were RU/H- Research University, (high research activity) and DRU-Doctoral Research University combined as Research/Ph.D and Bac/A&S- Baccalaureate, Arts and Sciences. The levels of sponsorship were public, private, private nonsectarian, and private religious. A search was completed on the Carnegie Classification website that generated a list of over 100 institutions. An email invitation to participate in the study was sent to those institutions that had a designated parent relations programs office and contact on their website. Attachments to the institution invitation email included the study purpose and methodology as well as the IRB approval letter. Expectations of the institutional designee were to send out the prepared parent invitation to participate to all parents on their parent listserv. The invitation could be sent as an email or included in the parent newsletter. This was explained in the methodology section that was sent as an attachment to the institutional invitation (see Appendix).

The target population for this study was parents of currently enrolled students at the six different kinds of institutions as described above. The population frame included all parents who had a student currently enrolled in a participating institution working toward a degree or certificate. The parents will have an email listed with a parent relations office or designee on each campus. The intent was to have a convenience sample of 200 or more parents at each study site.

Participating Institutions

Eleven institutions agreed to participate in this study. Table 3.1 describes the type and the level of sponsorship of the institutions that participated. Those described as religious included in their vision and mission statements, religious beliefs or a specific religious denomination.

Table 3.1
Numbers of Participating Institutions, Percentage of Total, and Responses by Sponsorship and Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Sponsorship	Public Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Total
Research	3	2	2	7
Responses	1,801	857	439	3,097
Liberal Arts	1	1	2	4
Responses	12	73	190	275
Total	4	3	4	11
Responses	1,813	930	629	3,372
Percentage of Total	54%	28%	19%	

Demographically, there was one public research institution located in the south, one located in the Rocky Mountains, and one located in the northern United States. There were two private research institutions located on the west coast, one on the east coast, and another in the south. There were two liberal arts institutions in the midwest, another in the south, and one on the east coast. The institutions varied in size from large to small. As shown in Table 3.1, one can read that none of the liberal arts colleges had the desired 200 responses.

Data Collection

Once permissions from the institutions in the sample were obtained the designated administrators in parent relations offices sent out, through email, a parent invitation to participate in the study created by the researcher. The email invitation sent out included a link to the survey. Informed consent was included in the first page of the survey and participants indicated their consent by completing the survey. The participants were given 3 weeks in which to complete the

survey. A follow up email was sent out to participants on the listserv at the halfway point to remind them of the survey. Parents were surveyed one time for the purposes of this study.

Seven of the 11 institutions sent out the survey invitation to parents in their parent newsletter. The other four institutions sent out the parent email invitation that the researcher created on their parent listserv. Five of the institutions chose not to send out the reminder email to parents about the survey. A separate link was created for one institution because of requested changes to some of the demographic questions.

The survey was conducted during the spring semester of 2013. Parents at each institution were given a 3 week window in which to participate in the survey. There were 3,378 total surveys completed. Some institutions had less than the desired 200 participants and low potential response rates, though all were included in the study. The one participating public liberal arts institution had 12 responses, or a 1% response rate. One large public research institution had 149 responses, or a response rate of .6%. These two institutions had the lowest response rates of the 11 included in the study. The response rates were based on each institution's available list of parent emails included in their list serve; however, many parents may not have read the institutional newsletter or seen the invitation to participate in the study.

Instrument

The PECTAC was created and developed by Wayne Young for use in his doctoral research in 2006. The instrument was intended to explore parent expectations of the teaching and supporting functions of a private, religiously affiliated college in the midwest. Additionally, the PECTAC was used in another study conducted by Christina Spearman in 2010. In Spearman's study, the PECTAC was used to examine the expectations of parents of first year students at a

large, public university in the south. I have obtained permission from Wayne Young to use the instrument in this study.

The PECTAC was created to understand parents as partners and the importance that parents placed on the teaching and caring functions of an institution (Spearman, 2010). The questionnaire contained 86 questions separated into three specific sections (Young, 2006). The first section included 12 demographic items. The items included gender of parent, marital status, gender of student, race of parent, educational level of parent, number of children in college, prior experience as a college parent, number of computers in the home, type of internet access, and an additional question about how involved the parent was in the college choice process. The degree of involvement for this question was measured on a 4-point Likert scale of 1 (*very involved*) to 4 (*not at all involved*). A neutral option was not included because the investigator assumed that a parent had some degree of involvement or was not at all involved in the college choice process of their student.

The second section of the PECTAC included 40 items related to the teaching functions of a college/university. The first subscale included 14 items in which parents are asked about the technological resources that they expected their student to be provided. An example of the questions in the section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the universities provide your student with general academic advising information via a website?" The second subscale included 10 items about teaching, in which parents are asked to rate the importance of team and active learning opportunities. An example of the questions in this section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will discuss and critique ideas from readings with other students and the instructor." The third subscale included 13 items asking parents to rate the importance of out of class learning

opportunities. An example of the questions in the section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will be provided with opportunities for service and volunteerism?"

The third section of the PECTAC included 34 items surrounding the caring functions of the college/university. In the first subscale, nine items related to the importance that parents placed on the administrative and faculty care of students. A sample question in this section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that your student should have regular contact with his/her academic advisor." The second subscale included 11 items that related to the importance that parents placed on a caring university/campus community. An example question is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that upon arriving at college you student finds programs welcoming them to campus life." The third caring subscale included 11 items relating to the importance that parents placed on ways that a university could be a caring partner with parents. An example question is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the universities notify me of my student's academic success on a regular basis." Modifications made to this section for this study, included a question on how important that it is to parents that the institution provide a parent relations office and an active parent association with opportunities to volunteer. Additional modifications to the survey for this study included the addition of a question regarding the name of the institution that their student attends as well as their student's classification year (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior) and age. These were important for data analysis since kind and type of institution as well as student classification year are key variables in this study. Other modifications included the deletion of the sections where parents were asked to rate the two items that they deemed most important in each subsection.

Additionally, student demographics were expanded to include ethnicity. Parent demographic questions were changed and parent relationship to student was deleted.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Young (2006) assembled an 11-member panel to assess the PECTAC and establish validity. Additionally, he conducted two pilot studies and formed a focus group of parents from the two pilot studies and a faculty focus group to obtain further feedback on the instrument.

A Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of teaching subsection items; Technology Resources (.836), Active and Team Learning (.721), and Out of Class Learning (.762). Additionally, a Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of the caring subsection items; Caring Faculty (.808), Caring University Community (.832), and Partnership with Parents (.842). The overall teaching section alpha was .872 and the overall caring section alpha was .897 (Young, 2006). These alphas indicated adequate support for instrument reliability for Young's study.

<div align="center">

Limitations

</div>

Using survey research for this study may have limited the sample and excluded parents that did not register an email with the designated parent relations office; therefore, they did not have the opportunity to participate. The study's use of parent listservs from parent relations and admission offices may have further limited the study only to those parents who were involved and had certain expectations of the institution. It could also have excluded those parents who were not comfortable or familiar with computer surveys.

Relying on parent self-reports is another limitation of this study, as there is no way to verify that parents really expect what they reported. Additionally, because only one parent may have responded to the survey their responses may not represent the expectations of both parents.

Data Analysis

Data collected from the survey was downloaded into the IBM SPSS software package so that analysis could be conducted. Descriptive and frequency analyses were conducted to describe the population. The dependent variables in the study are: parent expectations of the teaching functions of the institution (technology resources, out of class learning opportunities, and active and team learning) parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution (caring faculty, caring university community, and partnership with parents). Independent variables cluster around several categories; institutional sponsorship (public, private nonsectarian, private religious) institutional type (research/PhD and liberal arts), parent characteristics (gender, ethnicity, educational attainment), and student classification. Level of significance used for this study was $p < .01$. Effect size determinations were based on Cohen's (1988) guidelines for d: small =.2; medium = .5; large =.8 and for eta squared: small= 0.02; medium = 0.13; large = 0.26.

Research Questions

Each research question along with the statistical analysis used to examine outcomes for this study is as follows:

1. What differences exist between the kind of institution that their student attends in regards to the importance parents placed on the institution's ability to teach and care for their child?

    a. Is there a difference between public institutions, private nonsectarian institutions, and private religious institutions in regard to parent expectations?

    b. Is there a difference between research universities and liberal arts colleges in regard to parent expectations?

    c. Is there an interaction between sponsorship and institutional type (research or liberal arts) in regard to parent expectations?

2. What differences exist between the parent's racial identity in regard to their

expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution and parent

race?

3. What differences exist between parent educational attainment in regard to

their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

4. What differences exist between parent gender in regard to expectations of the

teaching and caring functions of the institution?

5. What differences exist between student classification (freshman, sophomore,

junior, senior, graduate student) in regard to parent expectations of the teaching

and caring functions of the institution?

6. How well does the combination of parent gender, race, educational attainment,

student classification, and institution type predict parent expectations of the teaching

and caring functions of the institution?

For research question 1 and the subquestions (a-c), a two-way factorial ANOVA was used to

examine differences between these variables in regards to the two aspects of parental

expectations. For research question 2, two independent samples t-tests were used to examine the

differences between parent educational attainment and parent expectations of (a) the teaching

functions of the institution and b) the caring functions of the institution. For research question 3,

two one-way ANOVAs were used to examine the differences between the racial identity of the

parent in regard to parent expectations of (a) the teaching functions of the institution and (b) the

caring functions of the institution. For research question 4, two independent samples t-tests were

used to examine the differences between parent gender and parent expectations of (a) the

teaching functions of the institution and (b) parent expectations of the caring functions of the

institution. For research question 5, two one-way ANOVAs will be used to examine the differences between student classification and parent expectations of (a) the teaching functions of the institution and (b) the caring functions of the institution. Last, research question 6 had two multiple regressions used to examine the effects of these six variables on parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the demographics of the participants of the survey and presents the results of the data analysis. The first section focuses on the demographics and descriptive data. The following sections focus on the analysis and findings of each of the research questions.

Demographic Summary

There were 3,378 participants in this study from 11 different institutions. Fifty-four percent of the respondents had students that attended a public institution, 27% had students at a private nonsectarian institution, and 19% had a student at a private religiously affiliated institution. Ninety-one percent of the respondent's students attended a research institution and 8% had students at a liberal arts institution. Of the parents who participated in the study, 73% were female and 26% were male. Additionally, participants reported being Caucasian (88%), and married (87%) with at least a bachelor's (47%) or master's (29%) degree. The majority reported being the parent of a female student (54%) who was 18-24 years old (98%) and classified as a freshman student (32%). A large portion of participants (54%) reported being "very involved" in their student's college choice. Many described this as being their "first experience as a college parent" (52%) and that they were "somewhat" involved in their student's current college experience (49%).

What follows is the breakdown of the demographic information of all of the participants in the study. The tables included in each section further describe the participant demographics by institutional sponsorship (public/private/religious) and institutional type (research/liberal arts).

Of the 3,378 participants in the study, 3,322 replied to the Parent Gender item. Of those, 73% (2,461) were female, and 26% (861) were male. Only 55 individuals did not answer this question. The researcher concluded that the respondent may have chosen not to participate in that question or forgot to indicate their gender before moving on to the next question in the survey. It could be further concluded that the participant did not answer due to the limited options available in response to the parent gender item, as there were not options for "transgender" or "other".

Those responding to the question about race/ ethnicity were 88% (2,983) Caucasian, 3% (105) were Hispanic/Latino, 2.3% (77) were African American/Black, 2% (68) were Asian, .8% (26) indicated being Multiracial, and 1.6% (53) chose "other". Only 65 participants did not answer the question about ethnicity. Participants who did not report their ethnicity may have skipped the question due to the following reasons: an appropriate option had not been provided, they chose not to divulge their race/ethnicity, and they mistakenly went on to the next item.

In regard to parent marital status, 87% (2,926) reported themselves as being married and 8% (262) reported being divorced. In addition, 2.8% (94) were single parents and 1.2% (42) reported being widowed. There were 53 participants that did not report their marital status. These participants may have mistakenly moved on to the next item, been uncomfortable reporting their marital status, an appropriate option had not been provided, or they chose not to provide their marital status.

In reporting parent highest level of education, 47% (1,570) participants reported having a Bachelor's degree, 29% (976) reported having a master's degree, 10% reported having a Ph.D. or another type of terminal degree, and 13% (439) reported being a high school graduate. Of the 3,378 participants, 46 did not answer this question. Those that did not answer may have mistakenly moved on to the next question, or did not feel comfortable divulging information

about their education. They also may not have answered because there was not an available option that fit their education level.

Fifty-two percent (1,760) of participants indicated that this was their first experience as a parent of a college student and 47% (1,579) reported that this was not their first experience as the parent of a college student. Only 38 participants did not answer this question.

Fifty-four percent (1,815) of participants indicated that they were "very involved" in their student's college choice. Forty-seven percent (1,188) indicated that they were "somewhat involved" in their student's college choice. Nine percent (302) reported being "a little involved and 1% (38) were "not at all involved" in their student's college choice. There were 34 participants that did not answer this question.

Additionally, participants answered questions regarding their student's gender, age, classification, and ethnicity. Fifty-four percent (1,830) indicated that their student was female and 45% indicated that their student was male. Only 38 participants did not answer this question. This may have been because there was not an "other" or "transgender" option. In reporting student age, 98.2% (3,317) of participants reported that their student was 18-24 years old, .6% (19) reported that their student was 25-30 years old, and .1% (5) reported having a student that was 30 years old or above. Only 36 participants did not answer this question. In regard to race/ethnicity, participants reported 85% (2,860) their student as Caucasian, 4% (126) as Multiracial, 4% (123) reported their student as Latino/Hispanic, and 2% (65) reported Asian. In addition, 3% (83) reported their student as African American/Black. Two percent (68) of participants indicated their student as "other". Thirty-six individuals did not answer this question.

Additionally, Participants were asked to report their student's classification or year in school. Thirty-two percent (1,076) reported their child as a Freshman, 26% (882) reported their student as a Sophomore, 22% (747) reported their student as a Junior, and 18% (610) as a Senior. Only a small percentage (.6%, 20) indicated that their student was a graduate student. Forty-two participants did not answer this question.

Subsection Item: Importance by Institution Sponsorship and Institution Type

In addition to the demographic information, the PECTAC had 70 items asking parents to report the importance placed on the teaching and caring functions of a university. The 70 items were divided into six subscales, three teaching and three caring. Since sponsorship and type were important variables in this study, the subscale frequencies were split in to the three levels of sponsorship (public, private nonsectarian, private religious) and a second time in to the two types of institution (research, liberal arts).

For the first teaching subscale: Technology Resources-(T1), Table 4.1 illustrates the 14 items and the percentage of parents that selected them as "very important" at each of the levels of sponsorship. It is important to note here that parents did not have to answer every question in each subsection to move forward with the survey. The item in the subscale with the highest percentage "very important" responses across all three levels of sponsorship and institutional type was "High speed internet access in his/her residence hall room" with 87% at public, 89% at private nonsectarian, and 88% at private religious as well as, institutional type (research 87%, liberal arts 89%). The item with the second highest percentage "very important" was "Email access to his/her academic advisor" and third was "Email access to his/her faculty instructor. Interestingly, across all three levels of sponsorship and institutional type, the item that had the highest missing value (106) as well as the lowest percentage "very important" was "A University

provided portable computer" with 7% at public, 9% at private nonsectarian, and 10% at private

religious as well as, research 8% and liberal arts 14%.

Table 4.1
T1-Technology Resources- Item Percentage "Very Important"

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
General academic advising information via a website	59%	57%	58%	59%	50%
Web access to registration/drop/add courses and view tuition and fees	86%	79%	80%	84%	72%
Web access to view financial aid Information	76%	72%	78%	75%	77%
Specific academic advising information via a website	52%	44%	47%	49%	42%
Access to a university provided email address	61%	60%	58%	60%	65%
Access to required textbooks and ordering via a website	58%	58%	55%	57%	56%
Access to computer labs on campus	56%	51%	47%	53%	60%
High speed internet access in his/her residence hall room	87%	89%	88%	87%	89%
Wireless Internet access throughout campus	83%	83%	81%	83%	83%
Training on the library's digital resources	41%	46%	44%	42%	48%
A university provided portable computer	7%	9%	10%	8%	14%
Email access to his/her faculty instructor	85%	85%	83%	85%	84%
Academic content delivered via a course website	46%	39%	40%	43%	41%
Email access to his/her academic advisor	85%	86%	82%	85%	86%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

The second teaching subscale; T2- Team and Active Learning Opportunities, Table 4.2,

illustrates the 10 items and the percentage of parents that selected them as "very important" at

each of the three levels of sponsorship and the two types of institution. The item with the highest

percentage of "very important" responses across all levels of sponsorship and institutional type

was "Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)" with 84% at

public, 88% at private nonsectarian, and 86% at private religious, as well as research and liberal

arts at 85%. The second item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was

"Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise" with 74% at

public, 72% at private nonsectarian, and 72% at private religious as well as research 73% and

liberal arts at 70%. The two items with the lowest percentages of "very important" responses

were "Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging" and "Learning via

an online course". Both items had percentages under 10% at each of the levels of sponsorship

and institutional types. The item with the highest missing value (79) was "Participate in group

projects outside of class using instant messaging".

Table 4.2

T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities-Item Percentage "Very Important"

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
Discuss and critique ideas from reading with other students and the	51%	74%	61%	59%	59%
Present in front of peers and the instructor using technological means	42%	54%	49%	47%	46%
Outperform the faculty instructor's expectations	26%	33%	31%	28%	34%
Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging	7%	5%	8%	7%	9%
Learn via an on-line course	6%	8%	6%	7%	5%
Participate in community based or service based course projects	23%	28%	34%	25%	35%
Use the internet to research an assignment	54%	57%	59%	56%	57%
Complete assignments via a course website	22%	18%	19%	20%	21%
Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise	74%	72%	72%	73%	70%
Be given consistent feedback on written	84%	88%	86%	85%	85%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

The third teaching subscale; T3- Out of Class Learning Opportunities, Table 4.3, illustrates the 14 items and the percentages of parents that selected them as "very important" across the three levels of sponsorship and two institutional types. The item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses across all three levels of sponsorship and institution type was "Have access to career counseling and placement services", with public at 85%, private additional academic advising or mentoring if requested" with 85% at public, 86% at private nonsectarian, and 81% at private religious. The third item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was, "Be provided with opportunities for internships" with 82% at public, 88% at private nonsectarian, and 80% at private religious institutions. The item with the largest differences across all three levels of sponsorship was, "Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture", with 28% at public, 51% at private nonsectarian, and 35% at private religious. The item with the largest missing value (130) across all levels of sponsorship was "Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed."

The first of the caring subscales, T1- Caring Faculty, Table 4.4 illustrates the nine items in the subscale and the percentage of parents who selected them as "very important" across the three levels of sponsorship. The item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was " Be treated fairly be his/her course instructor(s)", with 91% at public, 93% at private nonsectarian, and 90% at private religious. The second item with the highest percentage "very important" was "Develop plans for a major with his/her academic advisor" with 80% at public, 81% at private nonsectarian, and 82% at private religious. The item with the largest missing value (24) across all three levels of sponsorship was "Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant" (nonsectarian 89%, and private religious at 84% as well as research at 86% and liberal arts at 84%).

Table 4.3

Item Percentage "Very Important" Out of Class Learning Opportunities-T3

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
Be provided with training on how to be more responsible	36%	38%	45%	37%	48%
Have opportunities to join a variety of clubs and organizations	44%	50%	40%	45%	47%
Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested	85%	86%	81%	85%	85%
Be provided with opportunities for internships	82%	88%	80%	84%	79%
Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture	28%	51%	35%	35%	40%
Be provided with opportunities for service and volunteerism	37%	50%	49%	42%	51%
Have access to services and resources in the greater city area	27%	48%	30%	33%	30%
Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed	40%	48%	41%	41%	54%
Access to student tutoring and academic support	74%	67%	63%	69%	74%
Have opportunities to socialize in group activities	42%	50%	46%	44%	52%
Complete a practicum or internship using technology	33%	35%	33%	33%	37%
Have access to career counseling and placement services	85%	89%	84%	86%	84%
Be provided with information on developing good morals	26%	27%	45%	29%	41%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

The second caring subscale, C2- Caring Campus Community, Table 4.5 illustrates the 11 items and the percentage of parents who selected them as "very important" across the three levels of sponsorship. The item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was, "Programs welcoming your student to campus" with 77% at public, 77% at private nonsectarian, 75% at private religious. The second item with the highest percentage "very important" was "Health care at the student health center" with 66% at public, 66% at private nonsectarian, and

Table 4.4

C1- Caring Faculty Item Percentage "Very Important"

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
Have regular contact with his/her academic advisor	77%	77%	75%	76%	81%
Develop plans for a major with his/her academic advisor	80%	81%	82%	80%	86%
Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member	76%	83%	81%	78%	84%
Be known by his/her course instructor(s)	55%	66%	68%	59%	72%
Be treated fairly by his/her course instructor(s)	91%	93%	90%	91%	90%
Have access to his/her course instructors outside of class	67%	67%	62%	66%	63%
Be provided the opportunity to give feedback on his/her course instructor(s)	60%	55%	56%	57%	59%
Receive information on additional tutoring by his/her course instructor(s)	65%	55%	59%	61%	66%
Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant	57%	66%	69%	62%	63%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

62% at private religious. The item with the highest missing value (83) was "A friend in his/her floor Resident Assistant (if living on campus)."

The final caring subscale, C3-Parent Partnership, Table 4.6 illustrates the 13 items and the percentage of parents who selected them as "very important" across the three levels of sponsorship and institutional type. The item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was, "Provide a safe and secure campus" with 95% at public, 95% at private nonsectarian, and 94% at private religious as well as research 94% and liberal arts at 94%. The second item with the highest percentage of "very important" responses was "Provide my student with additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested" with 79% at public, 74% at private nonsectarian, and 73% at private religious. The item with the lowest percentage of

Table 4.5

C2-Caring Campus Community Item Percentage "Very Important"

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
Programs welcoming your student to campus life	68%	67%	73%	86%	71%
Opportunities to explore his/her leadership potential	48%	57%	63%	53%	56%
A campus community that appreciates the uniqueness of each student	50%	58%	59%	53%	61%
Programs orienting him/her to college life	61%	58%	61%	59%	64%
Support and challenge like a parent might give	32%	32%	43%	33%	49%
Health care at the student health center	66%	66%	62%	65%	66%
Opportunities to learn how to be in community with others	35%	41%	45%	38%	49%
A friend in his/her floor Resident Assistant (if living on campus)	27%	28%	37%	29%	34%
Opportunities to grow in his/her faith life	32%	20%	66%	34%	48%
Care at the student counseling center	44%	47%	53%	46%	56%
Opportunities to participate in community service	32%	39%	45%	35%	46%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

"very important" responses was, "Provide parent programs and active parent associations with opportunities to volunteer" with 17% at public, 13% at nonsectarian, and 22% at private religious as well as 16% at research and 24% at liberal arts. Additionally, this item had the highest missing value (49).

50

Table 4.6

C3-Parent Partnership Item Percentage "Very Important"

PECTAC Item	Public	Private Nonsectarian	Private Religious	Research	Liberal Arts
Notify me of my student's academic progress on a regular basis	35%	34%	35%	33%	43%
Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing	53%	60%	58%	55%	61%
Have my calls returned by members of faculty or administration within 24 hours	44%	47%	50%	45%	56%
Provide a safe and secure campus	95%	95%	94%	94%	94%
Provide me with my student's major and degree progress information via a website	44%	38%	40%	42%	39%
Discipline my student fairly if he /she breaks University policies and procedures	59%	50%	59%	56%	63%
Provide my student with additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested	79%	74%	73%	76%	80%
Notify me if my student is using illegal substances	60%	57%	69%	60%	69%
Orient me in how I will be involved in my student's education	37%	35%	40%	36%	48%
Provide a designated parent relations office	28%	26%	29%	27%	33%
Provide parent programs and active parent associations with opportunities to volunteer	17%	13%	22%	16%	24%
Provide my student unlimited visits to the student counseling center	52%	52%	52%	51%	60%
Notify me if my student is drinking illegally	39%	38%	54%	40%	53%
Total Respondents	1,805	904	630	3,064	275

PECTAC Reliability

A Cronbach's Alpha was conducted on each of the three teaching and three caring

subscales, as illustrated in Table 4.7. All alphas were greater than .70 and provide support for

internal consistency and reliability (Gliner, Morgan, & Leech, 2009). The overall internal

consistency and reliability was assessed for the teaching and caring items as well. Teaching items

(α = .89) and Caring items (α = .92). The overall internal reliability and consistency of the

PECTAC was assessed as well as the split half reliability (splitting the survey in half). The

resulting alphas at .92 overall, .90 for the first half and .85 for the second half further support the

internal reliability and consistency of the PECTAC for this study.

Table 4.7
PECTAC Coefficient Reliability for Subscales

SUBSCALE	No. of Items	α
T1-Technology Resources	14	.80
T2-Team and Active Learning	10	.76
T3-Out of Class Learning	13	.83
OT-Overall Teaching	37	.89
C1-Caring Faculty	9	.79
C2-Caring Campus Community	11	.85
C3-Parent Partnership	13	.87
OC-Overall Caring	33	.92

Findings for Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked "What differences exist between the kinds of institution that

their student attends in regards to the importance that parents placed on the institution's a)

teaching functions and b) caring functions?" Two- way ANOVAs were run to assess whether

institutional sponsorship and type seem to have an effect on parent expectations of the teaching

functions (T1, T2, T3, OT) of the institution, and if the effects of parent expectations depend on

institutional sponsorship and type (i.e., on the interaction of sponsorship with institutional type).

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Technology Resources

Table 4.8a shows the means and standard deviations for Technology Resources for the

two types of institution and the three sponsorship groups. Table 4.8b shows that there was not a

significant interaction between institution sponsorship and type on parent expectations of

Technology Resources ($p = .453$). Additionally, there were no significant differences among the

public, private nonsectarian and private religious institutions (*p*= .890) or between the research and liberal arts institutions (*p* = .648).

Table 4.8a
Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for T1- Technology Resources as a Function of Institution Type and Sponsorship

	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
T1 Technology Resources	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1792	1.52	.335	13	1.57	.433	1.52	.335
Private Nonsectarian	830	1.55	.350	72	1.52	.345	1.55	.350
Private Religious	439	1.58	.374	190	1.51	.362	1.56	.371
Total	3061	1.54	.345	275	1.52	.360	1.54	.347

Table 4.8b
Analysis of Variance of T1-Techonology Resources by Institutional Sponsorship and Kind

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Sponsorship	2	.014	.117	.890
Institution Type	1	.025	.208	.648
Sponsorship x Type	2	.095	.792	.453

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Team and Active Learning

Table 4.8c shows the means and standard deviations for Team and Active Learning Opportunities for the two types of institution and the three sponsorship groups. Table 4.8d shows that there was not a significant interaction between institution sponsorship and type on parent expectations of Team and Active Learning Opportunities (*p* = .463). Additionally, there were no differences among public, private nonsectarian, and private religious institutions (*p* =.693), or between research and liberal arts institutions (*p* =.344).

Table 4.8c

Means, Standard Deviations, and n for T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities as a Function of Institutional Sponsorship and Kind

	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
T2-Team and Active Learning	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1789	1.94	.416	13	1.88	.464	1.94	.417
Private Nonsectarian	830	1.90	.405	72	1.84	.414	1.90	.406
Private Religious	438	1.89	.406	190	1.90	.411	1.89	.407
Total	3057	1.93	.412	275	1.88	.414	1.92	.413

Table 4.8d

Analysis of Variance of T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities by Institutional Sponsorship and Kind

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Sponsorship	2	.062	.367	.693	.000
Institution Type	1	.152	.897	.344	.000
Sponsorship x Type	2	.131	.770	.463	.000
Error	33326	.170			

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Out of Class Learning

Table 4.8e shows the means and standard deviations for Out of Class Learning Opportunities for the two institutional types and the sponsorship groups. Table 4.8f shows that there was not a significant interaction between institutional sponsorship and type on parent expectations of Out of Class Learning Opportunities ($p = .885$). Further, there were no significant differences among public, private nonsectarian, private religious, ($p = .089$) or between research and liberal arts institutions ($p = .058$).

Table 4.8e

Means, Standard Deviations, and n for T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities as a Function of Institution Type and Sponsorship

T3 Out of Class Learning	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1792	1.69	.407	13	1.59	.444	1.69	.407
Private Nonsectarian	831	1.60	.397	72	1.51	.363	1.59	.395
Private Religious	440	1.65	.424	190	1.59	.394	1.63	.416
Total	3063	1.66	.409	275	1.57	.389	1.65	.408

Table 4.8f

Analysis of Variance of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities by Institutional Sponsorship and Type

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	$\acute{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	.398	2.43	.089	.001
Institution Type	1	.590	3.59	.058	.001
Sponsorship x Type	2	.020	.122	.885	.000
Error	3332	.164			

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Overall Teaching

Table 4.8g shows the means and standard deviations for Overall Teaching for the two institutional types and the three sponsorship groups. Table 4.8h shows that there was not a significant interaction between institutional sponsorship and type on parent expectations of Overall Teaching ($p = .949$). Also, there were no significant differences among public, private nonsectarian and private religious institutions ($p = .328$) or between research and liberal arts institutions ($p = .171$).

Table 4.8g
*Means, Standard Deviations, and n for OT-Overall Teaching as a function of Institution
Type and Sponsorship*

	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
OT-Overall Teaching	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1792	1.69	.307	13	1.66	.386	1.69	.308
Private Nonsectarian	831	1.66	.309	72	1.61	.314	1.66	.310
Private Religious	439	1.69	.324	190	1.65	.321	1.68	.323
Total	3062	1.69	.310	275	1.64	.321	1.68	.312

Table 4.8h
Analysis of Variance of OT- Overall Teaching by Institutional Sponsorship and Type

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	$\acute{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	.108	1.17	.328	.001
Institution Type	1	.182	1.87	.171	.001
Sponsorship x Type	2	.005	.052	.949	.000
Error	3331	.097			

To assess whether institutional sponsorship and type each seem to have an effect on parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution, and if the effects of parent expectations of caring depend on institutional type and sponsorship (i.e., on the interaction of institutional sponsorship with type) two-way ANOVAs were conducted.

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of a Caring Faculty

Table 4.9a shows that there was not a significant interaction between institutional sponsorship and type on parent expectations of Caring Faculty (*p* = .374). Additionally there were no differences among public, private nonsectarian and private religious institutions (*p*=.759) or research and liberal arts institutions (*p* = .171).

Table 4.9a

Means, Standard Deviations, and n for C1-Caring Faculty as a Function of Institution Type and Sponsorship

C1 Caring Faculty	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1787	1.34	.335	13	1.40	.432	1.34	.335
Private Nonsectarian	831	1.32	.322	72	1.29	.270	1.32	.318
Private Religious	439	1.34	.345	190	1.28	.303	1.32	.334
Total	3057	1.34	.333	275	1.29	.302	1.33	.331

Table 4.9b

Analysis of Variance of C1-Caring Faculty by Institutional Sponsorship and Type

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	$\acute{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	.107	.983	.374	.001
Institution Type	1	.010	.094	.759	.000
Sponsorship x Type	2	.084	.771	.463	.000
Error	3326	.109			

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of a Caring Campus Community

Table 4.9c shows the means and standard deviations for Caring Campus Community and the two institutional types and three sponsorship groups. Table 4.9d shows that there was not a significant interaction at the $p < .01$ level between institutional sponsorship and type on parent expectations of a Caring Campus Community $F(2, 3331) = 4.41$, $p = .012$. Eta was .003 which, according to Cohen (1988), is a very small effect (less than .01).There was not a significant effect between institutional type ($p < .598$). However, there was a significant main effect of sponsorship on parent expectations of a Caring Campus Community, $F(2, 3331) = 7.43$, $p = .001$. Eta squared for sponsorship was .004 which, according to Cohen (1988), is a small effect size. Games Howell post hoc tests were used to examine the differences among the three sponsorship groups. Overall, the public and private non- sectarian groups did not differ, but both

types of religious institution parents rated a caring campus community as more important than

the other two levels of sponsorship.

Table 4.9c
Means, Standard Deviations, and n for C2-Caring Campus Community as a Function of Institution Type and Sponsorship

C2 Caring Campus Community	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	M	SD
Public	1791	1.72	.467	13	1.81	.546	1.72	.468
Private Nonsectarian	831	1.73	.463	72	1.55	.438	1.71	.464
Private Religious	440	1.54	.428	190	1.55	.424	1.54	.427
Total	3062	1.70	.465	275	1.56	.436	1.68	.464

Table 4.9d
Analysis of Variance of C2-Caring Campus Community by Institutional Sponsorship and Kind

Variable and source	df	MS	F	p	$\dot{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	1.56	7.43	.001	.004
Institution Type	1	.058	.278	.598	.000
Sponsorship x Type	2	.929	4.41	.012	.003
Error	3331	.210			

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Parent Partnership

Table 4.9e shows the means and standard deviations for Parent Partnership for the two

institution types and three sponsorship groups. Table 4.9f shows that there was a significant

interaction between institution sponsorship and type on parent expectations of Parent

Partnership, $F(2, 3329) = 6.52$, $p = .001$. Eta squared was .004 which, according to Cohen (1988)

is a very small effect (less than .01). Additionally, there was a significant main effect of

sponsorship on parent expectations of Parent Partnership, $F(2, 3329) = 9.68$, $p < .001$. Eta

squared for sponsorship was .006 which, according to Cohen (1988), is a small effect size.

Games-Howell post hoc tests indicate that overall means, public (1.75) and private

nonsectarian (1.80) did not differ from each other at the *p <.01* level, but both had lower

expectation ratings than the combined mean (1.68) for both types of religious institutions. In

58

order to better understand the significant interactions, Games Howell post hoc tests were

conducted to compare the six subgroups. The simple effects revealed that there were significant

differences somewhere among the six subgroups $F (5, 3332) = 9.73$, $p <.001$, eta^2 = 0.14 (a small

effect size). Only one meaningful simple effect was significant at the $p < .01$. The liberal arts

religious institution parents had lower parent expectation ratings (1.56) (high importance) of

parent partnerships than the parents of research oriented religious institutions (1.73). Parents of

both types of religious institutions had higher expectation ratings of a parent partnership than the

parents at private and nonsectarian institutions. But, religious liberal arts schools had the highest

expectations, producing a significant interaction.

Table 4.9e
Means, Standard Deviations, and n for C3-Parent Partnership as a Function of Institutional Type and Sponsorship

C3 Parent Partnership	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1788	1.74	.500	13	2.10	.709	1.75	.502
Private Nonsectarian	832	1.81	.508	72	1.69	.523	1.80	.510
Private Religious	440	1.73	.489	190	1.56	.431	1.68	.478
Total	3060	1.76	.501	275	1.62	.485	1.75	.502

Table 4.9f
Analysis of Variance of C3-Parent Partnership by Institutional Sponsorship and Type

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	$\acute{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	2.40	9.68	.000	.006
Institution Type	1	.042	.169	.681	.000
Sponsorship x Type	2	1.62	6.52	.001	.004
Error	3329	.248			

Effects of Institution Kind on Parent Expectations of Overall Caring

Table 4.9g shows the means and standard deviations for parent expectations of Overall

Caring for the two institutional types and the three sponsorship groups. Table 4.9h shows that

there was not a significant interaction at the $p < .01$ level between institutional sponsorship and

type on Overall Caring, F (2, 332) = 3.84, $p < .02$. Eta squared was .002 which, according to

Cohen (1988) is a very small effect size. However, there was a significant main effect of

sponsorship on Overall Caring, F (2, 332) = 9.04, $p < .001$. Eta squared for sponsorship was .005

which is a small effect size.

Games-Howell post hoc tests were conducted and revealed that parents of students at

religious colleges had higher expectations of overall caring than those at public and nonsectarian

institutions F(5, 3332) = 10.4, $p <.001$, eta squared = .015.

Table 4.9g
Means, Standard Deviations, and n for OC- Overall Caring by Institutional
Sponsorship and Type

OC- Overall Caring	Research			Liberal Arts			Total	
	n	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Public	1791	1.63	.363	13	1.82	.533	1.63	.365
Private Nonsectarian	832	1.65	.368	72	1.53	.374	1.64	.369
Private Religious	440	1.56	.359	190	1.48	.322	1.54	.350
Total	3063	1.62	.365	275	1.51	.354	1.61	.365

Table 4.9h
Analysis of Variance of OC- Overall Caring by Institutional Sponsorship and Type

Variable and source	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	$\dot{\eta}^2$
Sponsorship	2	1.19	9.04	.001	.005
Institution Type	1	.064	.001	.980	.000
Sponsorship x Type	2	.504	3.84	.022	.002
Error	3332	1.31			

Findings for Research Question 2

Research question 2 asked "What differences exist between parent educational attainment (college graduate vs. non college graduate) in regard to their expectations of the institution's teaching and caring functions?" In order to investigate whether differences exist between parents who were college graduates and non-college graduates in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution, eight independent samples t-tests were conducted on the teaching functions (T1, T2, T3, OT) and the caring functions (C1, C2, C3, OC) of the institution.

Comparison of Parent Education on Teaching Functions of the Institution

Table 4.10a shows that non-college graduates expectations of each of the teaching functions of the institution were significantly different from college graduates. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average expectation score for non-college graduates was significantly lower (which indicates higher expectations) than those of the parents who were college graduates. Over all there is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of the teaching functions of the institution and those parents who did not graduate from college and those who were college graduates ($p < .001$). Effect sizes were smaller than typical.

Comparison of Parent Education and the Caring Functions of the Institution

Table 4.10b illustrates that there were no significant differences between parents who are non-college graduates and those that are college graduates in their expectations of faculty to be accessible to students outside of class, or to know their student personally. However, the table does show statistically significant differences between parents that are non-college graduates and those that are college graduates on the remaining caring functions of the institution ($p < .001$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average expectation score for parents that

are non-college graduates was significantly lower (which indicates higher expectations) than that

of parents who identify as college graduates. The effect sizes were smaller than typical.

Table 4.10a
Comparison of Parent Educational Attainment on Expectations of the Teaching Functions of the Institution (*n = 439 Non-college graduates and 2890 College graduates*)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
T1-Technology Resources			-4.66	33	<.001	-0.23
Non-College	1.46	.351				
College Grad	1.55	.344				
T2- Team and Active Learning			-4.53	33	<.001	-0.22
Non-College	1.84	.400				
College Grad	1.93	.411				
T3- Out of Class Learning			-3.94	33	<.001	-0.20
Non-College	1.58	.395				
College Grad	1.66	.408				
OT- Overall Teaching			-5.37	33	<.001	-0.26
Non-College	1.61	.308				
College Grad	1.69	.310				

Table 4.10b
Comparison of Parent Educational Attainment on Expectations of the Caring Functions of the Institution (*n = 439 Non-college graduates and 2890 College graduates*)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
C1- Caring Faculty			-.528	3322	.597	-0.03
Non-College	1.32	.337				
College Grad	1.33	.339				
C2- Caring Campus Community			-5.17	3326	.000	-0.26
Non-College	1.58	.455				
College Grad	1.70	.464				
C3- Parent Partnership			-6.24	3324	.000	-0.33
Non-College	1.61	.482				
College Grad	1.77	.501				
OC- Overall Caring			-5.67	3327	.000	-0.30
Non-College	1.52	.359				
College Grad	1.63	.364				

Findings for Research Question 3

In order to examine differences between the parents' racial identities in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution, eight one-way ANOVAs were conducted.

Comparison of Parent Racial/Ethnic Identity on the Teaching Functions of the Institution

Table 4.11a shows the means and standard deviations for the parent racial identity groups for each of the teaching functions of the institution. There were statistically significant differences between parent racial identities on expectations of all the teaching functions of the institution. Technology Resources- including internet access across campus as well as web access to register for classes and view tuition and fees $F (5, 3303) = 8.70$, $p < .001$; Team and Active Learning-including participating in group projects outside of class, using the internet to research an assignment, presenting in front of peers and instructor $F (5, 3300) = 10.07$, $p < .001$; Out of Class Learning Opportunities - including opportunities to participate in internships, community service projects, or completing a practicum using technology $F (5, 3305) = 12.79$, $p <.001$; Overall Teaching $F (5, 3304) = 15.49$, $p < .001$.

Table 4.11a
Means and Standard Deviations Comparing Parent Race Groups on the Teaching Functions of the Institution

	T1			T2			T3			OT		
Parent Race	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
African Amer.	77	1.38	.321	76	1.69	.417	77	1.40	.329	77	1.46	.297
Asian	68	1.52	.431	68	1.86	.453	68	1.52	.432	68	1.61	.381
Caucasian	2980	1.55	.340	2978	1.93	.405	2982	1.67	.403	2981	1.69	.303
Latino/Hisp	105	1.38	.304	105	1.74	.435	105	1.49	.405	105	1.51	.303
Multiracial	26	1.50	.516	26	1.89	.406	26	1.63	.377	26	1.65	.378
Other	53	1.49	.422	53	1.88	.481	53	1.78	.576	53	1.70	.430
Total	3309	1.54	.346	3306	1.92	.411	3311	1.65	.408	3310	1.68	.311

63

Table 4.11b
One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Parent Racial Identity Groups on the Teaching Functions of the Institution (T1, T2, T3, and OT).

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
T1- Technology Resources					
Between groups	5	5.15	1.03	8.71	<.001
Within groups	3303	390.66	.118		
Total	3308	395.81			
T2- Team & Active Learning					
Between groups	5	8.39	1.68	10.06	<.001
Within groups	3300	550.29	.167		
Total	3305	558.66			
T3- Out of Class Learning Opportunities					
Between groups	5	10.49	2.10	12.80	<.001
Within groups	3305	541.75	.164		
Total	3310	552.23			
OT- Overall Teaching					
Between groups	5	7.35	1.47	15.50	<.001
Within groups	3304	313.38	.095		
Total	3309	32			

The omnibus or overall significances were further investigated by conducting Games-Howell post hoc comparisons. Comparisons on Technology Resources indicated that there were significant mean differences with African American and Latino parents having higher expectations than Caucasian parents ($p < .001$, $d = .51$ for both groups). Additionally, there were significant mean differences between both African American ($p <.001$, $d = .58$) and Latino parents ($p < .001$, $d = .45$) and Caucasian parent expectations on T2-Team and Active Learning. Significant mean differences were also found between Caucasian, and both African American ($p <.001$, $d = .73$), and Latino/Latina parents ($p < .001$, $d = .44$) on expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities. Comparisons on OT-Overall Teaching indicated that there were significant mean differences between African American parents and Caucasian parents expectation ratings ($p < .001$, $d = .76$), as well as Caucasian and Latino/Latina parents ($p <.001$, $d = .59$). Post Hoc results revealed that in general, African American and Latino/Latina parents

had higher expectations of the teaching functions of the institution with medium to large effect sizes. Perhaps partly due to smaller Ns, none of the other pairs of racial/ethnic groups were statistically different.

Comparison of Parent Racial/Ethnic Identity and the Caring Functions of the Institution

Table 4.12a shows the means and standard deviations for the parent racial identity groups for each of the caring function variables. There were statistically significant differences between parent racial identities on parent expectations of three of the four caring variables. C2- Caring Campus Community $F(5, 3304) = 12.49$, $p < .001$; C3-Parent Partnership $F(5, 3302) = 16.56$, $p < .001$; OC- Overall Caring $F(5, 3305) = 15.94$, $p < .001$. Games Howell Post Hoc tests were conducted and revealed that there were statistically significant mean differences between Caucasian and both African American, and Latino parents' expectations of all the caring functions of the institution. Games Howell Post Hoc tests on Caring Campus Community (C2) indicated that there were large significant differences between African American and Caucasian parent expectations of programs welcoming their student to campus, care at the student counseling center, etc. ($p<.001$, $d= -.72$). Additionally, there were statistically significant differences between Caucasian and Latino parent expectations ($p< .001$, $d = .52$) on a caring campus community (C2). Post Hoc comparisons on expectations of a Parent Partnership (C3) revealed significant differences between Caucasian and African American parents in orienting them as to how they might be involved on campus, or having a designated parent services/programs office ($p<.001$, d= -.52). Further, statistically significant differences were also found on C3 between Caucasian and Latino parents ($p < .001$, $d = .55$). The effect sizes, according to Cohen (1988) are typical or medium. Comparisons on expectations of (OC) the overall caring functions of the institution indicated a statistically significant difference between

Caucasian and African American parents ($p < .001, d= -.82$). The effect size is large.

Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference between Caucasian and Latino

parents on overall caring ($p < .001, d =-.56$). The effect size is typical. In general, both African

American and Latino parents reported higher expectations of the caring functions of the

institution than Caucasian parents. The effect sizes for the differences between African American

and Caucasian parents were large, while those between Latino and Caucasian were medium.

Table 4.12a
Means and Standard Deviations for Parent Race Groups on Expectations of the Caring
Functions of the Institution

Parent Race	C1			C2			C3			OC		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
African American	76	1.26	.324	77	1.39	.397	77	1.39	.385	77	1.35	.314
Asian	68	1.27	.348	68	1.57	.478	68	1.54	.479	68	1.48	.389
Caucasian	2978	1.34	.329	2982	1.70	.462	2980	1.77	.497	2982	1.63	.361
Latino/Hispanic	105	1.29	.327	104	1.47	.407	105	1.50	.472	105	1.43	.345
Multiracial	26	1.36	.323	26	1.72	.462	26	1.70	.470	26	1.62	.340
Other	53	1.35	.394	53	1.79	.595	52	1.77	.637	53	1.66	.455
Total	3306	1.33	.331	3310	1.68	.466	3308	1.75	.502	3311	1.61	.366

Table 4.12b
One way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Parent Racial Identity Groups on the
Caring Functions of the Institution (C1, C2, C3, OC)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
C1-Caring Faculty					
Between Groups	5	.954	.191	1.74	.121
Within Groups	3300	361.30	.109		
Total	3305	362.26			
C2- Caring Campus					
Between Groups	5	13.32	2.66	12.49	<.001
Within Groups	3304	704.88	.213		
Total	3309	718.20			
C3-Parent Partnership					
Between Groups	5	20.35	4.07	16.56	<.001
Within Groups	3302	811.49	.246		
Total	3307	831.84			
OC- Overall Caring					
Between Groups	5	10.45	2.09	15.94	<.001
Within Groups	3305	433.30	.131		
Total	3310	433.75			

<center>**Findings for Research Question 4**</center>

In examining what differences exist between parent gender in regard to expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution, eight independent samples *t*-tests were conducted.

Comparison of Parent Gender on Expectations of the Teaching
Functions of the Institution

Table 4.13a shows that female parents' expectations were significantly different from males on T1-Technology Resources. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the technology resources expectations for females ($M = 1.49$) were much higher (lower ratings = higher expectations) than those of males ($M = 1.67$). The effect size, *d* is approximately 0.51 which is a typical or medium effect size. Males and females were not statistically different on expectations of T2- Team and Active Learning Opportunities. However, there were statistically significant differences in expectations between males and females on T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the expectations for females ($M= 1.62$) were significantly higher than those of males ($M = 1.73$). The effect size *d* is approximately 0.26 which indicates a smaller than typical effect size.

Inspection of the two group means on OT or Overall Teaching indicates that there were statistically significant differences between expectations for males and females on the overall teaching functions of the institution. The expectations for females ($M = 1.65$) were significantly higher than those of males ($M = 1.76$). The effect size *d* is approximately 0.35 which indicates a small to medium effect.

Table 4.13a
Comparison of Parent Gender on the Teaching Functions of the Institution
(n= 860 males and 2461 females)

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p	d
T1-Technology Resources			12.8	1294.5	<.001	0.51
Male	1.67	.383				
Female	1.49	.319				
T2- Team and Active Learning Opportunities			-1.55	1521.2	.120	-0.07
Male	1.90	.406				
Female	1.93	.413				
T3- Out of Class Learning Opportunities			6.39	1426.6	<.001	0.26
Male	1.73	.425				
Female	1.62	.400				
OT-Overall Teaching			7.87	1377.7	<.001	0.35
Male	1.76	.332				
Female	1.65	.300				

Comparison of Parent Gender on Expectations of the Caring Functions of the Institution

Table 4.13b illustrates results of the second set of independent t-test run on parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution. Inspection of the two group means indicate that female ($M = 1.31$) parents had significantly higher expectations of a caring faculty than male parents ($M = 1.40$). The effect size d is approximately 0.27 which is a small effect. Additionally, female parents ($M = 1.65$) had a higher expectations of a caring campus community than male parents ($M = 1.78$). The effect size d is approximately 0.28 which is a smaller than typical effect. There was not a statistically significant difference between males and females on C3- Parent Partnership. Lastly, there was a statistically significant difference between female ($M = 1.59$) expectations on overall caring than male expectations ($M = 1.67$). Female parent expectations were significantly higher than male parent expectations on overall caring. The effect size d is approximately 0.21 which is a small effect size.

Table 4.13b
Comparison of Parent Gender on the Caring Functions of the Institution
(n =861 Males and 2,460 Females)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
C1- Caring Faculty			7.00	1431.4	<.001	0.27
Male	1.40	.343				
Female	1.31	.324				
C2- Caring Campus Community			7.11	1442.4	<.001	0.28
Male	1.78	.478				
Female	1.65	.456				
C3- Parent Partnership			.712	1562.9	.476	0.04
Male	1.76	.486				
Female	1.74	.508				
OC- Overall Caring			5.20	1483.2	<.001	0.21
Male	1.67	.369				
Female	1.59	.363				

Findings for Research Question 5

To investigate what differences exist between student classification (Freshman,

Sophomore, Junior, Senior) in regard to parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions

of the institution, two sets of one way ANOVAs were conducted. The ANOVA is utilized to

compare three or more levels or groups (e.g., four levels of student classification) in a single

analysis. Further, observations are independent (each person is in only one group and has only

one score on each measure). Post Hoc tests were conducted where the ANOVAs were significant.

Comparison of Student Classification on the Teaching Functions of the Institution

Table 4.14a shows the means and standard deviations for each of the groups. There were

no statistically significant differences found between student classifications on parent

expectations of T1- Technology Resources. There was a statistically omnibus significant

difference between student classification in regards to parent expectations of T2-Team and

Active Learning $F (4, 3304) = 3.97$, $p = .003$ and expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning

Opportunities $F (4, 3309) = 4.39$, $p= .002$. However, there was not a statistically significant

difference at the $p < .01$ level between student classification and expectations of OT- Overall

Teaching $F (4, 3308) = 2.93, p = .020$.

Although the overall F for T2 Team and Active Learning was significant, Games Howell

Post Hoc tests indicated that there were no significant pairs of mean differences between student

classification in regards to parent expectations of T2- Team and Active Learning. There were

significant mean differences between parents of freshman and junior students ($p < .001, d = 0.16$)

on expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities. Parents of freshman students had

higher expectations than parents of junior students on T3, but the effect size was small.

Table 4.14a
*Means and Standard Deviations Comparing Student Classification Groups on the Expectations
of the Teaching Functions of the Institution*

	T1			T2			T3			OT		
Student Classification	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Freshman	1075	1.55	.348	1074	1.93	.412	1076	1.62	.408	1076	1.68	.313
Sophomore	880	1.53	.344	880	1.93	.402	881	1.66	.398	880	1.68	.302
Junior	747	1.54	.340	747	1.95	.416	747	1.70	.419	747	1.71	.311
Senior	610	1.53	.357	608	1.87	.416	610	1.64	.404	610	1.66	.320
Total	3312	1.54	.347	3309	1.92	.412	3314	1.65	.409	3313	1.68	.312

Comparison of Student Classification on the Caring Functions of the Institution

Table 4.14c shows the means and standard deviations for the student classification groups

for each of the caring function variables. There were statistically significant omnibus differences

between student classifications in regards to parent expectations of three of the four caring

variables. C2-Caring Campus Community $F (4, 3328) = 3.55, p = .007$; C3-Parent Partnership $F

(4, 3327) = 5.31, p < .001$; OC-Overall Caring $F (4, 3329), p = .002$. Games Howell Post Hoc

tests revealed that there were some statistically significant mean differences among expectations

of caring between parents of Freshman, Juniors, and Seniors. Games Howell Post Hoc results on

C2 indicated that there were significant mean differences between parents of freshman and junior

Table 4.14b

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Student Classification Groups on the Expectations of the Teaching Functions of the Institution (T1, T2, T3, OT)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
T1-Technology Resources					
Between groups	4	.427	.107	.887	.471
Within groups	3307	400.3	.120		
Total	3311	400.7			
T2- Team and Active Learning					
Between groups	4	2.68	.671	3.97	.003
Within groups	3304	562.0	.169		
Total	3308	5.64.7			
T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities					
Between groups	4	2.93	.732	4.39	.002
Within groups	3309	554.1	.166		
Total	3313	557.0			
OT- Overall Teaching					
Between groups	4	1.13	.284	2.93	.020
Within groups	3308	322.6	.097		
Total	3312	323.8			

Table 4.14c

Means and Standard Deviations Comparing Student Classification Groups on the Expectations of the Caring Functions of the Institution (C1, C2, C3, OC)

	C1			C2			C3			OC		
Student Classification	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Freshman	1073	1.33	.336	1076	1.66	.456	1076	1.71	.495	1076	1.59	.365
Sophomore	881	1.31	.319	881	1.68	.452	881	1.72	.483	881	1.60	.350
Junior	745	1.35	.338	746	1.72	.481	746	1.78	.520	747	1.65	.373
Senior	610	1.33	.325	610	1.71	.475	610	1.80	.508	610	1.64	.374
Total	3319	1.33	.333	3313	1.68	.465	3312	1.75	.501	3314	1.61	.365

students ($p < .007$, $d = -0.14$) on expectation ratings of a caring campus community. The effect size is small. Parents of freshman students had higher expectation of a caring campus community than parents of junior students. Additionally, there were significant mean differences between parents of freshman and senior students ($p < .001$, $d = -0.17$) on expectations of C3-Parent Partnership. The effect size is small. Parents of freshman students had higher expectations of a

Table 4.14d

One Way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Student Classification Groups on Expectations of the Caring Functions of the Institution

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
C1-Caring Faculty					
Between groups	4	.677	.169	1.54	.188
Within groups	3324	365.3	.110		
Total	3328	366.0			
C2- Caring Campus Community					
Between groups	4	3.06	.766	3.55	.007
Within groups	3328	717.7	.216		
Total	3332	720.8			
C3- Parent Partnership					
Between groups	4	5.32	1.33	5.32	<.001
Within groups	3327	831.9	.250		
Total	3331	837.3			
OC-Overall Caring					
Between groups	4	2.29	.574	4.32	.002
Within groups	3329	442.5	.133		
Total	3333	444.8			

parent partnership than parents of senior students. Further, there were significant mean differences between parents of freshman students and parents of junior students expectations of overall caring ($p < .002$, $d = -0.13$). Parents of freshman students had higher expectations on overall caring than parents of junior students. The effect size was small. Overall, parents of freshman students had higher expectations of the caring functions of the institution, but effect sizes were small.

Findings for Research Question 6

Investigation of how well that the combination of parent gender, race, educational attainment, student classification, institutional sponsorship, and institutional type predict parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution was conducted using eight multiple regressions. The purpose of using multiple regression is to investigate if parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution can be predicted from a

combination of the predictor variables listed above. Categorical variables, parent ethnicity and institutional sponsorship were recoded into dichotomous (dummy) variables to fit the conditions of multiple regression. Ethnicity was coded 1 (*White*) and 0 (*nonWhite*) and sponsorship was coded 1 (*religious*) and 0 (*non-religious*).

Prediction of Technology Resources

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for T1-Technology Resources can be found in Table 4.15a. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations on T1, $F (6, 3252) = 43.28$, $p < .001$. The adjusted R squared value was .07. This indicates that 7% of the variance in parent expectations of Technology Resources was explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988) this is a small to medium effect. The beta weights in Table 4.15b, indicate that parent gender, ethnicity and education combine to predict expectations of Technology Resources at $p <.01$. In addition, religious sponsorship was significant at $p <.05$. At the $p < .01$ level, the combination of female parent gender, non-White ethnicity, and parent being a non-college graduate combined to predict high expectations of Technology Resources.

Table 4.15a
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for T1 and Predictor Variables (N = 3259)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
T1- Technology R	1.54	.35	-.022	-.236**	-.098**	.087**	.030*	.021
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.007	-.023	.000**	.033*	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.026	-.055**	-.049	-.001**
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.072	-.061	-.050
4. Education	1.87	.34					-.112**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.389**
6. LA/Research	1.92	.27						

$* p < .01$ $** p < .001$

Table 4.15b
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Ethnicity, Education, Sponsorship, and Institutional Type Predicting T1- Technology Resources (N= 3259)

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	-.009	.005	-.027
Parent Gender	-.184	.013	-.233**
Parent Ethnicity (recoded)	.121	.020	.104**
Parent Education	.069	.018	.067**
Sponsorship (recoded)	.042	.016	.047*
LA/Research	.045	.023	.036
Constant	1.5	.064	

Note: adjusted R^2 = .07; $F (6, 3252) = 43.28$, $p < .001$ * $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$

Prediction of Team and Active Learning

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for T2- Team and Active Learning can be found in Table 4.15c.This combination of variables significantly predicted expectations on T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities, $F (6, 3250) = 11.06$, $p < .001$, with parent education and ethnicity significantly contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R squared value was.018, which according to Cohen (1988), is a small effect size. The beta weights, illustrated in Table 4.15d suggest that parents who are of non-White ethnicity and non-college graduates contribute most in predicting higher expectations of T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities.

Table 4.15c
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for T2-Team and Active Learning Opportunities and Predictor Variables (N=3257)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
T2-Team and Active Learning	1.91	.41	-.035	.026	.108**	.081**	-.033	.032
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.007	.024	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.026	-.055*	-.049*	-.001
3. Parent Ethnicity (recoded)	.90	.30				.072**	-.060**	-.050*
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					.127**	-.113**
5. Sponsorship (recoded)	.19	.39						- .389**
6. LA/Research	1.92	.27						

*$p < .01$ **$p < .001$

Table 4.15d
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Pub/Priv/Relig, and LA/Research Predicting Expectations of T2- Team and Active Learning

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	-.014	.006	-.037
Parent Gender	.025	.016	.027
Parent Ethnicity (recoded)	.143	.024	.104**
Parent Education	.087	.022	.071**
Sponsorship (recoded)	-.006	.020	-.006
LA/Research	.007	.028	.025
Constant	1.54	.078	

*$p < .01$ **$p < .001$
Note adjusted $R^2 = .018$; $F (6, 3250) = 11.06$, $p < .001$

Prediction of Out of Class Learning Opportunities

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities and predictor variables can be found in Table 4.15e. This combination of variables significantly predicted expectations of Out of Class Learning Opportunities, $F (6, 3254) = 17.32$, $p = .001$, with parent gender and parent ethnicity contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R squared value was .029 which indicates that the effect is small. The beta weights presented in Table 4.15f, suggest that parent female gender, non-White ethnicity combined to significantly predict higher parent expectations of Out of Class Learning Opportunities.

Table 4.15e
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities and Predictor Variables (N=3261)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
T3-Out of Class Learning	1.65	.407	.025	-.112**	.105**	.068**	-.024*	.058**
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.006	.022	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.025	-.055**	-.050**	-.001
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.072**	-.061**	-.050
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.112**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.389**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

 *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$

Table 4.15f
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Sponsorship, and Institution Type Predicting Expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	.008	.006	.022
Parent Gender	-.104	.016	-.112**
Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.146	.024	.107**
Parent Education	.057	.021	.047
Sponsorship (recoded)	.004	.020	.004
Institution Type	.088	.028	.059
Constant	1.41	.077	

Note: $*p < .01$, $**p < .001$ adjusted $R^2 = .029$; $F(6, 3254) = 17.32$, $p < .001$

Prediction of Overall Teaching Functions

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the predictor variables and OT-Overall Teaching can be found on Table 4.15g. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations of Overall Teaching, $F(6, 3253) = 26.33$, $p < .001$ with three of the six variables contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R squared value was .045. This indicates that approximately 4% of the variance in parent expectations of Overall Teaching is explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988), this is a small effect. The beta weights presented in Table 4.15h suggest that female parent gender, non-White ethnicity, and non-college graduate combine to predict higher expectation ratings of Overall Teaching.

Table 4.15g
Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations for OT- Overall Teaching and Predictor Variables (N=3260)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
OT-Overall Teaching	1.68	.31	-.011	-.142**	.129**	.096**	-.010	.047*
Predictor Variables								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.006	.022	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.025	-.055	-.049**	-.001
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.072**	-.061**	-.050*
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.087**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.386**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

*$p < .01$ **$p < .001$

Table 4.15h
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Sponsorship, and Institution Type Predicting Parent Expectations on Overall Teaching

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	-.004	.005	-.015
Parent Gender	-.099	.012	-.140**
Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.136	.018	.131**
Parent Education	.069	.016	.075**
Sponsorship(recoded)	.016	.015	.020
Institution Type	.058	.021	.051
Constant	1.50	.058	

Note: $*p < .01$ $**p < .001$; adjusted $R^2 = .045$, $F(6, 3253) = 26.33$, $p < .001$

Prediction of Caring Faculty

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for C1- Caring Faculty can be found in Table 4.16a. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations of a caring faculty, $F(6, 3249) = 10.61$, $p < .001$, with only one variable contributing to the prediction at the $p < .01$. The adjusted R squared value was .017. This indicates a small effect. The beta weights in Table 4.16b suggest that only parent female gender was a significant predictor ($p < .01$) of high parent expectations of a caring faculty.

Table 4.16a
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for C1-Caring Faculty and Predictor Variables (N = 3256)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
C1- Caring Faculty	1.33	.33	.003	-.123**	.041*	.008*	-.020	.041*
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.005	.021	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.025	-.055**	-.050	-.002
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.070**	-.062**	-.050
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.113**	.128**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.389**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

*$p < .01$ **$p < .001$*

Table 4.16b

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Institution Type, and Sponsorship Predicting Parent Expectations of C1- Caring Faculty

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	.001	.005	.002
Parent Gender	-.095	.013	-.125**
Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.052	.019	.047*
Parent Education	-.008	.017	-.008
Sponsorship(recoded)	-.008	.016	-.009
Institution Type	.049	.023	.041
Constant	1.37	.063	

Note:* $p < .01$ **$p < .001$; adjusted R^2 = .017 ; F (6, 3249) =10.61, $p < .001$

Prediction of a Caring Campus Community

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for C2-Caring Campus Community can be found in Table 4.16c. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations of a caring campus community, F (6, 3253) = 31.27, $p <.001$ with three of the six variables contributing to the prediction at the $p <.01$ level. The adjusted R squared value was .053. This indicates that 5% of the variance in parent expectations of a caring campus community was explained by the model. This is a somewhat larger than small effect size, according to Cohen (1988). Table 4.16d, suggests that parent female gender, non-college graduate, and religious sponsorship combined to contribute significantly to higher expectation ratings of a caring campus community at the $p < .01$ level.

Prediction of Parent Partnership

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for C3-Parent Partnership and predictor variables can be found in Table 4.16e. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations of C3, F (6, 3252) = 21.16, $p < .001$, with two of the six variables contributing to the prediction at the $p <.01$ level. The adjusted R squared value was .036. This

Table 4.16c
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for C2- Caring Campus Community and Predictor Variables (N= 3260)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
C2-Caring Campus Community	1.69	.46	.040	-.125**	.103**	.088**	-.148**	.079**
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.006	.023	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.026*	-.055	-.049**	-.002
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.072**	-.062**	-.050
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.112**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.389**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

*p < .01 ** p < .001

Table 4.16d
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Sponsorship and Institution Type on Predicting Parent Expectations of C2- Caring Campus Community (N= 3260)

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	0.17	.007	.041*
Parent Gender	-.138	.018	-.131**
Parent Ethnicity (recoded)	.147	.027	.094**
Parent Education	.077	.024	.056*
Sponsorship (recoded)	-.159	.022	-.134**
Institution Type	.042	.032	.025
Constant	1.65	.100	

Note: adjusted R^2 = .053; $F (6, 3253)$= 31.27, $p < .001$ *$p < .01$ **$p < .001$

indicates that approximately 3% of the variance can be explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988), this is a small effect. The beta weights in Table 4.16f, suggest that parent non-college graduate and parent non-White ethnicity combine to predict significantly higher expectations of a Parent Partnership at $p < .01$.

Prediction of Overall Caring Functions

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations can be found in Table 4.17g. This combination of variables significantly predicted parent expectations of OC- Overall Caring, $F (6, 3254) = 25.57$, $p < .001$, with four of the six variables contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R squared value was .043. This indicates that approximately 4% of the variance is

explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988), this is a small effect. The beta weights,

presented in Table 4.16h suggest that female parent gender, non-White ethnicity, non-college

graduate, and religious sponsorship combine to predict high expectations of overall caring.

Table 4.16e
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for C3-Parent Partnership and Predictor Variables (N= 3259)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
C3- Parent Partnership	1.75	.50	.060**	-.007	.136**	.109**	-.071**	.075**
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.006	.024	.001	.034	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			.025	-.055**	-.049**	-.002
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.069**	-.062**	- .050
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.112**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.388**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

*$p < .01$ ** $p < .001$*

Table 4.16f
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Sponsorship and Institution Type on Predicting Parent Expectations of C3- Parent Partnership (N= 3259)

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	.026	.008	.058*
Parent Gender	-.007	.020	-.006
Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.218	.029	.130**
Parent Education	.132	.026	.089**
Sponsorship(recoded)	-.042	.024	-.033
Institution Type	.105	.034	.058*
Constant	1.06	.095	

Note adjusted R^2 = .036; $F (6, 3252) = 21.16$, $p < .001$
*$p < .01$ ** $p <.001$*

Table 4.16g
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for OC-Overall Caring and Predictor Variables (N= 3261)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
OC- Overall Caring	1.61	.37	.049	-.087**	.128**	.098**	-.106**	.083**
Predictor Variable								
1. Student Classification	2.29	1.12		-.006	.022	.000	.033	-.005
2. Parent Gender	1.74	.44			-.025	-.055**	-.050**	-.002
3. Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.90	.30				.072**	-.061**	-.050
4. Parent Education	1.87	.34					-.112**	.127**
5. Sponsorship(recoded)	.19	.39						-.389**
6. Institution Type	1.92	.27						

*p < .01 ** p < .001

Table 4.16h
Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Student Classification, Parent Gender, Parent Ethnicity, Parent Education, Sponsorship and Institution Type on Predicting Parent Expectations of OC-Overall Caring (N= 3261)

Variable	B	SEB	β
Student Classification	.016	.006	.049
Parent Gender	-.075	.014	-.090**
Parent Ethnicity(recoded)	.150	.021	.122**
Parent Education	.075	.019	.069**
Sponsorship (recoded)	-.071	.017	-.077**
Institution Type	.068	.025	.051
Constant	1.32	.069	

Note. adjusted R^2 = .043; F (6, 3254)= 25.57, $p < .001$
*p < .01 **p < .001

Summary of Results

The parent participants in this study were majority female, married, Caucasian, and had a college degree. At least half were first time college parents and were very involved in their student's college choice. Parents reported that internet access in the residence hall and email access to academic advisors and professors were very important.

They also indicated that consistent feedback on written work and leaving college with more technology skills were very important. Additionally, they reported that their student having access to career and placement services as well as the opportunity to participate in an internship

were very important. Parents also reported that it was important that their student be treated fairly by instructors. Having access to their academic advisor to develop plans for a major was important as well. Furthermore, providing programs welcoming their student to campus and a safe and secure campus were rated as very important. Additionally, providing health care at the student health center was rated as very important. Those items not important to parents were learning via an online course and training on the library's digital media resources.

Table 4.17 illustrates the results and effect sizes for research question 1. There were no differences between institution sponsorships or types in regard to parent expectations for the teaching functions of the institution. There was a significant but weak interaction between institution sponsorship and type on parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution, specifically, liberal arts religious institution parents had higher expectations of C3-Parent Partnership than parents of the other institutions. For C2, C3, and overall caring, religious institution parents (research and liberal arts combined) rated caring as more important than did the parents of public and private nonsectarian students.

Table 4.17
Significant Results and Effect Sizes for Research Question: Effects of Sponsorship and Type in Relation to Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring (8 2x3 ANOVAS)

Variable	Type		Sponsorship		Interaction	
	Res v.LA		Rel v.Pub v. NonS		Type x.Sponsorship	
	Sig	ES	Sig	ES	Sig	ES
T1-Technology Resources	NS	-	NS	-	NS	-
T2- Team and Active Learning	NS	-	NS	-	NS	-
T3- Out of Class Learning	NS	-	NS	-	NS	-
OT-Overall Teaching	NS	-	NS	-	NS	-
C1- Caring Faculty	NS	-	NS	-	NS	-
C2- Caring Campus	NS	-	Rel >Other	VS	NS	-
C3- Parent Partnership	NS	-	Rel >Other	S	Rel LA> Other	VS
OC-Overall Caring	NS	-	Rel >Other	S	NS	-

Note. NS =Not significant; Rel =Religious Sponsorship; Pub = Public; NonS= Private Non-Sectarian; Rel LA= Religious Liberal Arts colleges; ES = Effect Size: - = Not shown because effect was not significant; VS= very small; S= small

Table 4.18 illustrates the significant results for research question 2. For seven of the eight tests, parents that were non-college graduates had higher expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution. There were, however no significant differences found between non-college graduates and college graduates in regards to a caring faculty.

Table 4.18
Significant Results and Effect Sizes for Research Question 2: Comparison of Parent Education Levels in Regard to Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring

Variable	Non-College v. College Grad	Effect Size
T1-Technology Resources	Non-College > College Grad	S
T2-Team and Active Learning	Non-College > College Grad	S
T3-Out of Class Learning	Non-College > College Grad	S
OT-Overall Teaching	Non-College > College Grad	S
C1-Caring Faculty	No Effect- No Significance	-
C2-Caring Campus	Non-College > College Grad	S
C3-Parent Partnership	Non-College > College Grad	SM
OC-Overall Caring	Non-College > College Grad	SM

Note. Non-College = Non college graduate; College Grad = College graduate; Effect sizes: S = Small, SM= Small to medium

Table 4.19 illustrates the findings for research question 3 in regards to comparisons of parent racial identity in relation to parent expectations of teaching and caring. In general, African American and Latino parents had higher expectations of teaching and caring than the other groups. Note that effect sizes are large or medium, especially for differences between African American and Caucasian groups. There were no differences found between parent racial identities in regards to a caring faculty.

Table 4.19
Significant Results and Effect Sizes for Research Question 3: Comparison of Parent
Racial/Ethnic Identity in Regards to Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring

Variable	Racial Identity	Post Hoc ES
T1-Technology Resources	AfAm, Lat > Cauc	M, M
T2-Team and Active Learning	AfAm, Lat > Cauc	M, S
T3-Out of Class Learning	AfAm, Lat > Cauc	L, M
OT-Overall Teaching	AfAm, Lat >Cauc	L, M
C1-Caring Faculty	No effects	-----
C2-Caring Campus	AfAm, Lat >Cauc	L, M
C3-Parent Partnership	AfAm, Lat >Cauc	M, M
OC-Overall Caring	AfAm, Lat >Cauc	L, M

Note. AfAm = African American; Lat =Latino/Latina; Cauc =Caucasian

Table 4.20 illustrates results found on research question 4 regarding comparison of parent gender in relation to expectations of teaching and caring. Post hoc gender comparisons on teaching found that mothers had higher expectations of teaching on three of the four subscales. There was no difference found between genders on T2-Team and Active Learning. Mothers had higher expectations of overall teaching than fathers. Additionally, Post hoc comparisons on the caring subscales indicated that mothers had higher expectations of caring than fathers on three of the four subscales. No differences between genders were found on C3- Parent Partnership. Mothers had higher expectations of overall caring than fathers, but the effect size was small.

Table 4.20
Significant Results and Effect Sizes for Research Question 4: Comparison of Genders in Regards
to Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring

Variable	Mother v. Father	Post Hoc ES
T1-Technology Resources	Mother >Father	M
T2-Team and Active Learning	No effect	----
T3-Out of Class Learning	Mother >Father	S
OT-Overall Teaching	Mother >Father	SM
C1-Caring Faculty	Mother > Father	S
C2-Caring Campus	Mother >Father	S
C3-Parent Partnership	No effect	----
OC-Overall Caring	Mother >Father	S

Note. Effect Sizes= ES; S=Small; SM= Small to medium

Table 4.21 illustrates findings for research question 5 regarding student classifications in regards to parent expectations of teaching and caring. There were no significant differences between student classifications on T1-Technology Resources. There was a significant omnibus difference found between student classifications on T2-Team and Active Learning, though post hoc tests revealed that these were not significant differences between any of the pairs of student levels. Parents of freshman students had significantly higher expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities than parents of junior students, though no effect was found on OT-Overall Teaching. Additionally, no effect was found between student classifications and parent expectations of C1-Caring Faculty. Parents of freshman students had higher expectations of C2-Caring Campus Community than parents of junior students. On C3-Parent Partnerships, parents of freshman had higher expectations than those of junior and senior parents. Parents of freshman students had higher expectations of overall caring than parents of juniors.

Table 4.21
Significant Results and Effect Sizes for Research Question 5: Comparison of Student Classification in Regards to Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring

Variable	Student Classification	Post Hoc ES
T1-Technology Resources	No effect	----
T2-Team and Active Learning	Omnibus effect	----
T3-Out of Class Learning	Freshman > Junior	S
OT-Overall Teaching	No effect	----
C1-Caring Faculty	No effect	----
C2-Caring Campus	Freshman >Junior	S
C3-Parent Partnership	Freshman > Junior/Senior	S, S
OC-Overall Caring	Freshman >Junior	S

Note. S= Small effect size

Table 4.22a displays significant predictors for each of the teaching functions of the institution using multiple regressions. R squared values indicate that the model significantly predicted some of the teaching function variables, but most effect sizes were smaller than typical. The combination of female parent gender, non-White race/ ethnicity, and non-college graduate seem to significantly influence expectations of the overall teaching functions of the institution.

Table 4.22b displays significant predictors for each of the caring functions of the institution using multiple regression. The last column in the table represents the effect size labels according to Cohen (1988). R squared values indicate that the model significantly predicted all of the teaching function variables, but again effect sizes were smaller than typical. Furthermore, the combination of female parent gender, non-White race/ethnicity, non-college graduate, and religious sponsorship seem to significantly influence parent expectations of overall caring functions of the institution. In general, those parents who had higher expectations of caring were mothers, non-college graduates, and of non-White race/ethnicity.

Table 4.22a
Significant Predictors (p<.01) for each of the Teaching Functions of the Institution Using Simultaneous Multiple Regression

Variable Significant Predictor	Beta	Cohen's Effect Size
Technology Resources		S-M
Parent Gender	-.233**	
Parent Education	.067**	
Parent Ethnicity	.104**	
Team and Active Learning		S
Parent Education	.071**	
Parent Ethnicity	.104**	
Out of Class Learning Opportunities		S
Parent Gender	-.112**	
Parent Ethnicity	.107**	
Overall Teaching Functions		S
Parent Gender	-.140**	
Parent Education	.075**	
Parent Ethnicity	.131**	

Table 4.22b

Significant Predictors of the Caring Functions of the Institution Using Simultaneous Multiple Regression

Variable Significant Predictor	Beta	Cohen's Effect Size
Caring Faculty		S
Parent Gender	-.125**	
Caring Campus Community		S
Parent Gender	-.131**	
Parent Ethnicity	.094*	
Parent Education	.056*	
Sponsorship	-.134**	
Parent Partnership		S
Parent Education	.089**	
Parent Ethnicity	.130**	
Overall Caring		S
Parent Gender	-.090**	
Parent Education	.069**	
Parent Ethnicity	.122**	
Sponsorship	-.077**	

Note. S=Small effect size

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter begins with summary statements of the major findings and how the data analysis presented in chapter 4 relates to other literature. It also offers a discussion of the implications for action, recommendations for future research, and comparisons of the findings of this study to that of Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies.

The purpose of this study was to extend the limited research on parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution and compare those results based on parent gender, race/ethnicity, education, and student classification. Additionally, this study examined the differences in parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of different kinds of higher education institutions.

This study consisted of parents from 11 different institutions that had a designated parent services/programs office. Participants were surveyed during the middle of the spring 2013 semester. Demographically, the majority of participants were female (mothers), college graduates, and Caucasian.

Discussion of Major Findings

No Significant Effects were Found in Relation to Institution Sponsorship or Type on Parent Expectations of Teaching

There were no significant interactions between institution sponsorship and type on parent expectations of any of the teaching subscales. Additionally there were no significant differences among the public, private nonsectarian, and private religious institutions or between the research and liberal arts institutions on any of the teaching subscales.

There is no existing research on institutional sponsorship and type in regards to parent expectations of teaching.

According to Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) and Astin (1999), the benefits of attendance at a small residential liberal arts college as well as the student's satisfaction with the faculty and quality of teaching, one might expect that those parents who have students attending private liberal arts institutions would have higher expectations of teaching than those at other institutions. Differences exist between public and private as well as liberal arts and research colleges and universities. Differences in size, selectivity, mission, and other environmental characteristics have small indirect or inconsequential effects on student outcomes (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). When looking at educational outcomes, parents may not have evaluated or even know much about the faculty to student ratio, out of class learning opportunities, or team and active learning opportunities at the institution that their student attends. Additionally, the wording of the questions on the survey could have impacted how parents responded to the questions regarding teaching. Finally, the lack of a difference in this study does not necessarily mean that there is no difference between institutional sponsorship and type in relation to parent expectations of teaching; it just means that one was not found in this study with this sample which may have included mostly parents at each institution with quite high expectations.

One might speculate further that parents see teaching and caring much differently. They may see the institution caring for their student in terms of treating them fairly and making sure that the campus is safe and secure as more valuable in a day and age where campus violence is seen as happening more often. According to the results of this study and others (College Parents of America, 2007; Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Spearman, 2010; Young, 2006) safety and

security on campus is a concern for parents and may impact parent/student choices of attendance more heavily than internet access or feedback on written work of the student.

Parents of Students Attending Religious Institutions Have Higher Expectations of Caring

There were no significant findings related to institutional sponsorship and type in regards to parent expectations of C1- caring faculty at public, private nonsectarian, and private religious or research and liberal arts institutions. There was a significant main effect of sponsorship on parent expectations of a C2- Caring Campus Community, though the effect was very small. Overall, the public and private sectarian groups did not differ, but religious institution parents rated a caring campus community as more important than the other two levels of sponsorship.

Following a significant interaction on C-3 Parent Partnership, Games-Howell post hoc tests revealed that there were significant differences among the six subgroups. Liberal arts religious institution parents had higher expectations of a parent partnership than the parents of research oriented religious institutions, though this was a small effect. Parents at both types of religious institutions had higher expectations of a parent partnership than parents at private and nonsectarian institutions. But religious liberal arts institutions had the highest expectations, producing a significant interaction.

Young's (2006) findings, using the same questionnaire at Creighton University, a Jesuit Catholic institution support this finding. In his examination of teaching and caring, parents placed more importance on the caring functions of the institution. There is little research available regarding parent expectations of teaching and caring at religious institutions. Though the existing literature may provide some indirect explanation as to why parents of students at liberal arts institutions may have higher expectations of caring. Many liberal arts colleges have specific religious affiliations and stress the importance of the student's spiritual development in

the curriculum. These factors may influence parent expectations resulting in the higher ratings for parents of students at liberal arts religious institutions found in this study, specifically on C3-Parent Partnership. In regards to religious institution parents having higher expectations of a caring campus community and overall caring, just there being an institutional association or connection with religion and spirituality may relay the impression of caring and compassion to parents and students.

According to Astin (1993), parents and students believe that private liberal arts colleges in general offer special educational benefits not available in private research institutions or in the various types of public institutions that compete for students. Some affluent liberal arts colleges spend five times as much per student than less affluent institutions (Astin, 1999). Additionally, liberal arts colleges vary widely in their educational programs offering a more personalized educational experience.

Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) stated that small private institutions have positive effects on educational aspirations and educational attainment (p.595). Further, attendance at a liberal arts institution increased the value that students placed on a liberal education (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Additionally, Astin (1999) stated that students attending private liberal arts colleges are more satisfied with faculty, the quality of teaching, and the general education program. Students may convey these judgments to parents impacting parent expectations. This may partially explain why parents at liberal arts religious institutions have higher expectations for parent partnerships than other parents.

Teaching and Caring Are More Important to Parents that are Non-College Graduates

Non-college graduates had higher expectations on all of the teaching subscales, though effect sizes were small. Additionally, non- college graduates had higher expectations of caring

on three of the four caring subscales than college graduates with small to medium effect sizes. There were no differences found between college graduates and non-college graduates on C1-Caring Faculty.

Findings suggest that parents who did not graduate from college may have little information regarding college, but they may have high expectations of the institution that their son or daughter attends. The literature supports that parents who did not graduate from college have higher expectations than those who did graduate from college. According to Carney's (2004) study at Cornell College, parents who had not attended college had higher expectations than those who had attended college. Carney (2004) indicated that parents that had not attended college had higher expectations that both the student and the institution would inform them of issues and concerns the student encountered.

Additionally, in a study conducted by MacDermott, Conn, and Owen (1987) at the University of Akron, found that those parents who had not attended college were more concerned with cost, academic reputation, and individual attention from the institution than those who did attend college. The concern for individual attention is similar to the caring functions in this study. This seems as if it might be contradictory, as there was no effect between college graduates and non-college graduates on C1- Caring Faculty. Both college graduates and non-college graduates rated caring faculty as very important with the lowest scale means for both groups, so probably important to all parents.

College educated parents and those who had not attended college felt that the quality of instruction, library facilities, faculty credentials, and financial backing were important when selecting an institution (MacDermott et al., 1987). College educated parents were more likely to visit colleges with their students and visited more campuses that were located at a distance from

home (MacDermott et al., 1987). Interestingly, those parents who put emphasis on individual attention from the institution did not visit campuses with their student (MacDermott et al., 1987). Further, individual attention may mean from staff and administrators, not just faculty.

Additionally, studies have suggested that parent view of teaching and caring may be influenced by previous college experience or the lack of college experience, which further supports the results of the current study. Parents with college experience may have lower expectations except for a caring faculty, because they have previous knowledge about college life, where those without college experience may have higher expectations due to their lack of knowledge about college as a whole (Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Immerwhar & Foleno, 2000; Wartman & Savage, 2008).

Teaching and Caring are More Important to African American and Hispanic Parents

There were statistically significant differences between race/ethnicity for each of the teaching functions of the institution. Results of post hoc tests indicated that there were significant differences between African American, Latino, and Caucasian parents on T1-Technology resources with a medium effect. African American parents had higher expectations of internet access across campus as well as web access to register for classes and view tuition and fees. Additionally, there were significant differences between African American, Latino and Caucasian parents on T2-Team and Active Learning. On T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities both Latino and African American parent expectations were higher than Caucasian parents with small effect sizes. Comparisons on OT-Overall teaching indicated that there were significant mean differences between African American, Latino, and Caucasian parents with a large to medium effect size. On average African American and Latino parents had higher expectations of teaching than the other groups. Additionally, there were significant differences found between parent race/ethnicity in regards to three of the four caring functions

93

of the institution. There were no differences found on expectations of C1-Caring Faculty. For C2, C3, and OC both African American and Latino parents had higher expectations than Caucasian parents with medium to large effect sizes.

Results of this study indicate that race/ethnicity can influence expectations of teaching and caring. Further evidence to support this finding is found in the literature. According to Immerwahr and Foleno (2000), African American and Latino parents place a much higher importance on a college education than do White parents. Similar findings in relation to parent race/ethnicity and expectations were found in Carney's (2004) study of parents of incoming freshman students at Cornell College. Her results suggested that parent expectations are positively influenced by race/ ethnicity. She indicated that this may be the result of the parent-student relationship and the parent's perceived need to advocate for their minority student. African Americans believe that a college education is necessary to improve their standard of living and are increasingly convinced that a college degree is more important now than ever before (Keppler, Mullendore, & Carey, 2005). Latino/Latina students are more family oriented and, therefore, family plays a central role in their college experience. Parents may worry about their student more because they are stepping outside the family nest. Latino parents have confidence in college administrators as they feel that every person in the student's community will take part in shaping their values, morals, and behaviors (Keppler et al., 2005). Latino parents may believe and/or expect that college and university officials will intervene in the life of their student much like a family member might (Keppler et al., 2005), implying that Latino parents may well have higher expectations for the caring aspects of the institution.

Teaching and Caring are Generally More Important to Mothers than Fathers

The current study found that mothers rated the teaching and caring functions of the institution as more important than fathers. Mother's expectations on T1-Technology Resources were significantly higher than father's expectations with a medium or typical effect. Mothers and fathers expectations were not significantly different on T2- Team and Active Learning. Though there were significant differences between mothers and fathers on T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities with a small effect. On OT-Overall Teaching, expectation ratings were higher for mothers than fathers though the effect size was small.

In regards to parent gender in relation to expectations of the caring functions of the institution, mothers had significantly higher expectations of C1-Caring Faculty than fathers with a small effect size. Mothers also had higher expectations of a caring campus community (C2) than fathers with a small effect. There were no significant differences between mothers and fathers on C3-Parent Partnership. Finally, there were significant but weak differences between mothers and fathers expectations on OC-Overall Caring. Mothers had higher expectations of overall caring than fathers with a small to medium effect size.

It is supported in the existing K-12 research that mothers are more likely than fathers to be involved in their children's education (Epstein, 1995). This may be due to the different types of relationships that mothers and fathers have with their children. This is supported in the literature as men and women vary in the ways that they form family relationships (Spearman, 2010).

Similarly, according to Young (2006), female parents overall, had higher expectations of caring and teaching. In addition, Spearman (2010) found that mothers were more likely to have higher expectations than fathers. Additionally female parents are more interested in an

institution's caring faculty and caring campus community than male parents, which further support the findings in the current study. As a primary caregiver, mothers are the ones that are most interested in seeing that their students have access to what they need (computer skills, learning opportunities) and are cared for by the institution (caring faculty, caring campus community).

Teaching and Caring are More Important to Parents of Freshman Students

There were no overall teaching effects of student classification, but freshman parents did have higher expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning than parents of junior students. There were significant differences between student classifications in regards to parent expectations on three of the four caring subscales. There were no significant effects for C1-Caring Faculty. Post hoc tests indicated that there were significant differences between parents of freshman students and the parents of junior students on C2- Caring Campus Community with a small effect size. Parents of freshman students had higher expectations of a caring campus community than parents of junior students. Further, there were significant differences found between parents of freshman students and parents of both junior and senior students with small effects on C3-Parent Partnership. Parents of freshman had higher expectations of a parent partnership than either parents of juniors or seniors. Additionally, there were significant differences between parents of freshman students and parents of junior students on OC-Overall Caring with a small effect. Parents of freshman students had higher expectations of overall caring than parents of junior students.

Parents are no longer letting go when they drop students off at college. They have been told since their children entered school that they should "know their teachers, know their friends, and know what they are doing and who they are doing it with" (Savage, 2009, p. 3). The literature supports the results of the current study that indicate that parents of freshman students

generally have higher expectations of the institution than especially parents of junior and senior students. Even after the college search is over and the student goes away to school the parent influence continues (Shoup et al., 2009). The use of technology keeps them connected to their student and aware of what is going on miles away at school. Young (2006) and Spearman (2010) surveyed parents of first year (freshman) students and found very similar results relating to parents of freshman students. Interestingly, this study did not find that parents of sophomore students had lower expectations than freshman parents on teaching and caring, so parents seem to maintain high expectations at least through the sophomore year.

According to Goree-Turrentine, et al. (2008), parent's top goals for their student's college experience are quality education, job preparation, graduation, and academic success. One might speculate that parents of junior and senior students would have higher expectation ratings for career counseling and placement services since their student is close to graduation, however this was not a finding in this study, in fact parent expectations of T3- out of class learning were much lower than parents of freshman students. The current study did not identify with a developmental theory. The purpose of this study was to explore parent expectations. Young's (2006) study identified with Eric Erickson's stages of psychosocial development and a parent's need to care for their student beyond the start of the college years. Spearman's study was consistent with Chickering and Reisser's (1993) student development theory, specifically vector three; moving through autonomy toward independence. This theory focuses more on the students' development and behavior during the college years.

Parent Gender, Ethnicity, and Education Predict Expectations of Teaching

Female parent gender and non-White ethnicity and being a non-college graduate appear to influence parent's overall expectations of teaching. This finding is consistent with Carney's

(2004) study where she found that education and race predict parent expectations. There was a suggestion that religious sponsorship at the $p < .05$ level contributed to the prediction of T1-Technology Resources. Religious sponsorship was not found to be a predictor on any of the other teaching subscales. The combination of parent education and race/ethnicity predicted expectations of T2-Team and Active Learning with a small effect size. Indicating that parents who were non-college graduates and of non-White race/ethnicity had higher expectations of team and active learning. The combination of parent gender and race/ethnicity predicted expectations of T3-Out of Class Learning Opportunities with a small effect. Mothers of non-White race/ethnicity had higher expectations of out of class learning opportunities. The combination of gender, race/ethnicity, and education significantly predicted expectations of OT-Overall Teaching with a small effect. This result indicates that mothers that are non-college graduates and of non-White race/ethnicity have higher expectations of the overall teaching functions of the institution. Interestingly, only gender contributed to the prediction of C1-Caring Faculty with a small effect size. It appears that only being a mother predicted high expectations of a caring faculty when all the other variables were included. For C2- Caring Campus Community the combination of gender, race/ethnicity, education, and sponsorship combined to significantly predict higher expectations of a caring campus with a small effect. Results suggest that mothers and those of non-White race/ethnicity who are non-college graduates and have a student attending a religious institution have higher expectations of a caring campus community. The combination of education and race/ethnicity significantly predicted expectations of C3- Parent partnership with a small effect size. Results indicate that parents who are non-college graduates and of non-White race/ethnicity have higher expectations of a parent partnership. Further, the combination of gender, education, race/ethnicity, and sponsorship combined to significantly

predict expectations of OC-Overall Caring functions of the institution. Results suggest that mothers, non-college graduates, and those parents who are of non-White ethnicity and who have students attending a religious institution have higher expectations of overall caring.

Ethnicity and gender were the most consistent and strongest predictors of teaching and caring. As discussed earlier, it is supported in the existing K-12 research that mothers are more likely than fathers to be involved in their children's education (Epstein, 1995). This may be due to the different types of relationships that mothers and fathers have with their children. This is supported in the literature as men and women vary in the ways that they form family relationships (Spearman, 2010). Literature and the results of this study and Carney's (2004) study support that African American and Latino parents place a much higher importance on a college education than Caucasian parents. Further, according to MacDermott et al. (1987) those who did not attend college were more concerned with cost, reputation, and individual attention than those who did attend college. The concern for individual attention is similar to the caring function in this study. Additionally, parents who attended college may have lower expectations because they have previous knowledge about college, where those without college experience may have higher expectations due to their lack of knowledge about college as a whole (Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Immerwhar & Foleno, 2000; Wartman & Savage, 2008). Further, Young's (2006) study at Creighton University (private, Jesuit Catholic institution) supports the results of this study that parents who have students attending a religious institution have higher expectations of caring. His results indicated that the parents at Creighton placed a higher importance on the caring functions of the institution vs. the teaching functions. The results suggest that parents who have a student attending a religious institution may have higher expectations of caring just because of the institution's affiliation or connection with religion.

Individual Items Rated as Very Important

High Speed Internet Access in Residence Hall Room was Important to Parents

Over 85% of parents in the current study rated high speed internet access in the residence hall room as very important in the Technology Resources subsection. In Spearman's (2010) and Young's (2006) studies, parents rated high speed internet access as very important using the same questionnaire as the current study.

Internet access is important for students when doing research, checking email and accessing coursework. Students having internet access in their rooms makes it much easier for them to get homework completed and respond to email from instructors. It may also be much more convenient than having to go to the lobby or to the library to finish important work or access those important messages. In this day and age of wireless internet access in coffee shops and hotels, it is not unreasonable for parents to expect internet access in the residence hall room on a college campus.

Email Access to Instructors and Academic Advisors was Important to Parents

In the current study, email access to instructors and advisors was rated as very important by more than 80% of parents at all kinds of institutions. Similar results were found in Young' (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies. In Young's (2006) study these same items were rated as very important as well. Email access to instructors and advisors was important to parents across all three studies using the PECTAC questionnaire.

Parent expectations that their student will have access to their instructors as well as their advisors may not be an unrealistic expectation. Email communication between instructor and student may increase student understanding of course content and encourage questions. Additionally, student email communication with their advisor may help with questions about courses or prerequisites and may help students avoid issues.

Further, email is sometimes a much quicker way to get answers to questions thus avoiding having to wait until the next class meeting or appointment. However, expecting faculty with large classes to respond to detailed email questions is an extra burden that may not be realistic to expect.

Feedback on Written Work was Important to Parents

In the current study, feedback on student written work was ranked as very important by 85% of parents in the current study. This finding was again very similar to findings in Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies, using the same instrument (PECTAC) as the current study. In Young's (2006) study, the parents' ranked consistent feedback on written work was very important with the highest frequency. Additionally, in Spearman's (2010) study participants reported this same item as very important with the highest frequency. Further, when asked to rate the two most important items to them as parents this item was again selected as most important in Spearman's (2010) study. Feedback on student written work was consistently important to parents across all three studies using the same questionnaire (PECTAC). There is no available literature that specifically addresses parent expectations of feedback on written work in college.

Students Being Treated Fairly by His/Her Course Instructor was Important to Parents

Fair treatment by instructors was found to be important to 90% of parents in the current study. This finding is similar to results found in Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies using the same questionnaire (PECTAC). Student's being treated fairly by their instructor is an item listed in the subsection of a "Caring Faculty." In Young's (2006) study, parents ranked student's being treated fairly by their instructor was ranked as very important with the highest frequency. In addition, the participants in Spearman's (2010) rated this item as most important to them as a parent. Fair treatment by instructors was ranked as very important by parents across all three studies using the PECTAC.

The literature supports fair treatment of students by the institution and faculty. Janosik, (2001) found in comparing parent, student, and faculty attitudes about disciplinary proceedings, that parents had high expectations for students' due process rights, the right to appeal, and a focus on educational outcomes. Since disciplinary processes can result in suspension and or probation in some cases, parents may expect that they will be notified and involved in the process to ensure that their student is treated fairly (Carney-Hall, 2008).

Students Leaving College with More Technology Skills was Important to Parents

Results of this study indicate that parents expect that their student will leave college with better than adequate technology skills in their area of expertise. This parental expectation is in line with the literature that supports parent expectations of college to provide students with the necessary job skills needed for success (Goree-Turrentine et al., 2000; Immerwahr & Foleno, 2000; Spearman, 2010; Young, 2006). High ratings in the current study for the item about parent expectations that students will leave college with the necessary technology skills in their area of study is consistent with Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies using the same questionnaire. In Young's (2006) study, parents rated students leaving college with more technology skills in their area of expertise as very important. In addition, participants in Spearman's (2010) study ranked this same item as one of the two items most important to them as a parent.

Technology skills are more important today than ever before as the job market is very competitive (Immerwhar & Foleno, 2000). Parents expect that the degree program that their student is in will utilize technology in some way. Students should leave college with a good foundation in technology and understand its uses in their field. Parents are investing much time

and money in their student's education, and a top goal for parents is career preparation and placement (Goree-Turrentine et al., 2000).

Access to Career Counseling, Placement Services, Academic Advising, and Mentoring were Important to Parents

The results of the current study indicate that parents expect that their student will have access to academic and career supports in college. The findings of this study indicate that career counseling, academic advising, and mentoring are all important to parents appears to be supported by the literature on parent expectations. Additionally, this finding is supported by results reported by Young (2006) and Spearman (2010) using the same questionnaire.

In Young's (2006) study, parents rated access to career counseling and placement services as well as access to academic advising and mentoring as very important. The item with the highest rating was "Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if needed." The second item rated as most important was "Have access to career counseling and placement services." In Spearman's (2010) study, access to career counseling and placement was the item selected as most important to parents. The second most important was "receive additional academic advising or mentoring. Career counseling and placement as well as academic advising and mentoring were important to parents across all three studies using the PECTAC.

These results are also supported in other literature on parent expectations. According to Goree-Turrentine et al. (2000), one of the top parental expectation outcomes for college is job preparation. This preparation includes career decision-making and placement. Not unexpectedly, in the survey conducted by College Parents of America (2006), career planning appears to become more significant as students approach graduation. This result appears to be supported indirectly by the literature in a study conducted by Public Agenda (a public policy think tank). In 2000, Immerwahr and Foleno investigated public perceptions of higher education. They surveyed

over 1,500 parents of high school students. They discovered that the public holds a prevalent belief that higher education has a responsibility beyond the award of a degree and includes personal growth, development of skills for professional and personal success and a broadened view of the world (Immerwahr & Foleno, 2000). Additionally, the current economy may impact parent expectations with competition for jobs being very high, career planning and placement may be important to those parents who have students in college. Parents are investing a lot of time, money, and resources in their student's education. Their expectations of their student having access to advising and mentoring appear to fall line with having a caring faculty and a caring campus community (Spearman, 2010; Young, 2006). They want to make sure that their student has access to what they need to be successful.

Development of Plans for a Major with an Academic Advisor was Important to Parents

The results of this study indicate that development of plans for a major with an advisor is important to parents. At least 80% of parents across all institutions in the current study appear to expect that their student will choose a major, and they will have an advisor to guide them along the way with course suggestions. The importance of development of plans for a major with an academic advisor found in this study appears to be consistent with results found in Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies using the PECTAC questionnaire.

In Young's (2006) study, participants ranked development of plans for a major with an academic advisor third in terms of importance in the Caring Faculty subsection. Additionally, in Spearman's (2010) study, parents ranked the same item as the second most important in the subsection.

There is research that supports this result indirectly in reporting parent expectations that institutions provide a full-service, value-added experience for their students (Immerwahr & Foleno, 2000). Additionally, surveys conducted by College Parents of America, (2007) and

Goree-Turrentine et al. (2008) indicated that parents expected students to learn necessary job skills for a career.

Programs Welcoming Students to Campus, Providing Health Care at the Student Health Center, and Providing a Safe and Secure Campus were Important to Parents

Results of this study indicate that parents expect a caring campus community. A caring campus community appears to be one that provides programs that welcome students to campus, health care to students, and a safe and secure campus. Over 50% of the parents across the different kinds of institutions in this study rated these items as very important. These results are somewhat consistent with Young's (2006) and Spearman's (2010) studies using the same questionnaire as the current study. Participants in Young's (2006) study at a catholic university overwhelmingly rated "Provide a safe and secure campus" as very important. Programs welcoming students to campus and health care at the student health center were not rated very highly in Young's (2006) study. Participants in Spearman's (2010) study also rated having a safe and secure campus as very important. In addition, participants in Spearman's (2010) study rated providing health care at the student health center and programs welcoming students to campus as the second and third most important items.

Additionally, other literature supports that parents do have an assumption of care when their student enters higher education (Carney, 2004; Daniel et al., 2001; Spearman, 2010; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Young, 2006). Parents have always been very protective of their students and see themselves as primary problem solvers for their students (Carney-Hall, 2008). Forbes (2001) found that parents expected to be notified of student's serious health issues, psychological problems, and any campus policy violations. The issue of personal safety on campus is an important one for parents. The Virginia Tech University tragedy changed the way the public and parents view crisis response and campus safety in higher education (Carney-Hall,

2008). Parents have high expectations that colleges and universities will minimize risk and communicate in a timely manner and transparently about safety concerns. As incidents of campus crime increase and media attention grows, parent expectations regarding campus safety will likely increase (Carney-Hall, 2008).

Parents Generally Did Not View Online Course Delivery as Important

Interestingly, access to online coursework was not generally very important to parents. Given that students and parents use technology daily and results of this study and others suggest that technology resources such as email and internet access are important to parents. It stands to reason that parents would not want to pay for online course delivery while their student is living on campus, unless there was a need for a particular class that was not available face to face.

Another explanation could be that some parents realize that online course delivery is in some cases supplemental to face-to-face class time; therefore, parents did not rate it as very important. Further, online coursework is still a fairly new concept and not everyone has welcomed it. There are still many who resist using technology to deliver course information in the way of a course website, discussion boards, or video broadcasts/podcasts of lectures. Since some parents may not have had experience with course delivery in this format, they may view it as unimportant.

Parents Generally Did Not View Training on the Library's Digital Resources to Be Very Important

Research papers are required in many upper level undergraduate classes and it is important to know how to utilize the library's digital resources. Surprisingly, parents did not view this as important. One possible explanation could be that parents assume that their student learned how to use the digital resources at their high school library and that they already know how to use a library's resources. Parents may not feel that there is much of a difference in the

library from high school to college. Though, colleges and universities have much larger libraries with many more available resources than the local high school library.

Parents Generally Did not View Providing Parent Programs and Active Parent Associations with Opportunities to Volunteer to Be Very Important

Since the parents participating in this study were on the institutional parent services/ programs office listserv, this was very surprising. Many institutions utilize a combination of the following services as a basis for parent and family programs and services: an orientation program, a handbook, a newsletter, a website, and a parent association (Saul & Honor, 2005). Parents who are included in the admissions and orientation process tend to see their involvement as an opportunity to partner with the institution. Orientation programs offer opportunities to engage and include parents and families in their student's educational process. The programs provide opportunities to assist the student, parent, family members, and staff in establishing expectations and boundaries for involvement (Ward-Roof et al., 2008).

Creation of a parent council or parent and family association provides a way to gather feedback from parents and connects them to the college. Since the parent services/programs office could fall under the college/university's development umbrella, its services could be geared toward development only. If the parent services/programs office falls under the student affairs umbrella it may be structured more toward programs and services for college parents. The way the office is structured may have had an impact on how parents perceive the office and subsequently responded to the question.

Since the participating parents registered their email with the parent programs/services office on their campus, one might speculate that they would be interested and involved with their student's college experience. Additionally, one might also speculate that they might find an

active parent association with opportunities to volunteer as important. That was not the case in the current study.

Comparison with other Parent Expectation Studies

The current study was built around Young's (2006) study of parent expectations of teaching and caring. Young studied parent expectations at Creighton University using the same questionnaire as the current study. He developed the original PECTAC questionnaire that was slightly modified for use in the current study. Young's study examined parent gender and first time college parent status to investigate differences between and among different subgroups. He worked from Eric Erikson's developmental theory that parents have a developmental need to care for their child beyond the high school years. Young's research questions surrounded differences in the importance parents placed on teaching and caring based on gender and first time college parent status. The current study did not undertake examination of first time college parents but did examine gender and its effect on parent expectations of teaching and caring. Young's results indicated that there was a significant difference in the importance that parents placed on the PECTAC items related to institutional teaching vs. caring at Creighton University. Creighton University is a Jesuit, Catholic institution and is listed as a private, Master's College and University by the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.

Young's accessible sample included all parents with students accepted to Creighton University's fall 2005 Freshman class (possible $n = 1,867$) and resulted in an actual sample of 475. The majority of participating parents reported being female, Caucasian, married, and holding a Bachelor's degree. Young's research question surrounded examining the difference in the importance parents place on an institutions ability to teach their student based on the gender of the parent. Results of his study found that there was a statistically significant difference between genders and the importance placed on teaching and caring using Principle Component

108

Analysis and a 2x2 MANOVA . His findings surrounding the importance that parents placed on the institution's ability to teach their student based on parent gender were statistically significant with small effects. Since Young's sample was much smaller than the current study it is more appropriate to compare effect sizes. Additionally, the current study found that there was a significant difference between gender related to the importance parents placed on the institution's ability to teach their student with small effect sizes.

Spearman (2010) also used the same questionnaire as the current study. She examined expectations of parents of first year students at a large, public institution in the south. The institution is a 4-year, comprehensive research institution as classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Spearman worked from Chickering and Reisser's (1993) student development theory, specifically on vector three, moving through autonomy toward interdependence. The sample size was 1,137 out of a possible 3,389 participants. The majority of parents reported being female, Caucasian, and married with a bachelor's degree. Parent expectations were analyzed in relation to parent gender, first time college experience, and parent college experience (education). The findings on parent gender in relation to expectations of teaching and caring were consistent with the findings of the current study. Spearman found that there was a significant difference between the gender of the parent on the importance placed on a university's ability to teach their student ($p \leq .001$) which is consistent with the findings of the current study ($p < .001$). Additionally, findings on parent gender in relation to the importance placed on a university's ability to care for their student. Spearman's (2010) findings suggested that there was a statistically significant difference ($p \leq .001$) between genders in regards to the importance parents placed on the university's ability to care for their student. These results are consistent with the current study's findings ($p < .001$). Spearman's findings on parent college

experience (education) in relation to the importance that parents placed on the university's ability to teach their student were statistically significant ($p= .021$) and are somewhat consistent with the current study's findings regarding parent education and expectations of teaching ($p < .001$). Additionally, Spearman (2010) found that parent college experience (education) in relation to the importance parents placed on a university's ability to care for their student was statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) which is again consistent with the findings of the current study ($p < .001$).

Neither Young nor Spearman examined parent ethnicity or student classification in relation to parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution. However, Carney's (2004) study did examine effects of race/ethnicity on parent expectations of and involvement with their college student and a liberal arts college.

Carney surveyed an entire class of parents of first year students at a small, private, liberal arts institution in the Midwest. Carney created the College Parent Experiences questionnaire that was mailed out to parents at the end of their student's freshman year (May 2004) and the sample included a total of 198 participants. The majority of participants were female, college educated, Caucasian, married, and middle aged from a medium to high socioeconomic status. Significant characteristics that predicted parent expectations of the institution were education level and race. Results of Carney's study found that parents that are highly educated have lower, perhaps more realistic expectations of the institution than those parents who are not highly educated. Additionally, parents of color have higher expectations of the institution than Caucasian parents. These findings are similar to those found in the current study. Parents who were non-college graduates, African American, and Hispanic had higher expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution than those who were Caucasian and college graduates.

Goree-Turrentine et al. (2000) conducted a qualitative, two year study at two large public institutions in the Southeast using interactive websites to encourage parents to list their top goals for their student's college experience. They surveyed parents of incoming first year students during orientation. Goals were divided into two tiers, top tier included job preparation, quality education, maturity/independence, graduation, fun/enjoyment, academic success, and friendships. The lower tier included, experiencing diversity, graduate school, stimulating learning environment, health/safety, success/pride, citizenship, improving social skills, and developing faith/values. The top four goals listed were: quality education, job preparation, graduation, and academic success. These findings are similar to those of the current study when compared to the responses by parents of what is most important to them. In the current study, items found to be very important to parents were access to career counseling and placement services. Additionally, other items that were found to be important to parents were; access to academic advisors, tutoring, and mentoring resources, as well as leaving college with technology skills in their area of expertise.

Goree-Turrentine et al. (2000) further examined the two institutions to determine if parent goals were institution specific or similar across the same types of institution. Results were the same for both institutions on the top goals. The emphasis of quality education, job preparation, and graduation at similar institutions appears to reflect the results of the current study concerning items that were found to be important to parents across the different kinds of institutions.

As early as 1973, administrators studied parent expectations of their student's institution. Based on a survey instrument developed by Deschaine to study four Colleges in Michigan, Tweddale (1973) surveyed 128 parents of first time freshman students at Grand Valley State College (GVSC). The larger study was apparently not published or presented; it included two

small liberal arts, religious colleges, Aquinas and Hope, as well as a community college and the four year liberal arts state sponsored college, GVSC. Comparisons of these four institutions would have been relevant to the current study.

GVSC itself had a traditional college of arts and sciences as well as three small experimental colleges that focused on general studies with a common core, interdisciplinary studies, and self-directed and self-paced learning, respectively. The survey had five scales: intellectual (similar to the PECTAC teaching scale), supportive (similar to the caring scale), social, regulative, and religious. Tweddale (1973) did not statistically compare the college of arts and sciences with the three experimental colleges combined, though the mean ratings were somewhat different. The experimental colleges were higher on supportive/caring, as might be expected, but lower on intellectual. One might speculate that the data for the two religious colleges (Aquinas and Hope) may have been relatively higher on supportive than GVSC's Arts and Sciences College or the community college. Such a finding would have been consistent with the current study, which found that parents at religious colleges had the highest expectations for caring.

<center>**Delimitations**</center>

Delimitations define the parameters of the study and help to define the factors that may prevent generalization of the results outside the study sample. This study was limited to only institutions that had a parent services/programs with access to a parent listserv. Additionally, it was limited to those parents who had listed their email address with the parent services/programs office on their student's campus. Further, questions regarding parent relationship to student; mother, father, grandparent, guardian, other relative were not included in the survey, only a

<center>112</center>

gender question was given so caution should be used in generalizing the results of this study to other populations outside this study.

Limitations

One of the primary limitations is that the sample may only include the most interested parents and the ratings of importance may be higher than for all parents. Additionally, 3 institutions of the 11 that participated had less than a 2.5% response rate so caution must be used in generalizing results outside the surveyed sample. Finally, in light of the small effect sizes and large samples, the practical significance of the differences between various demographic groups and types of institutions should be interpreted cautiously.

Recommendations for Practice

Parent expectations of higher education are formed by past experiences, admission and enrollment brochures, the cost of tuition, new student orientations, the media, and many other factors. Additionally, the observable behavior of students and parents is much different now than a generation ago (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Parents and students communicate more often and have closer relationships (Wartman & Savage, 2008). Further, institutions are not seen as taking the place of parents or as a bystander in their relationships with students (Bickle & Lake, 1999). Parents continue to play an important role in the relationship between the student, parent, and institution. Their expectations influence how they interact with their student as well as with the institution that their student attends. The results of this study suggest that parents have specific expectations of higher education. Specifically, mothers, non-college graduates, African American, and Latino parents, as well as parents of freshman students and parents of students who attend religious institutions have higher expectations of many of the institutional functions of teaching and caring. The current study adds to the research conducted on parent expectations

113

and may help administrators and institutions better understand how parent expectations differ among the various kinds of institutions. Additionally, results of this study may help administrators improve or create services and programs to better serve African American and Latino parents, who rated the teaching and caring scales as especially important.

The findings of this study and the literature (Carney, 2004; Immerwhar & Foleno, 1999; Spearman, 2010; Young, 2006) suggest that information may need to be tailored to meet the needs of African American and Latino/Latina parents who may not have clear information about higher education or what it means for their student. They may not feel comfortable asking questions in a group setting about areas in which they are unfamiliar; however, the results of this study indicate that they have much higher expectations of teaching and caring than other parents.

In thinking about interactions that administrators have with parents, several come to mind. There are interactions that result in the parent getting the information from faculty/staff needed to satisfy/solve an issue or concern and then there are those interactions that result in both parties being unsettled or frustrated. Some of this might be avoided if we tailored our information delivery to better meet the expectations of parents, specifically African American and Latino parents and mothers. It may also be important for staff members to be aware of the expectations that these groups (mothers, African American, and Latino parents) have.

Results of this study in addition to Spearman's (2010) and Young's (2006) suggest that a need to re-evaluate higher education's view of student recruitment and orientation may be in order. A look at delivering information to students, as well as parents during the recruitment process may result in a stronger partnership with parents. Delivery of more detailed information specifically for parents may help avoid unrealistic expectations of the institution. Additionally, making information available to parents about out of class learning opportunities and different

technology offerings available to students may possibly meet expectations of African American and Latina mothers. Including information regarding career services and academic advising may need to be more extensive and in-depth. This may be especially true when parents do not understand why their student is not taking a science class the first semester such as biology or are worried about their student finding a job related to their chosen major.

The results of this study regarding parent expectations and gender (mothers have higher expectations than fathers) may indicate that institutions may need to evaluate how information is communicated to parents. Spearman (2010) and Young (2006) agree that information regarding the differences in gender and expectations may help institutions to better tailor information delivery. So a general parent orientation session may need to be changed to meet the expectations of mothers and fathers. Specifically, information regarding technology and computer skills and out of class learning opportunities should be geared toward female parents. Additionally, including all institutional partners who can be viewed as caring for students (Counseling Center, Student Health Center, Dean of Students, Academic Advisors) in parent orientation sessions may be necessary to meet those expectations of female parents.

I think that development of a parent guide to campus that includes information on financial aid with frequently asked questions as well as detailed information on scholarships and campus resources such as, TRIO and DSS would be helpful. A Parent guide could be created to include not only financial aid but, academic advising, career services, counseling, health and wellness centers, student academic success centers, and student engagement information. This parent guide might serve as a supplement to the institutional website. Making it available online to parents but, having it in paper format may make it easier for those parents who are not comfortable using a computer or who do not have access to a computer at home. It should also be

115

available in Spanish. Providing this parent guide and including contact information in the form of email addresses as well as phone numbers and physical addresses may level the playing field by informing those parents who might not have a lot of experience with higher education. I think that including the parent guide in admission and recruitment packets would be ideal. When students apply to the institution, the guide could be sent to the parents at the same time the college acceptance letter is mailed to the student. This supplement might help administrators build a better relationship with African American and Latino parents by providing information via an alternative avenue.

The findings of the current study, as well as those of the similar studies conducted Spearman (2010) and Young (2006) appear to agree that parent information sessions at orientation may need to include more information about the teaching and caring functions of the institution. Specifically, do parents have an opportunity to hear from faculty members on their learning outcomes? Parents could greatly benefit from hearing from faculty members about their perspectives on teaching (faculty panel discussion). The results of this study appear to suggest that parents have specific expectations about the education that their student will obtain at the institution. Bringing faculty in to parent orientation sessions may give parents an opportunity to ask questions as well as gain insight to what faculty expect from the students. Adding this aspect to parent orientation sessions may help parents better understand ways that they can help and support their student.

Additionally, the findings of this study and others (College Parents of America, 2007; Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Immerwhar & Foleno, 1999) seem to suggest that parents may benefit from receiving more information about the career center and resources available for their student to explore the different careers associated with degree programs offered at the institution.

116

Providing this information may help parents support their student in their chosen career goals. Further, parents may not understand why their student is not taking a science class their first semester of college or why their student cannot double major and graduate in 4 years. Including academic advising in the parent orientation sessions may alleviate many questions that parents have about classes and degree programs as well as enable them to encourage their student to seek advising.

Finally, results of this study indicate that a safe and secure campus is very important to parents. Are we giving parents enough information regarding safety and security on campus and the many ways that the institution communicates safety concerns to students? Is there a parent orientation session that covers this information in detail? Do parents know where to find the campus safety statistics? Are parents informed about the Clery Act and what it means? Do parents know that there is a care team on campus and what their function is? The results of this study and others emphasize that parents have an expectation that their student will be safe on campus (Carney, 2004; College Parents of America, 2007; Forbes, 2001; Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Spearman, 2010; Wartman & Savage, 2008; Young, 2006). It is up to institutions to make sure that parents are made aware of the controls in place for intervention and prevention of safety issues and concerns on campus. Making sure that campus police and those administrators who have roles on safety committees are involved in parent orientations is important. As results of this study and others suggest, a safe and secure campus is important to parents.

Additionally, providing detailed information about student counseling centers, health and wellness centers may need to be included in parent orientation. This helps parents support their student if there is situation where those services are needed.

Last, making sure that parents have a single point of contact (parent services office, parent liaison, etc.) may go a long way toward building a relationship with parents. Research and literature suggest that parents may benefit from having one point of contact rather than having to call or email several departments to get answers to questions. Surprisingly, the results of this study did not indicate that parents overall felt that having a parent services office or an active parent association with opportunities to volunteer were very important. Parents at religious and liberal arts institutions rated those items as more important than parents at other institutions. The parent partnership with the institution may be viewed by parents more in terms of the institution meeting the expectations parents have for their student (safety, security and then belonging) and less in terms of what the institution can provide for the parent individually. Additionally, since parent services offices and parent associations are still relatively new to parents, they may not be familiar with them or understand their function. Institutions may need to inform parents of the existence of these offices and the services that they provide.

Results of this study and others (Spearman & Young) seem to suggest that institutions may need to spend more time on parent orientation. There appears to be a misconception that we need only to orient the students to the institution and that parents just need basic information. By only giving parents general information institutions may be causing more confusion and unrealistic parent expectations. If parents are given more detailed information and provided a parent contact, a large portion of confusion may be alleviated.

Research indicates that parents will remain involved in their student's college experience and institutions need to be sensitive to their expectations (Carney, 2004; Goree-Turrentine et al., 2008; Spearman, 2010; Wartman & Savage, 2008, Young, 2006). By taking the time to inform parents of what they can expect from the institution in the way of teaching and caring, unrealistic

expectations may be avoided. The message that institutions may need to emphasize to parents is that they are important in their student's success and they are part of a partnership with the institution toward that goal. Parents are major stakeholders and their expectations, hopes, and desires are important to the future success of higher education.

The findings of this study and those of Young (2006) and Spearman (2010) appear to agree, specifically in the question about parent involvement in college choice. At least fifty percent of parents surveyed in all three related studies reported being very involved in the college choice process. Institutions of higher education will need to work toward better understanding of parent expectations and seek to form a partnership with parents moving forward.

Recommendations for Further Research

Replication of this study with parent participation from historically black colleges, community colleges, tribal colleges, military colleges, as well as other public, private, non-sectarian and religious institutions of varying size and locations may further enhance the research available on parent expectations. It may increase the discussion about what parent expectations are and how they may differ across institutions. It could also shed light on how institutions are addressing these expectations. Additionally, it may lead to more insight of parent expectations of teaching and caring and whether the larger population of parents is more focused on teaching or caring at other institutions, especially those institutions that have a religious affiliation. Though this study had a large sample size and included a number of institutions, response rates were low. Future studies may need to focus on better response rates to test that results are more generalizable.

Longitudinal studies conducted on parents of high school seniors, following them through to graduation from college may shed light on how parent involvement and expectations may

change as their student goes through the college choice process to their freshman year and then on to graduation. Though this study did include parents of sophomore, junior, and senior students the information from the survey results did not provide ample data to explain if or how parent expectations might change as a student matriculates through college. Research conducted on the parent perspective as their student matriculates will further enable higher education to learn more about how and why parent involvement and expectations may change.

Qualitative investigation of parent expectations of the institution should be conducted to give parents an opportunity to share their perspective and what individual factors might play a role in shaping their expectations. The data gathered for this study were quantitative and the survey did not include open ended questions or interviews with parents where they could answer in a more individualized and personal manner. Conducting a more evaluative type of investigation could provide valuable data that might further benefit higher education institutions and administrators in understanding parent expectations and in creating or improving current parent programs and services.

Because the results of this study and others indicate that parents have high expectations of the teaching functions of an institution, it may be beneficial to examine if and when parents contact faculty members and academic advisors. The questionnaire used in this study did not ask questions regarding when or why a parent might contact a faculty member or an academic advisor so these might need to be added for future studies. The literature supports that parents are increasingly contacting faculty/instructors about student concerns and grades. Research in this area may provide data about parent involvement and expectations that parents have regarding faculty and academic advisors that might be useful for institutions and administrators.

The PECTAC questionnaire has been used in three studies. In the current study the sections where parents were asked to rate the two most important items were removed. These same sections were not included by Young (2006) in the first study using the questionnaire. Modifications to the questionnaire may be beneficial to future researchers. Additional research using large population samples may further support the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

Conclusion

One purpose of this study was to extend the current research on parent expectations and to examine parent expectations at several different kinds of higher education institutions. Another purpose was to compare the results based on education, gender, race, and student classification. Major findings suggest that parents of students attending religious institutions have higher expectations of caring. Though we do not know why this may be it may be based on institutional marketing, parent previous experience, or other factors. Further research is needed to understand why parent expectations may be higher at these kinds of institutions. Additionally, it appears that parents who were African American or Latino had markedly higher expectations of teaching and caring. Females and those who were non-college graduates had somewhat higher expectations of teaching and caring than parents who were Caucasian, male, and college graduates. The results of this study suggest that further investigation is needed on these individual groups of parents to understand why their expectations are different. This may suggest approaching these groups in a more qualitative research direction. Doing this may help us better understand the forces behind these expectations.

Overall the expectations that parents had of the individual teaching and caring items appears to suggest that parents have specific expectations of the institution. Institutional use of

parent satisfaction surveys may better enable administrators to improve current services, programs and information delivery. Further, these surveys may indicate that new services or programs may be needed. These tools may also help administrators to better address parent expectations and prevent the formation of unrealistic parent expectations.

One might speculate that the reasons that parents' expectations may be different is because of the end of *en loco parentis*, the institution of FERPA regulations, and the Clery ACT. Because of these, parents may feel the need to be involved and have certain expectations of the institution that their student attends. The trust in the institution may have been lost along the way when the need for parent lobbying for safety and security and fair treatment of their student became legal issues.

The challenge is for institutions and administrators to work together with parents in support of their student, creating a partnership with the same goal in mind (success of the student) and trust. Any collaboration or partnership requires communication of both parties, expectations of each other, and the outcome of the partnership. According to Wartman and Savage (2008), "Colleges and universities are most successful in working with parents when they define, explain, and support an appropriate role for parents during the college years" (p. 99). Additionally, Keppler et al. (2008) states "Partnership requires intentionality, clear goals, and well developed institutional processes that create shared understanding" (p. 1).

Ultimately, consistent and clear communication is the key to a successful outcome. Institutions must strive to reach all parents, not just those that attend orientation or answer a survey. Communication with parents should not just happen when the student is a freshman but, continue throughout the student's college years. Giving parents the tools and information that they need in order to work collaboratively with the institution makes sense for everyone involved

and will prevent unrealistic parent expectations. After all, we each have the same goal, success of the student.

This study provides useful information for institutions and administrators to begin building effective partnerships with parents. Additionally, this study provides information about parent expectations that adds to the current research on parent involvement and expectations. Further, this information can be used by institutions and administrators to improve current parent programs and services or create new ones.

REFERENCES

Altschuler, G. C., & Kramnick, I. (1999). A better idea has replaced `in loco parentis'. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(11), B8.

Arnett, J. J. (2001). Are college students adults? Their conceptions of the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development, 8*(2), 133-143.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1999). How the liberal arts college affects students. *Daedalus,* 128(1), 77-100.

Baker, T. R. (2008). Navigating state and federal student privacy laws to design educationally sound parental notice policies. *New Directions for Student Services, 122*, 81-103.

Bastian, J. (2010). *Exploring parental perception of involvement with college students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.3404001)

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

Block, S. (2007, January). Rising costs make climb to higher education steeper. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/money/perfi/college/2007-01-12-collegetuition-usat_x.htm

Carney, K. C. (2004*). Parent Expectations of and Involvement with Their College Student and a Liberal Arts College. Education.* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3157958)

Carney-Hall, K. C. (2008). Understanding current trends in family involvement. *New Directions for Student Services, 122,* 3-14.

Chickering, A, & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coburn, K. L. (2006). Organizing a Ground Crew for Today's Helicopter Parents. *About Campus, 11*(3), 9-16.

Collard-Jarnot, K. (2009). Parent and family institutional philosophy and on-campus partners. *NASPA Journal, XVIII* 40-54.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

College Parents of America (2006 & 2007). Survey of current college parent experiences. Retrieved November 15, 2010 from http://www.collegeparents.org//sites/default/files/ current-parent-survey-summary.pdf

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

Cress, C. M., & Sax, L. J., (1998). *Campus climate issues to consider for the next decade.* In K. W. Bauer (ed.), *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities.* New Directions for Institutional Research. (98), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Cutright, M. (2008). From helicopter parent to valued partner: Shaping the parental relationship for student success. *New Directions for Higher Education, 14*4, 39-48.

Daniel, B. V., Evans, S.G., & Scott, B. R. (2001). Understanding family involvement in the college experience today. *New Directions for Student Services, 94*.

Donovan, J., & McKelfresh, D. A. (2008). In community with student's parents and families. *NASPA Journal, 45*(3): 22.

Education, U. D. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved October 4, 2010, from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg2.html#sec1118.

Epstein, J. (1995). School, family, and community partnerships : Where do campuses fit in? *About Campus* (September/October), 11-17.

Fletcher, M.A. (2002, June 4). College aid's middle class shift. *Washington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A54871-2002Jun3?language=printer

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

Goree-Goree-Turrentine, C. S., Ostroth, D. D., & Ward-Roof, J.A. (2000). The parent project: What parents want form the college experience. *NASPA Journal,38*(1), 13.

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

Harper, C. E., Sax, L. J., et al. (2012). "The Role of Parents in College Student's Sociopolitical Awareness, Academic, and Social Development." *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 49*(2), 20.

Harvard Family Research Project (2007). Family involvement in middle and high school Students' education. Retrieved November 12, 2010, from http://www.gse.harvard.edu /hfrp/projects/fine/resources/research/adolescent.html

Henning, G. (2007). Is in Consortio cum parentibus the new in loco parentis? *NASPA Journal,44*(3), 538-560.

Hine, T., (1999). *The rise and fall of the American teenager: A new history of the American adolescent experience.* New York, NY: Harper Collins

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V. and H. M. Sandler (1997). Why do parents become involved in their children's education? Review of Educational Research 67(1): 3.

Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K.S. (1987). Studying student college choice: A three-phase model and the implications for policymakers. *College and University,* 1987 (2), 207-221.

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

Howe, N. S., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials Rising: The next great generation.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Howe, N. S,. & Strauss, W. (2003). *Millennials go to college.* American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers and Life Course Associates.

Immerwahr, J., & Foleno, T. (2000). *Great expectations: How the public and parents -white, African American, and Hispanic view higher education.* San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

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 Student*s. Washington, D.C.: NASPA, 53-59.

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.

Kaplan, W., & Lee, B.A. (1995). *The Law of Higher Education* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kennedy, K. (2009). The politics and policies of parental involvement. *About Campus, 14*(4), 16-25.

Kepic, G. (2006) Causes and implications of parental involvement in the advising process. Retrieved from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Website on 5/7/12. http://nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/Parental-Involvement.htm

Keppler, K., Mullendor, R. H., & Carey, A., Ed. (2005). *Partnering with the Parents of Today's College Students,* NASPA.

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

Levine, A., & Cureton, J.S., (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student.* NASPA.

Lowrey, J. W. (2005). Legal issues regarding partnering with parents: Misunderstood federal laws and potential sources of institutional liability. In K. Keppler, R. Mullendore, and A. Carey (Eds.), *Partnering with the parents of today's college students.*(pp.43-51). Washington, DC: NASPA.

Lum, L. (2006). Handling "Helicopter Parents". *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 23*(20), 40-43.

MacDermott, K. G., Conn, P. A., & Owen, J. W. (1987). The influence of parental education level on college choice. *The Journal of College Admissions, 115*.

Merriman, L. S. (2007). It's your child's education, not yours. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(13), B20.

Moriarty, E. (2011). *Relationship of helicopter parenting on autonomy development in first-year college students.* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3450941)

Mullendore, R.H., Banahan, L., and Ramsey, J. (2005). Developing a partnership with today's college parents. In K. Keppler, R.H. Mullendore, and A. Carey (Eds.), *Partnering with the parents of today's college students*. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P.T. (2004). First-Generation College Students: Additional Evidence on College Experiences and Outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*(3), 249-284.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research* (Vol. 1). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Price, J. (2008). Using purposeful messages to educate and reassure parents. *New Directions for Student Services,122*.

Rawe, J. (2007, April). Can we make campuses safer? *Time Magazine.* Retrieved 10/22/13 from http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1611164,00.html

Saul, B. & Honor, S. (2005). "Appendix A: Model programs. In K. Keppler, R.H. Mullendore & Carey (Eds.), *Partnering with the parents of today's college students.* ." NASPA Journal: 77-85.

Savage. M (2005). National Survey of College and University Parent Programs. University of Minnesota website. Retrieved from http://www.parent.umn.edu/ ParentSurvey05.pdf

Savage, M. (2009). *You're on your own (but I'm here if you need me): Mentoring your child during the college years*. New York, NY: Fireside.

Sax, L. J., & Wartman, K. L. (2010). Studying the impact of parental involvement on college student development: A review and agenda for research higher education. *Handbook of Theory and Research, 25*, 219-255.

Sells, D. (2002). Parents and campus safety. *New Directions for Student Services, Fall 2002*(99), 25-35.

Shoup, R., Gonyea, R. M., & Kuh, G. D. (2009). *Helicopter Parents: Examining the impact of highly involved parents on student engagement and educational outcomes*. Paper presented at the 49th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. Atlanta, Georgia.

Spearman, C. J. (2010*). Expectations of parents of first year students regarding collegiate teaching and caring at a public university.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3404394)

Schwartz, J. (2009). Stories of university parental involvement from those not flying in helicopters: The lived experience of parents of first-generation latina college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 70(9-A), 3375.*

Taub, D. J. (2008). Exploring the impact of parental involvement on student development. *New Directions for Student Services, 122,* 15-28.

Tweddale, R. B. (1974). A survey of parental expectations about grand valley state colleges.

Ward-Roof, J. A., Heaton, P. M., & Coburn, M. B. (2008). Capitalizing on parent and Family partnerships through programming. *New Directions for Student Services, 122,* 43-55.

Wartman, K. L., & Savage, M. (2008). Parental involvement in higher education: Understanding the relationship among students, parents, and the institution. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 33*(6), 1-125.

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

Wolf, D. S. S., Sax, L. J., & Harper, C. E. (2009). Parental engagement and contact in the academic lives of college students. *NASPA Journal, 46*(2), 325-358.

Young, W.W. (2006). *Parent expectations of collegiate teaching and caring* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3236911).

APPENDIX 1: Permission to Use PECTAC Survey Instrument

Dr. Young,

I am a doctoral student at Colorado State University in a distance cohort College and University Leadership program. My research interest surrounds parent involvement, specifically parent expectations of the institution. I hope to study parent expectations across several different types and sizes of institutions this fall. I am writing to ask your permission to utilize and modify the PECTAC that you developed and used in your study at Creighton. I would cite your work and give you credit for the development of the survey.

I welcome any questions you may have and will happily provide any additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

Tyna Adams
Graduate Student-ED Leadership Distance Cohort-Colorado State University

"Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world"-Nelson Mandela

Reply   Forward

Young Jr., William W. <waynejr@creighton.edu>   6/25/12

to

me

Tyna,

Good to hear from you. Absolutely, please proceed. I do appreciate the citations back to the original work and would appreciate you doing that in your work.

Also, there is now a group of 3 of us seeking the chance to publish and present on this topic—so we would love to add you to the group.

Please keep me updated. Good luck.

Wayne

APPENDIX 2: PECTAC SURVEY (MODIFIED FOR CURRENT STUDY)

PECTAC Survey (Copyright Young 2005)

Parent Expectations

Dear Parent:

My name is Tyna Adams and I am a graduate student in the School of Education at Colorado State University working on my dissertation. I am conducting research under the guidance of Dr. George Morgan, who is also in the School of Education. I would like to invite you to participate in a research study at your institution. The purpose of this study is to explore parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution. By taking approximately 8-10 minutes to complete this survey, you will be assisting college administrators to meet better the needs and expectations of college parents and students. While you may not benefit directly from your participation in this study, your experiences will help shape how colleges and universities together with Parent and Family Programs/ Parent Services respond to parent and family needs in the future. There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this study although you will be asked to reflect on your expectations and perceptions as a parent.

Your participation in this research study is completely voluntary and will be kept confidential. None of the personal demographic information will be linked to you or your student. If we write a report or article about this study, we will describe the study results in a summarized manner so that you cannot be identified. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in the study, you may stop participating at any time. Neither you nor your student will be penalized or lose any benefits for which you otherwise qualify.

By completing the survey, you are acknowledging that you have been fully informed of the purpose of the study, its benefits and risks, and your rights as a participant.

If you have questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at tmadams@lamar.colostate.edu or (205)467-5030 or Dr. George Morgan at george.morgan@colostate.edu or (970) 491-0608

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact Janelle Barker, Human Research Administrator at (970)491-1655 or email janell.barker@colostate.edu

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Parent Expectations

Teaching Section

Please respond to the following questions regarding the importance that you place on each item

1. As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the College/University provides your student with

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't know
General Academic Advising information via a website	○	○	○	○	○
Web access to register/drop/add courses and view tuition and fees	○	○	○	○	○
Web access to view financial aid information	○	○	○	○	○
Specific academic advising information via a website	○	○	○	○	○
Access to a University provided email	○	○	○	○	○
Access to required textbooks and ordering via a website	○	○	○	○	○
Access to computer-labs on campus	○	○	○	○	○
High-speed Internet access in his/her residence hall room	○	○	○	○	○
Wireless Internet access throughout campus	○	○	○	○	○
Training on the University library's digital resources	○	○	○	○	○
A University provided portable computer	○	○	○	○	○
Email access to his/her faculty instructor	○	○	○	○	○
Academic content delivered via a course website	○	○	○	○	○
Email access to his/her academic advisor	○	○	○	○	○

Parent Expectations

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

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't know
Discuss and critique ideas from readings with other students and the instructor during courses	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Present in front of peers and the instructor using technological means	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Outperform the faculty instructor's expectations	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Participate in group projects outside of class using instant messaging	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Learn via an on-line course	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Participate in community based or service based course projects	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Use the internet to research an assignment	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Complete assignments via a course website	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Leave college with more information technology skills in their field of expertise	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Be given consistent feedback on written work (research papers, journals, etc.)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Parent Expectations

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

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't Know
Be provided with training of how to be more responsible	○	○	○	○	○
Have opportunities to join a variety of clubs and organizations	○	○	○	○	○
Receive additional academic advising or mentoring if requested	○	○	○	○	○
Be provided with opportunities for internships	○	○	○	○	○
Have opportunities to learn about someone from a different race/culture	○	○	○	○	○
Be provided with opportunities for service and volunteerism	○	○	○	○	○
Have access to services and resources in the greater city area	○	○	○	○	○
Be provided with remedial or disability services if needed	○	○	○	○	○
Access to student tutoring and academic support	○	○	○	○	○
Have opportunities to socialize in group activities	○	○	○	○	○
Complete a practicum or internship using technology	○	○	○	○	○
Have access to career counseling and placement services	○	○	○	○	○
Be provided with information on developing good morals	○	○	○	○	○

Parent Expectations

Caring Section

Please respond to the following questions regarding the importance that you place on each item

4. Collegiate Caring: A Caring Faculty

As a parent, how important is it to you that your student

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't Know
Have regular contact with his/her academic advisor	○	○	○	○	○
Develop plans for a major with his/her academic advisor	○	○	○	○	○
Be known on a personal level by at least one faculty member	○	○	○	○	○
Be known by his/her course instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Be treated fairly by his/her course instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Have access to his/her course instructor(s) outside of class	○	○	○	○	○
Be provided the opportunity to give feedback on his/her course instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Receive information on additional tutoring from his/her course instructor(s)	○	○	○	○	○
Be instructed by a faculty member rather than a teaching assistant	○	○	○	○	○

Parent Expectations

5. Collegiate Caring: A Caring College/University Community
As a parent, how important is it to you that upon arriving at college your student finds...

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't Know
Programs welcoming your student to campus life	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunites to explore his/her leadership potential	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
A campus community that appreciates the uniqueness of each student	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Programs orienting him/her to college life	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Support and challenge like a parent might give	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Health care at the student health center	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities to learn how to be in community with others	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
A friend in his/her floor Resident Assistant (if living on campus)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities to grow in his/her faith life	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Care at the student counseling center	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Opportunities to participate in community service	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Parent Expectations

6. Collegiate Caring: Being in Partnership with Parents

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

	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	N/A Don't Know
Notify me of my student's academic progress on a regular basis	○	○	○	○	○
Contact me if my student is caught cheating or plagiarizing	○	○	○	○	○
Have my calls returned by members of the faculty or administration within 24 hours	○	○	○	○	○
Provide a safe and secure campus	○	○	○	○	○
Provide me with my student's major and degree progress information via a website	○	○	○	○	○
Discipline my student fairly if he/she breaks University policies and procedures	○	○	○	○	○
Provide my student with additional academic advising, tutoring, or mentoring if requested	○	○	○	○	○
Notify me if my student is using illegal substances	○	○	○	○	○
Orient me in how I will be involved in my student's education	○	○	○	○	○
Provide a designated parent relations office	○	○	○	○	○
Provide parent programs and active parent associations with opportunities to volunteer	○	○	○	○	○
Provide my student unlimited visits at the student counseling center, if needed	○	○	○	○	○
Notify me if my student is drinking illegally	○	○	○	○	○

Parent Expectations

Student Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions about your student

7. Is your student

○ Male

○ Female

8. What is your student's age?

○ 18-24

○ 25-30

○ 30 or above

9. What is your student's ethnicity?

○ African American/Black

○ Asian

○ Caucasian

○ Latino/Hispanic

○ Multiracial

○ Other

10. What is your student's classification?

○ Freshman

○ Sophomore

○ Junior

○ Senior

○ Graduate Student

11. What college/university does your student attend?

○ Place holder

○ Place holder

○ Place holder

○ Place holder

Parent Expectations

Parent Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions about yourself

12. Is this your first experience as a parent of a college student?

◯ Yes

◯ No

13. How involved were you in your student's college choice?

◯ Very Involved

◯ Somewhat Involved

◯ A Little Involved

◯ Not at all Involved

14. How involved are you in your student's current college experience?

◯ Very Involved

◯ Somewhat Involved

◯ A Little Involved

◯ Not at all Involved

15. What is your gender?

◯ Male

◯ Female

16. What is your marital status?

◯ Married

◯ Divorced

◯ Single-Parent

◯ Widowed

Page 9

Parent Expectations

17. What is your Ethnicity?

( ) African American/Black

( ) Asian

( ) Caucasian

( ) Latino/Hispanic

( ) Multiracial

( ) Other

18. What is your highest level of education?

( ) High School graduate

( ) Bachelor's degree

( ) Master's degree

( ) PhD or terminal degree

141

APPENDIX 3: IRB Approval from Colorado State University

Colorado State University

Date: January 4, 2013

To: Dr. George Morgan, Education
             Tyna Adams, Education

From: Janell Barker, IRB Coordinator

Re: Comparison Study: Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring at
             Different Types of Higher Education Institutions

IRB ID: 001-14H   **Review Date:**   January 4, 2013

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Coordinator has reviewed this project and has declared the study exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2): Research involving the use of educational tests,....survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- **You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.**

- **You must carry out the research as proposed in the Exempt application,** including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if stated in your application.

- **Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB Coordinator through an email prior to implementing <u>any</u> changes,** to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB protocol will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

- **Please notify the IRB Coordinator if any problems or complaints of the research occur.**

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. **Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption,** even if you conduct a similar study in the future.

APPENDIX 4: Institution Invitation to Participate in Research

Hello,

My name is Tyna Adams and I am a doctoral candidate in the College and University

Leadership program at Colorado State University (distance-cohort). I am conducting my

dissertation

research on Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring at Different Kinds of Higher

Education Institutions. I would love to include the parents at your institution in my study. A

report of the findings would be sent to you. I have attached my IRB approval letter as well as

the purpose and methodology for the study.

I hope to begin collecting data by mid-February and hope to include your institution. Please

let me know if you have questions or need clarification of any of the information that I have

included. I hope to hear back from you soon!

Sincerely,

Tyna

Adams

APPENDIX 5: Study Information Sent to Institutions with Invitation to Participate

Purpose of the Study

Today's college parent is involved in a myriad of ways with their college student's experience as well as the institution. Many of today's parents attended college themselves and have beliefs and expectations of what the college experience should be. Thus, one purpose is to compare expectations of parents who graduated from college with those who did not graduate or attend college. This study also extends the limited research on parent expectations and examines parent expectations at several different kinds of institutions. This study will invite parents of currently enrolled students at six different kinds of institutions to report the importance placed on the ability of the institution to teach and care for their student. Another purpose of this survey study is to compare results from the participants based on gender, race, and student classification.

Research Questions

The questions that will be explored within this study are:

1. What differences exist between the kind of institution that their student attends in regards to the importance parents placed on the institution's ability to teach and care for their student?

 a. Is there a difference between public institutions, private nonsectarian institutions, and private religious institutions in regard to parent expectations?

 b. Is there a difference between research universities and liberal arts colleges in regard to parent expectations?

 c. Is there an interaction between sponsorship and institutional type (research or liberal arts) in regard to parent expectations?

2. What differences exist between the parent's racial identity in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution and parent race?

3. What differences exist between parent educational attainment in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

4. What differences exist between parent gender in regard to expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

5. What differences exist between student classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate student) in regard to parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

6. How well does the combination of parent gender, race, educational attainment, student classification, and institution type predict parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution?

The dependent variables in the study are: Parent expectations of the teaching functions of the institution, Parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution. Independent variables cluster around several categories; institution type, parent characteristics, and student classification.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research Approach and Rational

According to Creswell (2009), researchers have a general view about the world and their approach to research that is shaped by the discipline area as well as, past and present research experience. This worldview influences the type of research that individuals gravitate toward. The post positivist worldview is represented by the traditional form of research. Those holding this worldview examine problems and issues to identify causes and resulting effects. The intent is to reduce ideas into variables and then to hypotheses and research questions that can be investigated. Thus, post positivists begin with a theory and collect data that either supports or

refutes it. Key to this worldview is identifying statements that explain the problem or describe the relationships of interest (Creswell, 2009).

It is often said that science is empirical, that scientific investigation is centered on observation (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000). Data analysis is part of the scientific process that makes it possible for the researcher to make observations and hypothesize about outcomes and then ask more questions. The process of asking a question, examining it, drawing inferences statistically, and arriving at answers is at the heart of scientific exploration (Young, 2006).

The survey approach is a quantitative method that provides numeric measures of behaviors, attitudes, and opinions of a population by examining a sample of that particular population. The results of the sample enable the researcher to make assertions about the population.

Survey research was chosen for this study for several reasons. It can generalize to a much broader population of college parents. Additionally, surveys can be delivered by remote location through email, mail, or phone and is a more cost effective and convenient way to survey a large population. This study includes several institutions demographically located at a distance from each other and the researcher. For the purposes of this study, the survey will be transformed into a web based survey created in Survey Monkey. The availability of the survey on line will provide for faster and easier delivery to parents as well as a fast turnaround for data collection. Using a web based survey will make it easier to reach a much larger population of parents. Additionally, the survey delivered in this way will protect the participant confidentiality as no identifying information will be available to the researcher, other than institutional type. Participants will be surveyed only one time for this study. An email invitation with a link embedded to the survey at survey monkey will be sent out with one reminder at the halfway point of the survey.

Variables and Design

The intent is to include at least eight colleges/universities in this study to compare parent

expectations of the teaching and caring functions of several kinds of institutions, which are

grouped based on two variables shown in the schematic design below. The goal is to have at

least four public and four to six private institutions; this variable will be called sponsorship and

have three levels (public, private non-sectarian, and private religious). A second variable will be

called type of institution and have two levels (research/PhD and liberal arts). This is a 3 x 2

factorial design with three levels of sponsorship and two institutional types. Note that this means

there are six specific kinds of institution: public research, private nonsectarian research, private

religious research, public liberal arts, private nonsectarian liberal arts, and private religious

liberal arts.

	Sponsorship			
Public		Private		Total
Type of Institution		Nonsectarian	Religious	
Research	2	1 or 2	1 or 2	4-6
Liberal Arts	2	1 or 2	1 or 2	4-6
Total	4	2-4	2-4	8-12

The reasoning behind comparing research and liberal arts colleges is that the largest differences

in parent expectations may be found between them. The religious orientation variable may well

also lead to interesting differences in parent expectations. Once all permissions and approvals are

obtained a more detailed description of the sites will be included in this section.

Participants

The institutions included in this study will consist of a convenience sample of institutions

that fit the design and agree to participate. The target population for this study is parents of

currently enrolled students at the six different kinds of institutions as described above. The

population frame will include parents who have a student currently enrolled in a participating

institution working toward a degree or certificate. The parents will have an email listed with a parent relations office or designee on each campus. The intent is to have a convenience sample of 200 or more parents at each study site.

Data Collection

Once IRB approval and permissions from the institutions in the sample are obtained, the intent is to have designated administrators in parent relations offices send out, through email, a parent invitation to participate in the study created by the researcher. The email invitation will include a link to the survey. Informed consent will be included in the first page of the survey and participants will indicate their consent by completing the survey. The designated administrator will send this invitation out on the university parent listserv. The intent is to give participants three weeks in which they can complete the survey. A follow up email will be sent out to participants on the listserv at the halfway point to remind them of the survey. Parents will be surveyed one time for the purposes of this study.

Instrument

The Parent Expectations of Collegiate Teaching and Caring (PECTAC) was created and developed by Dr. Wayne Young for use in his doctoral research in 2006. The instrument was intended to explore parent expectations of the teaching and supporting functions of a private, religiously affiliated college in the Midwest. Additionally, the PECTAC was used in another study conducted by Christina Spearman in 2010. In Spearman's study the PECTAC was used to examine the expectations of parents of first year students at a large, public university in the south. I have obtained permission from Dr. Wayne Young to use the instrument in this study.

The PECTAC was created to understand parents as partners and the importance that parents placed on the teaching and caring functions of an institution (Spearman, 2010). The questionnaire contained 86 questions separated into three specific sections (Young, 2006). The

first section included 12 demographic items. The items included: gender of parent, marital status, gender of student, race of parent, educational level of parent, number of children in college, prior experience as a college parent, number of computers in the home, type of internet access, and an additional question about how involved the parent was in the college choice process. The degree of involvement for this question was measured on a four point Likert scale (very involved, somewhat involved, a little involved, and not at all involved). A neutral option was not included; since the investigator assumed that a parent had some degree of involvement or was not at all involved in the college choice process of their student.

The second section of the PECTAC included 40 items related to the teaching functions of a college/university. The first subscale included 14 items in which parents are asked about the technological resources that they expected their student to be provided. An example of the questions in the section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important is it to you that the university provides your student with general academic advising information via a website?" The second subscale included 10 items about teaching, in which parents are asked to rate the importance of team and active learning opportunities. An example of the questions in this section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will discuss and critique ideas from readings with other students and the instructor." The third subscale included 13 items asking parents to rate the importance of out of class learning opportunities. An example of the questions in the section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that at college your student will be provided with opportunities for service and volunteerism?"

The third section of the PECTAC included 34 items surrounding the caring functions of the college/university. In the first subscale, nine items related to the importance that parents

placed on the administrative and faculty care of students. A sample question in this section is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that your student should have regular contact with his/her academic advisor." The second subscale included 11 items that related to the importance that parents placed on a caring university/campus community. An example question is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that upon arriving at college you student finds programs welcoming them to campus life." The third caring subscale included 11 items relating to the importance that parents placed on ways that a university could be a caring partner with parents. An example question is, "As a parent, please indicate how important it is to you that the university notifies me of my student's academic success on a regular basis." Modifications made to this section for this study, included a question on how important that it is to parents that the institution provide a parent relations office and an active parent association with opportunities to volunteer. Additional modifications to the survey for this study included the addition of a question regarding the name of the institution that their student attends as well as their student's classification year (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior) and age. These were important for data analysis since kind and type of institution as well as student classification year are key variables in this study. Other modifications included the deletion of the sections where parents were asked to rate the two items that they deemed most important in each subsection. Additionally, student demographics were expanded to include ethnicity. Parent demographic questions were changed as well, and parent relationship to student was deleted.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Young (2006) assembled an 11 member panel to assess the PECTAC and establish validity. Additionally, he conducted two pilot studies and formed a focus group of parents from the two pilot studies and a faculty focus group to obtain further feedback on the instrument.

A Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of teaching subsection items; Technology Resources (.836), Active and Team Learning (.721), and Out of Class Learning (.762). Additionally, a Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each of the caring subsection items; Caring Faculty (.808), Caring University Community (.832), and Partnership with Parents (.842). The overall teaching section alpha was .872 and the overall caring section alpha was .897 (Young 2006). These alphas indicated adequate support for instrument reliability for Young's study.

Limitations

Using survey research for this study may limit the sample and will exclude parents that have not registered an email with the designated parent relations office; therefore, they will not have the opportunity to participate. The study's use of parent listservs from parent relations and admission offices could further limit the study only to those parents who are involved and have certain expectations of the institution. It could also exclude those parents who are not comfortable or familiar with computer surveys.

Relying on parent self-reports is another limitation of this study, as there is no way to verify that parents really expect what they report. Additionally, since only one parent may respond to the survey their responses may not represent the expectations of both parents. **Data Analysis**

Data collected from the survey will be downloaded into the IBM SPSS software package so that analysis can be conducted. Descriptive and frequency analyses will be run to describe the population. The dependent variables in the study are: parent expectations of the teaching functions of the institution (technology resources, out of class learning opportunities, and active and team learning) parent expectations of the caring functions of the institution (caring faculty, caring university community, and partnership with parents). Independent variables

154

cluster around several categories; institutional sponsorship (public, private nonsectarian, private religious) institutional type (research/PhD and liberal arts), parent characteristics (gender, ethnicity, educational attainment), and student classification and gender. Each question with the statistical analysis used to examine it is described below:

1. What differences exist between the kind of institution that their student attends in regards to the importance parents placed on the institution's a) teaching functions and b) caring functions? Two two-way factorial ANOVA's will be used to examine differences between these variables in regards to the two aspects of parental expectations. The two-way ANOVA's each have three specific sub research questions:

   a. Is there a difference between public institutions, private nonsectarian institutions, and private religious institutions in regard to parent expectations?

   b. Is there a difference between research universities and liberal arts colleges in regard to parent expectations?

   c. Is there an interaction between sponsorship and institutional type (research or liberal arts) in regard to parental expectations?

2. What differences exist between parent educational attainment (college graduate vs. non-college graduate) in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution? Two independent samples t-tests will be used to examine the differences between parent educational attainment and parent expectations of a) the teaching functions of the institution and b) the caring functions of the institution.

3. What differences exist between the parent's racial identity (African American, Caucasian, Latino American, Asian American) in regard to their expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution? Two one-way ANOVAs will be used to

155

examine the differences between the racial identity of the parent in regard to parent

expectations of a) the teaching functions of the institution and b)the caring functions of the

institution.

4. What differences exist between parent gender (male vs. female) in regard to expectations

of the teaching and caring functions of the institution? Two independent samples t-tests will

be used to examine the differences between parent gender and parent expectations of a) the

teaching functions of the institution and b) parent expectations of the caring functions of the

institution.

5. What differences exist between student classification (freshman, sophomore, junior,

senior) in regard to parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the

institution? Two one way ANOVAs will be used to examine the differences between student

classification and parent expectations of a) the teaching functions of the institution and b)

the caring functions of the institution.

6. How well does the combination of parent gender, race, parent educational attainment,

student classification, institutional sponsorship, and institutional type predict parent

expectations of a) the teaching functions of the institution and b) the caring functions of the

institution? Two multiple regressions will be used to examine the effects of these six

variables on parent expectations of the teaching and caring functions of the institution.

APPENDIX 6: Parent Invitation to Participate Email

Dear Parent,

Our institution has been invited to take part in a study about Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring.

Today's college parent is involved in a myriad of ways with their student and the institution that their student attends. In order for institutions to better serve parents, it is important that we understand parent expectations. Thus, the purpose of this survey is to learn more about parent expectations of the institution.

We would very much appreciate your participation by completing a brief online survey. This survey will take between 8 to 10 minutes to complete. All replies are anonymous and will be treated confidentially.

To complete the survey, https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PECTAC_1

If this link does not work, please copy and paste the following link into your browser https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PECTAC_1

APPENDIX 7: Parent Reminder Email

Dear Parent,

You were sent a prior invitation to participate in a study that our institution is supporting about Parent Expectations of Teaching and Caring. This is just a reminder to let you know that there is still time for you to participate, if you have not already done so.

Today's college parent is involved in a myriad of ways with their student and the institution that their student attends. In order for institutions to better serve parents, it is important that we understand parent expectations. Thus, the purpose of this survey is to learn more about parent expectations of the institution.

We would very much appreciate your participation by completing a brief online survey. This survey will take between 8 to 10 minutes to complete. All replies are anonymous and will be treated confidentially.

To complete the survey, https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PECTAC_1

If this link does not work, please copy and paste the following link into your browser

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PECTAC_1